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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Objectives of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to approach the thought of Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria as it is reflected in their use of \( \text{koin\,}\nu\,\text{\imath} \) and its cognates. Secondarily, the study attempts to observe their use of \( \text{koin\,}\nu\,\text{\imath} \) and its cognates as compared with authors related to them in time but not necessarily in spiritual or philosophical tradition. Thirdly, the paper contains some observations on the general development of \( \text{koin\,}\nu\,\text{\imath} \) and its cognates from classical to Christian times.

This study took its inspiration from comments made by two eminent scholars. R. Reitzenstein remarked in his work, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*: "Die Wortgeschichte, wenn sie sich zu einer Geschichte der Begriffe vertieft, kann uns noch immer reichen Aufschluss über Probleme geben, denen wir auf keinem anderen Wege nahe kommen können."\(^1\) Glanville Downey prefaced a study on "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ" with the observation that "the influence of

\(^1\)Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen* (Fotomechanischer Nachdruck der dritten Auflage von 1927; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1956), 76.
pagan philosophical ideas on Christianity can be traced both in the larger sphere of the terms and modes of thought, and more specifically in the usage of individual words.¹

κοινωνία is one of many Greek words which express the idea of sharing, but as Jourdan has pointed out, it is unique in that it also has the "capacity for conveying the sense of the inward union."² Because of this special connotation, κοινωνία and its cognates occur in a variety of interesting contexts throughout the whole of classical literature. In choosing a dissertation topic which would cross the lines of ancient history, ancient philosophy, and classics, according to the plan of Loyola University's History of Western Origins program, it seemed that the history of the development of a word such as κοινωνία might, as Reitzenstein suggested, provide a significant insight into the influences, trends, and changes in one aspect of the thought of the ancient world. With this in mind, citations of κοινωνία and its cognates were collected from the works of authors dating from the fifth century B.C. to the fifth century A.D.

It soon became evident, however, that an uncontrolled and random sampling of citations of κοινωνία and its cognates from various unrelated authors would result in vague generalizations.

¹Glanville Downey, "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ," Historia, IV (1955), 199.

valid only for citations actually studied. It seemed that much more significant results could be obtained if the study were primarily structured to emphasize all the usages of \textit{koivuvia} and its cognates in certain selected authors even though this might impose an artificial and at times awkward unity on the material. Two criteria seemed of special importance in the selection of the authors to be studied in depth. First, that the authors selected be part of the same intellectual tradition but of chronologically different periods. Thus, it seemed, there would be more possibility that influence in the usage of the terms might appear and that divergences might be explainable in light of the author's own historical and cultural milieu. Second, that the corpus of the writings of the authors selected be sufficiently large and well edited so that the occurrences of \textit{koivuvia} and its cognates would be frequent enough to be significant and that citations would be accurate. Using these criteria as a basis for selection, Plato was chosen to represent the classical period; Plutarch of Chaeronea the Hellenistic-Roman period; and Clement of Alexandria the patristic period.

\textbf{Organization of the Study}

Chapter II of this study is devoted to an analysis of the linguistic derivation of \textit{koivuvia} and its cognates. It also includes a summary of the pre-Platonic usages of \textit{koivuvia} and its cognates as background for the study in general and in particular for the thought of Plato. Chapters III, IV, and V analyze \textit{koivuvia}
and its cognates in the thought of each of the three main authors, with supplementary citations from other authors, usually of the same chronological period. Each of these three chapters concludes with a discussion of how the authors in the periods under consideration used κοινωνία and its cognates in contexts which reflect to some degree the cultural, social, philosophical, economic, or religious milieu of the period in which they were written. Chapter VI is an analysis of the grammatical constructions occurring with κοινωνία and its cognates based on a study of over 1400 citations from all the periods studied. Chapter VII presents the threefold conclusions of the study: a basic similarity in the thought of Plato, Plutarch, and Clement is reflected in their use of κοινωνία and its cognates; authors within each period provide points of comparison and contrast with the main authors in their use of κοινωνία and its cognates; there is an observable development in the use of κοινωνία and its cognates from classical to Christian times.

Related Studies

This is not the first study of κοινωνία and its cognates to appear, however. Several studies have been made on this topic, both in regard to the business practices of the ancient world and in reference to the New Testament.

The conclusion of P.J.T. Endenburg in Koinoonia en Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den klassieken Tijd is that κοινωνία and its cognates in the classical writers do not designate
elaborate commercial enterprises, as some had suggested, but refer at best to quite simple commercial relationships.¹

Studies of the use of κοινωνία and its cognates in the New Testament have been more numerous.² Many of them have taken the classical usages of κοινωνία and its cognates into account as the basis of study of κοινωνία in the New Testament. However, their main concern is the significance of κοινωνία and its cognates in understanding the Christian message.

All of these studies have been valuable for the present study especially in terms of methodology, but none of them have attempted to discuss the problem in the manner which is being used here, namely, as an approach to the thought of Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria and as a broad analysis of the development of the word from classical to Christian times.


CHAPTER II
KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES

Derivation and Development

The etymological derivation of κοίνων and its cognates is the adjective κοίνος meaning "public, common."¹ The Homeric equivalent is ξύνος. As early as Hesiod, τὸ κοίνον is used substantively and acquires specialized meanings such as "community, public property, public or common, governing authority, alliance."²

Noun forms develop from κοίνος and τὸ κοίνον: κοινών and κοινά-ῶνος in the Doric and Arcadian dialects, and κοινών, -ῶνος and κοινάν, -ῶνος in the Attic dialect. They have the lexical meanings "companion, colleague, ally."³ Also formed on the substantive τὸ κοίνον are the denominative verb κοινώω, -όμαι "to make common, to profane," κοινώμα, -μάτιον meaning "bond," and κοινώσει meaning "intercourse, commerce."⁴

³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
The verb forms which developed from the noun forms above, according to the usual pattern of formation in Greek, are κοίνωνεζ in Doric and κοίνωνεμ (κοίνωνεμ) in Attic. Verbs ending in -εμ ordinarily mean "to find oneself in a situation or the usual exercise of an activity." κοίνωνεμ can mean "to take part" or, more rarely, "to give a share." The noun κοίνωνεμα as well as the nouns κοίνωνει in Doric and κοίνωνει in Attic meaning "mutual participation, association" are based on the verb forms. ευνυνι is the Ionic form of the word and ευνυνι occurs in Aeschylus.

Most nouns ending in -ια are abstract nouns. κοίνωνει, however, may be used either abstractly or concretely. As participation, it is an abstract noun; as association, it is a concrete one.

The adjectival form κοίνωνος meaning "companion" is also based on the early noun form κοίνων, -ώνος. It is usually used substantively. The adjectives κοινωνικός and κοινωνικός meaning "communicative" are formed from the adjective κοινωνος as is

---

1 Raphael Kühner and Friedrich Blass, Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache (3rd ed.; Hanover Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1892), II, 260, #328.

2 Hauch, op. cit., p. 798.

3 Endenburg, op. cit., 105.

4 Campbell, op. cit., 356.

meaning "concerning community."¹

Pre-Platonic Usages

When κοινωνία appeared in the Attic literature of the fifth century B.C. it had the concrete meaning of "association," which the κοινων- root word always had, but it also developed the abstract sense of "participation." κοινωνία seems to have distinguished itself from other words having the same general connotation by acquiring the special capacity for indicating a state of inner as well as external union.

A clear indication of the nature of the relationships which are described by κοινωνία and its cognates can be seen in the antithetical expressions which occur throughout Greek literature.

Such statements as "What κοινωνία have herdsmen with the sea?",² "What κοινωνία has a mirror with a sword?",³ and "the fox fared very badly because he had made an alliance with an eagle,"⁴ indicate that there must be some common bond or likeness

¹Frisk, op. cit.
²Euripides Iphigeneia in Tauris 254 (Fabulae, ed. Gilbert Murray; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II.
of nature or purpose which forms the basis for a special relationship or κοινωνία between things, between persons, or among persons and groups of persons. In the first two examples given above, there did exist a common element which provided the basis for the κοινωνία between the herdsman and the sea, between the mirror and sword, but it is not immediately evident to the questioner. In the last example a state of equality was created where it had not previously existed and thus makes κοινωνία possible. Such relationships obviously admit of degrees: the greater the common element, the deeper the κοινωνία.

The writers who discussed the findings of the scientific study of medicine in the Hippocratic school at Cos during the last decade of the fifth century also used κοινωνία to designate physical relationships observable in the body. Two passages from Hippocrates' treatise On Joints make reference to the communications of the veins and arteries and to the "spinal cord itself with its coverings, their origin, endings, connections and functions." The treatise On Ancient Medicine, written probably by an able member of Hippocrates' school c. 430-420 B.C., contains

---

1 Hippocrates On Joints 45.9, ed. Hugo Kuehlewein (Opera Quae Feruntur Omnia; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1894-1902), II, 171-172.


This interesting observation:

I am utterly at a loss to know how those who prefer these hypothetical arguments and reduce the science to a simple matter of 'principles' ever cure anyone on the basis of their assumptions. I do not think that they have ever discovered anything that is purely 'hot' or 'cold', 'dry', 'wet', without its sharing some other qualities. 1

This statement seems to be a protest against introducing the philosophical suppositions of Empedocles into the practice of medicine where scientific observation had shown the opposite to be true.

In Pindar's I Pythian ode, the natural \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \zeta \) which the poet describes between lyre and song seems to be symbolic of a deeper spiritual \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \zeta \). The ode was written to honor Hiero of Syracuse, victor in the chariot race in 470 B.C. 2 Its primary purpose, however, is the celebration of the coronation of Deinomenes, Hiero's son, as king of the recently-founded city of Aetna in Sicily. 3 It is an encomium of praise and an exhortation to the spirit of concord and harmony which the poet hopes will characterize the city of Aetna under the rule of a constitutional king. Pindar says that no \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \zeta \) of lyre and song 4 will ever

---

1Hippocrates On Ancient Medicine 15.6, op. cit., I, 17.


4Pindar I Pyth 95-98, op. cit., 64.
praise the ignoble Phalaris whose city knew no spiritual harmony, as it will praise the young Deinomenes if his kingdom is characterized by concord. Every aspect of the poem is deliberately intended to intensify the theme of unity and harmony which the poet was lauding and which he expressed symbolically in terms of the Κόινωνία of lyre and song.¹

Κόινωνία is also employed a number of times in passages from the fifth century B.C. dramatists to express the close relationship which exists among those of common blood. This relationship implies much more than a physical bond; it demands a deep moral unity as well. In Aeschylus' drama, The Suppliant Maidens, which is usually considered the earliest surviving Greek drama,² the king of Argos, Pelasgus, acknowledged that the daughters of Danaus have the right to ask him and the people of Argos for aid because of their ancient blood Κόινωνία with Argos.³ To neglect this obligation would be to incur the wrath of Zeus protector of suppliants. The people acknowledge this claim as valid and assure the maidens of their support, even though this means war for Ar-

¹Burton, op. cit., and Gilbert Norwood, Pindar (Berkeley: 1945), 101-105.


Antigone too, in Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes, yields to the demand of blood relationship, even over the law of the state, when she defies the order of Creon and announces her intent to bury her brother Polyneices: "It shames me not to face the State, and set Will against power, rebellion resolute;/ Deep in my heart is set my sisterhood,/ My common birthright with my brothers, born/ All of one womb, her children who, for woe,/ Brought forth sad offspring to a sire ill-starred." Living, she will share willingly in misfortune with him who no longer has a will, being dead.

After Rhesus was killed by Odysseus, the leader of the chorus in Euripides' Rhesus offers his condolences to the Muse of the Mountains, mother of Rhesus, telling her that he mourns for Rhesus as much as is fitting for one not sharing a common ancestry.

1Virginia Woods Callahan, Types of Rulers in the Plays of Aeschylus (Chicago, 1944), 6.

2Whitney J. Oates and Eugene O'Neil, Jr., eds., The Complete Greek Drama (2 vols; New York: Random House, 1938), 119. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations of Greek drama given in this chapter are taken from this work.


5Euripides Rhesus 904-905 (Fabulae, Oxford: Clarendon
Complementary to the use of κοινωνία in designating the blood relationship and the deeper moral unity which that relationship implies is its use to express the spiritual relationship of husband and wife in marriage. The children, which are the natural result of that relationship, are in turn referred to as the visible expression of the marital κοινωνία.

The chorus in Euripides' Madness of Heracles assured Heracles who has returned home to revenge harm done to his family by Lycus during his absence: "'Tis only right that parents should help their children, their aged sires, and the partners of their marriage."¹ After Heracles had succeeded in slaying Lycus, he goes mad and in his frenzy kills his own wife and children. When he recovers his senses, Heracles begs Theseus, king of Athens, to assure them a proper burial since the law forbade him to do so. He asks that the children be buried in their mother's arms and then moans the "sad fellowship, which I - O wretch! - destroyed unknowing."² He bewailed the sad participations of his wea-

---

¹ Euripides Herakles 583-584, ed. and com. by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (Berlin: Weidmann, 1889), 21-22.

² Euripides Herakles 1374-77, op. cit., 46.
They had been "the comrades of my glorious career in Hellas." But now these same weapons are partners with him in the inglorious deed of murdering his wife and children. He says: "I am not sure whether to keep them or let them go: dangling at my side they thus will say, "With us didst thou destroy children and wife we are thy children's slayers, and thou keepest us."

Jason, in Medea of Euripides, taunts Medea with the reminder that, by killing their children, she has not only punished him but she too has become sorrowful and a ἱππωνία in the evils.2

Further indication of the special importance of the marriage ἱππωνία can be seen in the comments of Deianira, the wife of Heracles, in the Trachiniae of Sophocles. Deianira has become aware that Heracles expects her to welcome Iole, for whom he had captured and destroyed Oechalia, into her home and to share with the beautiful young captive her role as wife of Heracles. Deianira does not object to the sexual relations between Iole and her husband. But the humiliation of being made to share her role as wife and mistress of the house is one that the elder Deianira is not willing to endure because she fears that her unique and permanent relationship with Heracles is about to be set aside. She

1Euripides Herakles 1337, op. cit., p. 45.

2Euripides Medea 1361 (Fabulae, op. cit.) I, 302.
laments to the chorus:

A maiden, - or methinks, no longer a maiden, but a mistress, - hath found her way into my house...And now we twain are to share the same marriage-bed, the same embrace. Such is the reward that Heracles hath sent me, - he whom I call true and loyal, - for guarding his home through all that weary time. I have no thought of anger against him, often as he is vexed with this distemper. But then to live with her, sharing the same union - what woman could endure it? For I see that the flower of her age is blossoming, while mine is fading; and the eyes of men love to cull the bloom of youth, but they turn aside from the old. This, then, is my fear, - lest Heracles, in name my spouse should be the younger's mate. 1

Deianira becomes an unwitting κοινωνός in the murder of Heracles when she sends him a robe on which she put the blood Nessus had given her to use as a love charm to win back the love of Heracles from Iole. She soon realizes that the love charm is poison and that it will be fatal for Heracles. The leader of the chorus tries to console her, saying, "Yet towards those who have erred unwittingly, men's anger is softened; and so it should be towards thee." Deianira replies, "Nay such words are not for one who has borne a part in the ill deed, but only for him who has no trouble at his own door." 2 Though unwittingly, she is indeed a

---

1 Sophocles Trachiniae 545-546, ed., com., and tr. by R.C. Jebb (The Plays and Fragments; Cambridge: University Press, 1892), V, 84.

J. C. Kamerbeek, The Plays of Sophocles Commentaries (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), 9, points out that this passage contains an interesting contrast between ξυνοικησία, the physical living together under a common roof, and κοινωνία, sharing in the same marital relations. Cf. also S.M. Adams, Sophocles the Playwright (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957) 116-120.

2 Sophocles Trachiniae 729-730, op. cit., 112.
in the murder of Heracles.

Agave in Euripides' Bacchae tells Cadmus that Phebeus is the child "of my love and his father's bred." And when Jocasta and Laius in Euripides' Phoenissae remain childless after years of marriage, Laius finally goes to Delphi to question Apollo, "craving moreover that our love might be crowned with sons born to his house."2

In Euripides' Ion, Creusa, who had as a girl given birth to Ion by Apollo, and her husband Xuthus consulted the oracle and the leader of the chorus reports to Creusa the oracle given in her regard: "To thee, my queen, it is not given to clasp/ In thy fond arms a child, or at thy breast/ To hold it." The tutor who was with Creusa quickly intervenes to ask: "If a common fate/ Await our lord, partaker of thy griefs,/ Or thou Creusa alone art thus unfortunate?" The chorus leader replies: "To him, old man, the god hath given a son/ And happiness is his unknown to her." In their childlessness, Xuthus is a koinwos with Creusa in grief. The chorus leader implies that the child to be given to Xuthus by the god will not be a source of common joy because it

1Euripides Bacchae 1276 (Fabulae, op. cit.), III.
2Euripides Phoenissae 13-16 (Fabulae, op. cit.), III.
3Ibid.
4Euripides Ion 771-772 (Fabulae, op. cit.), II.
will not be the offspring of their mutual love. As the story un-
folds, the child given to Xuthus is discovered to be none other than Ion, Creusa's own son. So Ion becomes a source of joy to
both Xuthus and Creusa, but still not a source of common joy.

In addition to husband, wife and children, the slave, too, is considered as an integral member of the household. He is there by entitled to participate in household worship.¹ Aeschylus in the Agamemnon has Clytemnestra address Cassandra: "Get thee within, thou too; thou Cassandra, since Zeus without anger has made thee to share with our house in its lustral water standing among our many slaves by the household altar."²

The stranger also, since he travels under the protection of Zeus, is entitled to participate in the sacrifice according to the laws of hospitality. The plot to kill Aegistheus hatched by Orestes and the former servant of Agamemnon in Euripides' Electra is based on this religious obligation. The old man tells Orestes that Aegistheus is out in the fields with some slaves preparing a feast for the nymphs and advises him to go past the place where Aegistheus is sacrificing so that he will see Orestes and invite him to the feast.³ Once able to get close to Aegistheus without

¹ Eduard Fraenkel, ed., Aeschylus, Agamemnon (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), II, 469, comments: "What Clytemnestra here makes appear as a special favor is in truth nothing more than the common practice of antiquity."

² Aeschylus Agamemnon 1035-38, I, 152-153.

³ Euripides Electra 637 (Fabulae, op. cit.), II.
rousing suspicion, it will be no problem to kill him. The ruse works perfectly and the plot proceeds as planned.

The natural κοινωνία which exists among persons related by blood may be further intensified by a common will. When Orestes is condemned to die by his own hand for the murder of his mother, Clytemnestra, he first returns to bid farewell to Electra. She greets him as "partner in one soul" with her, and prays, "Ah, would the self-same sword, if only it might be, could slay us both, and one coffin of cedar-wood receive us!" And Orestes replies, "That would be an end most sweet; but surely thou seest we are too destitute of friends to be allowed to share one tomb."¹

This common crime which they committed is the result of their common hatred of their mother for the murder of their father.

κοινωνία can also exist between persons not related by blood; it is then based on common interest or common effort or on some other type of common bond. In the Ajax of Sophocles, the hero of the play became temporarily insane when the arms of Achilles are awarded to Odysseus, and in his madness Ajax slaughters the cattle of the army, thinking they are the leaders of the Greek forces. Tecmessa, who had witnessed the event, recounts it for the Salaminian sailors adding that because of their very close relationship with Ajax, they are as involved in the disgrace as though they themselves had participated in it.²

¹Euripides Orestes 1054-55 (Fabulae, op. cit.), III.

²Sophocles Ajax 284 (The Plays and Fragments, op. cit.),
Medea comments to Creon that they share the same fate of being hated because they possessed a wisdom greater than the rest of men have.¹

In the Choephori of Aeschylus, Electra shared with the chorus the news about the locks of hair left as offerings at her father's grave because they also share with her a common sorrow over the death of Agamemnon.²

Iphigeneia, in Euripides' Iphigeneia in Tauris, secures the co-operation of the chorus of captive Greek women in her escape with Orestes from Thoas and the Taurians by promising to see to it that they will share her good fortune and be able to return to Greece themselves.³ The ruse Iphigeneia uses to escape involves submitting the statue of Artemis to ritual purification together with the two captives Orestes and Pylades who are "polluted with domestic blood." When Thoas inquires about the nature of their guilt, Iphigeneia replies that they slew their mother with a common sword,⁴ the use of a single sword being indicative of

VII, 52. Kamerbeek, op. cit., (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953), I, 74, comments: "κοινωνος: not 'als ab du dabei zugegen gewesen warst' (Rademacher), but 'Being concerned in it'...(Wrong: mali auctor, Ellendt.)"

¹ Euripides Medea 302 (Fabulae, op. cit.), I.


³ Euripides Iphigeneia in Tauris 1067-68 (Fabulae, op. cit.) II.

⁴ Euripides Iphigeneia in Tauris 1173, ibid.
their moral unity in the action performed.

Clytemnestra, in Euripides' Electra, attempts to justify herself for turning to Agamemnon's enemies for help in avenging his murder of their daughter Iphigeneia, because no one who had been loyal to Agamemnon could have been expected to be a willing κοινωνός in his murder.¹

Orestes asks Hermione, in the Andromache of Euripides, if she has any κοινωνός in her attempted murder of Andromache and her child.² And in Euripides' Orestes, Menelaus asks Pylades if he is a κοινωνός of Orestes in attempting to murder Hermione.³

The chorus of the Cyclops of Euripides want to take part with Odysseus in preparing the burning brand which is to gouge out the eye of the Cyclops.⁴ They regard participation in this act as analogous to a religious sacrifice in which all are united by desire and intent.

More in the realm of daily experience are the references in Aristophanes' Wasps to the κοινωνία established between two public advocates in the public lawcourts when they split a bribe

---

¹Euripides Electra 1047-48 (Fabulae, op. cit.), II.
²Euripides Andromache 915 (Fabulae, op. cit.), I.
³Euripides Orestes 1591 (Fabulae, op. cit.), III.
⁴Euripides Cyclops 469-471 (Fabulae, op. cit.), III.
and both work for the acquittal of the accused,¹ and in Lysias' speech Against Diogeiton where two brothers, on inheriting an estate, divide the money but hold the property in common.²

The κοινωνία which exists among individuals is seen also to exist in regard to the relationship of the citizens of a state and of states with each other. In the Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes, Praxagora proposes this solution for the economic and social ills of her state:

I want all to have a share of everything and all property to be in common; there will no longer be either rich or poor; no longer shall we see one man harvesting vast tracts of land, while another has not ground enough to be buried in, nor one man surround himself with a whole array of slaves while another has not a single attendant; I intend that there shall only be one and the same condition of life for all. ʒ

In an earthy aside typical of comedy, Praxagora's husband Blypheros asks: καὶ τῶν πελεθρῶν κοινωνεῖμεν; ⁴

The Mytilenaeans have established a κοινωνία with Athens but later become dissatisfied with their mutual relations. So


⁴Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae 596, ibid., 42.
they seek an alliance with the Peloponnesians, outlining the points which they consider essential to a successful koivos among states:

We will first discuss the question of justice and rectitude, especially as we are seeking an alliance, for we know that neither does friendship between men prove lasting, nor does a league between states come to aught, unless they comport themselves with transparent honesty of purpose towards one another and in general are of like character and way of thinking; for differences in men's actions arise from the diversity of their conviction. 1

These are criteria for a successful koivos between men as well as between states.

Conclusion

koivos and its cognates are directly related through linguistic development to the Greek xunos and koivos, meaning "public" or "common." During the long period of the evolution of the Greek language, the concept koivos gradually became refined. By the early fifth century, B.C., when koivos and its cognates appear in literature written in the Attic dialect, they show evidence of the process of linguistic and semantic development which preceded them by their ability to express both the concrete idea of "association" and the abstract concept of "participation."

The process by which koivos and its cognates acquired the ability to describe the abstract as well as concrete relation—

ships is of course unknown. However, indications of how this may have taken place are perhaps reflected in the use of κοινωνία and its cognates by the Athenian dramatists. Originally, it would seem, the κοινωνία established by consanguinity was the most important factor regulating relationships among persons. The leader of the chorus in the Rhesus commented to the Muse of the Mountain that he mourned for Rhesus as much as was fitting for one not related by blood. The emphasis then comes to be placed on the moral or spiritual obligations binding upon those related by blood, which were enforced, according to Aeschylus, by the will and power of Zeus. Thus, the people of Argos recognize that the daughters of Danaus have a special claim on their assistance because of their common ancestry, and Antigone buried Polyneices contrary to the law of the land because it is her duty, imposed by Zeus, as a blood relation. A common will or purpose then seems to become the more important basis of κοινωνία, even between those related by blood. Such a situation is illustrated by Orestes and Electra, who ally to kill their own mother. Finally, the spiritual basis of the κοινωνία comes to be regarded both as the gauge of the depth of the relationship and as the decisive criterion, with the importance of blood relationship decreasing accordingly. This phase of the development is illustrated by the relationships between Orestes and Pylades, Odysseus and his companions, and Ajax and his companions.

The use of κοινωνία and its cognates to describe the
physical interconnections of the parts of the body is a sophisticated use of the concrete relationship based on the scientific studies of the Hippocratic school of medicine at Cos. In Pindar's ode however, written over a half century earlier than the previous citations, the concrete κοινωνία of lyre and song is well on the way to becoming an abstraction capable of symbolizing spiritual harmony, a transfer of meaning particularly significant in this context since the ancient Greeks knew by experience that it was difficult for a tyrant with absolute power to retain outward and inner harmony with and among his subjects indefinitely. Finally, the reference to the principles of hot, cold, wet, and dry which the Hippocratic writer says cannot exist without κοινωνία in something else is an example of the type of abstraction common to the thought of the pre-Socratic philosophers.

Several passages from the pre-Platonic authors also reflect the ways in which κοινωνία and its cognates were used in common parlance in the fifth century B.C. Aristophanes has Praxagora in the Ecclesiazusae suggest a communal approach to living as a solution for the economic and social ills of the times. In the Wasps he describes the type of κοινωνία based on self-interest which public advocates established for themselves. Lysias indicates that joint heirs could maintain koinonia in the possession of inherited property. κοινωνία is also used to describe the relationship established between allies by Thucydides who has the Mytilenian envoy state that honesty of purpose, like character
and way of thinking are absolutely essential for successful political κοινωνία. 

κοινωνία and its cognates appear equally able to express both concrete and abstract types of relationships when they appear in the Attic Greek dialect of the fifth century B.C. However, they are limited to the description of specific relationships rather than as statements about relationship in general, whether concrete or abstract. The contexts in which they occur are characteristic either of the times which they describe or the themes of the literature prevalent in that period, thus reflecting the aspects of the milieu of the period in which they were written.
CHAPTER III

KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN PLATO AND RELATED AUTHORS OF THE CLASSICAL PERIOD

Introduction

About 427 B.C. Plato was born into a noble Athenian family which traced its ancestry back to Codrus, Athens' last king. As a young man, according to his own account in Epistle VII, he had a keen interest in political life. However he soon became disillusioned by the atrocities committed by the Thirty who overthrew the democracy in 411 B.C. and then by the injustice of the restored democratic party which condemned Socrates, his teacher and friend, to death in 399 B.C. After Socrates' death, Plato retired to Megara and then travelled extensively. He visited the Pythagorean community in Italy and went to Syracuse three times, c. 389, 367, 361 B.C. After his first visit to Syracuse he returned to Athens and began teaching philosophy in the Academy and writing philosophic dialogues. He died in 348 B.C.

The impact of his disillusionment at the corruption of Athenian politics, epitomized for him in the fate of Socrates, and then of politics in general was a crucial experience for Plato.

He could not participate in politics as they were; yet to divorce himself completely from politics would mean that an essential part of his existence would be denied. So he attempted instead to build a new life on an entirely different foundation for both the individual and the state.¹ Socrates had shown that man had to be remade in terms of virtue. Plato broadened and developed this idea until he arrived at the conclusion that

the classes of mankind...will have no cessation from evils until either the class of those who are right and true philosophers attains political supremacy, or else the class of those who hold power in the States becomes, by some dispensation of Heaven, really philosophic.²

The Greek state had originally been built on a religious foundation, with Zeus, Themis, the Fates and the Horai governing the affairs of men. When this foundation began to weaken in a more sceptical age, Heracleitus secured the foundation of the state on the justice and order of the cosmos. The Sophists of the fifth century, however, attempted to undermine this foundation by saying that there was no innate justice and order in things. Rather, justice was something arbitrarily established as supreme by a few wise men in order to control man's bestial nature. Law was thus considered generally hostile to nature.

Socrates differed from the Sophists, though accused of

¹Ibid., 9.

being one, because of his belief in the supremacy of justice. Behind his every question was the search for the good life which the good man should lead in the well-ordered polis. Socrates himself apparently was the inspiration which led Plato beyond the practical notion of justice to the essential justice existing in the world of Ideas, a transition facilitated perhaps by his familiarity with the traditional Greek concept of the generic. With the "eyes of the soul" a man could see the Eidos, a term which no longer designated for Plato a sense object but the reality which the sensible imperfectly expressed. "If there was such a thing as justice, if it was an Eidos, then a person became just when he looked at justice."¹ Plato felt it was his mission to educate both the individual and the polis to see what he had seen—the Idea of justice—and then to build a new polis with justice as its foundation.

This and nothing else is meant by Plato's epigram according to which there will be no end to evils unless philosophers become rulers or the rulers genuine seekers after truth. It is just another expression of that "systematic" connection which always existed for him between Eidos and Polis, not because of any conceptual construction, but because of an experienced necessity. ²

To make his intuition meaningful for others became the goal of Plato's life. His three trips to Syracuse were an attempt to actually create an ideal state ruled by a philosopher-king. Dion first invited Plato to Syracuse in 389 B.C. to teach philos-

¹Friedlander, op. cit., 19.
²Ibid., 20.
ophy to his brother-in-law, Dionysius I the king, but the enterprise was unsuccessful. Dionysius I died and was succeeded by his son Dionysius II who was under the influence of his uncle Dion. Dion again invited Plato to Syracuse in 367 B.C. to be his in educating the young ruler so that he might become a philosopher-king, and a worthy in the whole of life.

Dion believed that Dionysius' association with Plato in a liberal education would create a bond between them more strong and trustworthy than any produced by venal friendship or kinship of soul and body, and so Plato became "an associate of Dionysius at table and at hearth and a partaker in his holy rites."

Dionysius, however, completely failed to understand Plato's aims. Furthermore, he tried to involve Plato in his political activities, much to Plato's great distress. These two circumstances, according to Plato, finally created a "wolf-love and want of fellowship" between himself and Dionysius which ended with Plato's returning to Greece.

In 361 B.C. Dionysius invited Plato to return to Syracuse, assuring him that his purposes were now the same as those of his

---

1 Ep. VII 327C.
2 Ibid., 333B.
3 Ibid., 334B.
4 Ibid., 350C.
5 Ep. III, 316B, D, 318D.
6 Ep. III, 318E.
uncle Dion. Plato agreed to support him if this were true, but also reminded him of the example of Socrates who risked the greatest penalties rather than be a partaker in the unholy deeds of the Athenian tyrants. His second attempt to educate Dionysius II was no more successful than the first, however, and seems to have marked the end of Plato's attempts to actualize the ideal state he envisioned.

The other, more systematic means which Plato used to make his intuition meaningful for others, were the teaching of philosophy in the Academy at Athens and the writing of philosophic dialogues. Each of these dialogues expressed complementary aspects of the reality which he contemplated. Though it cannot be too strongly emphasized that his philosophy was not an outgrowth of earlier systems, it must be acknowledged that he found some elements in the earlier philosophical systems congenial to his mission, and that he used the vocabulary they provided him.

1Ep. VII 323D-324A.
2Ep. VII 325A.

3Leo Strauss, The City and Man (Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1963), 62, says: "There are many dialogues because the whole consists of many parts. But the individual dialogue is not a chapter from an encyclopedia of the philosophic sciences or from a system of philosophy, and still less a relic or a stage of Plato's development. Each dialogue deals with one part, it reveals the truth about that part. But the truth about a part is a partial truth, a half truth. Each dialogue, we venture to say, abstracts from something that is most important to the subject matter of the dialogue."
When Plato distinguished the reality of the Ideas from those of sense by terms such as "the beautiful-itself" and "good-as-being," he unconsciously perhaps but nevertheless necessarily placed himself "in the tradition of the search for the true being, which extended from Gorgias, Melissos, and Zeno back to the great Parmenides, the discoverer of the one eternal, immutable being." Plato agreed with Parmenides that being is absolutely opposed to not-being, that not-being is unknowable, that this world is one of being and not-being. He could not accept Parmenides' conclusions that being and thinking are one and the same, however.

Plato, who incorporates the abundance of intuited forms into his world of being, and for whom, because of Socrates, man or the "soul" is one of the highest experiences, could no longer envisage so simple a construction. He adopted the basic plan. Yet he envisaged different degrees of reality precisely corresponding to different degrees of knowledge. Eventually, for transcending Parmenides, he constructed a harmonious system of being and knowledge. 2

Plato also discerned a common element in Parmenides and Heracleitus, "the dialectical law of becoming and the permanence of change" which reflected aspects of his own thought. Plato opposed the world of being and the world of becoming on one level but united them again on a higher level. On the one hand the Idea gave the individual things to share in true being; on the

1 Friedlander, op. cit., 22.
2 Ibid., 24-25.
3 Ibid., 25-26.
other, the individual things had to strive for complete union with the Idea. Both are necessary for Plato's "harmony of opposites."

Plato also found the science of order in number, musical harmony, and the cosmos taught by the Pythagoreans sympathetic to his thought. He appreciated their doctrine that the state and the soul, as well as the cosmos, were ordered wholes. He respected their doctrine of the eternity and permanence of the individual soul. It confirmed his own insight that, since the world of Ideas exists, man must have some relation to it—something impossible unless he belonged to two worlds. On this foundation Plato justified his doctrine of the eternity of the soul. "If the human soul is by nature of such a kind that it knows eternal being, then it must itself—for like can only be known by like—have being after the manner of the eternal forms."¹

Plato had set out on a quest for the best state. He found a much more meaningful world—the world of Ideas where the things which appeared in the polis existed in their perfection. He came to the realization that man was not just a creature of this world of becoming but that he was able to share in Ideas through the power of his soul. He saw the harmony which existed in the world of Ideas imitated in the world of the cosmos and realized that this same order based on justice must also exist in the soul of the individual and the state and that they were neces-

¹Ibid., 3.
sarily oriented to the world of Ideas and fulfilled in one complete harmony of being.

Koinonia and its Cognates in Plato

The existence of the Ideas or Forms is essential to Plato's thought. In the Republic he says of them "that in itself each is one, but that by virtue of their communication with actions and with bodies and with one another, they present themselves everywhere, each as a multiplicity of aspects." As Friedlander points out, however, "...nowhere do we find a 'doctrine' as such, or a system comprising the order of these forms, communicating their knowledge, or clarifying their relationship to the world of appearance."2

Plato speaks of the Ideas in relation to the sensible particulars at times of immanence and at other times in terms of transcendence. One of the words which he uses to express the immanent aspect of the relationship is koinōnia. But he nowhere explains the precise character of this relationship, or koinōnia, perhaps, as Taylor suggests, because he himself senses an unsolved problem—namely how the participation takes place.3 This question has engaged scholars for centuries. Shorey regards the

1Rep. 476A.
2Friedlander, op. cit.,
relation of the particular to the Idea as a mystery. He says: "once we have accepted the metaphors 'presence', 'participation', 'pattern', a number of ideas can be reflected by or present in one thing as easily as can one idea."¹ Ross takes the position "that the relation of Form or universal to particular is perfectly intelligible, though unique" and sees "no mystery about the presence of a universal in many particulars, any more than there is about its presence in one."² However, he concludes that Plato needed the vocabulary both of immanence and of transcendence to express his fundamental insight which could not be fully communicated by the use of either alone.³

It remains for the Academy and its successors in philosophy to find out how the forms are articulated, how closely and by what means they limit the things that share them, and how, if at all, the same forms can be fixed patterns, meanings, and ideals. But it is an insight of central importance to Platonism that being, thinking, and doing all operate within limits of patterns which we have been referring to here as "the order of the forms."⁴

κοινωνία in the first instance is used to express a relationship among the ideas themselves. This is the key concept in Plato's Parmenides.⁵ The dialogue opens with the youthful

---

¹Paul Shorey, The Unity of Plato's Thought (New Impressions; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 52.
³Ibid., 231.
⁵For a discussion of the various analyses of this dialogue
Socrates suggesting to Parmenides that participation in the Ideas may be an answer to Zeno’s refutation of pluralism. He says:

But, Parmenides, the best I can make of the matter is this: that these Forms are as it were patterns fixed in the nature of things; the other things are made in their image and are likenesses; and this participation they come to have in the Forms is nothing but their being made in their image. 1

The discussion continues until both agree that the Forms are a necessary basis for all thought and discourse.

Parmenides then suggests to Socrates that a preliminary exercise in dialectic should proceed a definition of the Ideas, such as Beauty or Justice, and is persuaded to illustrate this method by discussing the hypothesis that the one is or exists and that the one is not or does not exist. He argues that if the one is, it exists and must have participation in time. "Since the One is one, of course it has being; and to 'be' means precisely having existence in conjunction with time present, as 'was' or 'will be' means having existence in conjunction with past or

cf. Andreas Speiser, Ein Parmenideskommentar: Studien zur platonischen Dialektik (Stuttgart: K.F. Koehler, 1959), 11. Cf. also Friedlander, op. cit., 26. "...Plato formulated this "harmony of opposites"...most elaborately in the Parmenides, where it has, as it were been crystallized in the precise dialectics of the "one" and the "other." Paradoxical as it may sound, the dialogue Parmenides is the most strongly Herakleitean among Plato's writings, and the philosopher Parmenides, in this work, just as much Herakleitean as an Eleatic."

future time. So if the One is, it is in time."¹ This statement reflects a primitive logic with the idea of participation playing the role which the copula will later assume in Aristotelian logic.

In discussing the limitation of the parts in relation to each other and to the whole, and the whole in relation to the parts, Parmenides concludes:

Thus the consequence for the things other than the One appears to be that from the combination of unity and themselves there comes to be in them something fresh, which gives them a limit with references to one another; whereas their own nature gives them, in themselves, unlimitedness. Thus the things other than the One, both as wholes and part by part, are unlimited and also have limit. ²

In summing up the consequences of saying that others exist but the one does not, Parmenides concludes that the other things will not be one nor will they be many, nor will they even appear to be one or many "for the Others cannot in any sense or manner have any connection with a nonentity, nor can any element of a nonentity be present to any of them, since a nonentity has no elements."³

In both of these texts the participation discussed in terms of Καινωνία is a rudimentary form of a metaphysical and metaphorical participation, metaphysical in that a reality is represented as existing outside the mind and metaphorical in that

¹Parm. 151E-152A.
²Parm. 158D.
³Parm. 166A.
the objects are abstractions treated objectively.

The stated purpose of the Sophist is to discover the true nature of the sophist. The Eleatic Stranger in the dialogue proposes to do this through the "method of definition by dichotomy" which leads to the development of a metaphysics. He establishes the following method of procedure:

Now, then, let us set to work again and, as we divide the kind proposed in two, keep to the right-hand section at each stage. Holding fast to the characters of which the Sophist partakes until we have stripped off all that he has in common with others and left only the nature that is peculiar to him, let us so make that nature plain, in the first place to ourselves, and secondly to others whose temperament finds a procedure of this sort congenial. 2

But the definition of the sophist is interrupted by what is in form a long digression, but is really the most serious and important part of the whole ... The Sophist has been found to be a juggler and deceiver, and the question arises whether deception or falsehood does not involve the assumption of Not-Being... Plato refutes the doctrine that Not-Being cannot exist by showing that it has a relative existence—that in each particular instance it denotes a difference or condition of being other than that in connexion with which it is said to exist. It is not mere negation—the opposite of Being—but becomes the positive notion of Difference... Hereupon follows the discussion of the nature of Being, and the conclusion is reached that everything which possesses any power, either to produce a change or to be affected by a cause, has existence, i.e., that power—whether active or passive—is Being. 3

---


2 Soph. 264E.

This digression on the problem of Being and not-Being contains many significant \( \text{συνωμόθεωριά} \) passages. Theatetus, acting as the spokesman for the "friends of the Forms," agrees that the stranger has correctly stated their position in the following assertion:

And you say that we have intercourse with Becoming by means of the body through sense, whereas we have intercourse with Real being by means of the soul through reflection. And Real being, you say, is always in the same unchanging state, whereas Becoming is variable. 1

The Stranger goes on further to define this 'intercourse' attributed to both as "The experiencing an effect or the production of one, arising, as the result of some power from things that encounter one another," 2 but says that the "friends of the Forms" do not accept this definition. They reply that "a power of acting and being acted upon belongs to Becoming, but neither of these powers is compatible with Real being." 3 The type of participation discussed above is epistemological in nature, having to do with the process of cognition.

Later in the dialogue, rest and motion are said to be by reason of their participation in existence, and ontological participation which forms the basis of a simple existential judgment.

Then the discussion moves from the metaphysical to logical participation as the Stranger proposes another problem:

1Soph. 248A.
2Soph. 248B.
3Plato's Theory of Knowledge, op. cit., 240.
Are we not to attach Existence to Motion and Rest, nor anything else to anything but rather to treat them in our discourse as incapable of any blending or participation in one another? Or are we to lump them all together as capable of association with one another? Or shall we say that this is true of some and not of others? 1

Theatetus agrees to discuss each one of these questions separately.

The Stranger first asks, if nothing has any power to combine with anything else, will the result not be that motion and rest have no share in being. 2 Theatetus agrees to this and also to the statement that neither rest nor motion will be if they have no share in being. 3 This position contradicts all who are accustomed to use being as an attribute or who speak of the combining and separating of elements and those "who will not allow one thing to share in the quality of another and so be called by its name." 4

The second possibility is that all things have the power of participation in one another. 5 Theatetus says this assumption is easily dismissed "because then Movement itself would come to a complete standstill, and again Rest itself would be movement, if each were to supervene upon the other." 6

1 Soph. 250B.
2 Soph. 251E.
3 Soph. 251E.
4 Soph. 252B.
5 Soph. 252D.
6 Plato's Theory of Knowledge, 260.
Therefore, the third proposition is the only possible one: some things can and others cannot participate in one another. The Stranger comments that things are like letters, some of which can be joined and others not. Just as it is the man who possesses the art of grammar who knows which letters can join with the others, so the philosopher is a man who is able to succeed in pointing out which Kinds are constant, and which are incompatible with one another; also, whether there are certain Kinds that pervade them all and connect them so that they can blend, and again, where there are divisions (separations), whether there are certain others that traverse wholes and are responsible for the division. 1

This knowledge, "how to distinguish, Kind by Kind, in what ways the several Kinds can or can not combine," the philosopher gains through the science of dialectic. 2

After this digression on dialectic, the Stranger returns to the next stage of the discussion, saying:

Now that we are agreed, then, that some of the Kinds will combine with one another and some will not, and that some combine to a small extent, others with a large number, while some pervade all and there is nothing against their being combined with everything, let us next follow up the argument in this way. We will not take all the Forms, for fear of getting confused in such a multitude, but choose out some of those that are recognized as most (or very) important, and consider first their several natures and then how they stand in respect of being capable of combination with one another. In this way, though we may not be able to conceive Being and Not-Being with perfect clearness, we may at least give as satisfactory an account of them as we can under the conditions of our present inquiry, and see if there is any opening allowing us to assert that

1Soph. 253A.
2Soph. 253E.
what is not, really is what is not, and to escape unscathed.¹

Being, rest, and motion are chosen as the three kinds of classes to be examined. Being can mingle with rest and motion, but these two cannot mingle with each other. Sameness and difference are also discussed in terms of motion. Motion is entirely other than rest; it exists by reason of its participation in being; it is other than the same; yet it is the same because all things partake of the same. "There is a sense in which the Real ... 'is not'. Anything real is the subject of innumerable true statements, asserting that it is not (is different from) anything else that is real."²

Having established the participation of the classes in one another,³ and that not-being is not the opposite of being but rather is difference, the dialogue moves into its third major topic, "the logical and grammatical analysis of the sentence." For intelligible speech presupposes this participation in order to be able to predicate existence, identity, and diversity. Thus the Stranger wants to establish discourse as one of the classes of being. The Sophist maintains that opinion and speech have no participation in not-being, and therefore that falsehood cannot exist, so that he may not be able to be accused of practicing "the art of creating images and semblances..." The Stranger re-

¹Soph. 254BC.
²Soph. 256B.
³Soph. 257A.
solves to examine speech and opinion and fancy and show that they
do participate in not-being and thus also "prove that falsity
exists, and by that proof pin down the Sophist there, if he is
amenable to capture, or else let him go and pursue our search in
some other Kind."¹ According to Cornford, "the thought and
speech which can partake of falsity are not Platonic Forms, but
the thoughts which exist in our minds and the speeches we utter."²
In order to prove this a long discussion of logical analysis fol-
lows with the result that "the art of contradiction-making, des­
cended from an insincere kind of conceited mimicry, of the sem­
blance-making breed, from image-making, distinguished as a por­
tion, not divine but human, of production that presents a shadow­
play of words"³ is shown to be, par excellence, that of the Soph­
ist.

Κοινωνία as it exists among the Forms is the perfection
of relationship. Unlike the particular which shares in the Form
only imperfectly,⁴ "the Form which shares in another is a perfect
specification of the other."⁵ The type of Κοινωνία described

¹Soph. 260E.
²Plato's Theory of Knowledge, 302.
³Ibid., 331.
⁴Aristotle comments at Metaphysics 991a8: "if the Ideas
and the particulars that share in them have the same form, there
will be something common to these...but if they have not the same
form, they must have only the name in common, and it is as if one
were to call both Callias and a wooden image a 'man', without ob­
serving any community between them."
⁵Ross, op. cit., 111-112, footnote 66.
in the Sophist does not deal with that of the particular in the form but rather with the "relation of class-inclusion between forms."¹ Much effort has been expended in this dialogue to prove what seems a rather obvious thesis, that the Kinds or classes have κοινωνία with one another in some but not all ways. This results in "the establishment of the principle that the Forms are neither a collection of entities standing in no positive relation to each other, nor yet capable of entering into all sorts of relations to one another—that they form, indeed, a system."²

In both the Parmenides and the Sophist Plato seems deliberately to use κοινωνία to describe various types of philosophical participation—logical, epistemological, ontological—so that the term does not become exclusively identified with any one of them. Cornford remarks, "By varying the word, Plato helps the reader to free his conception of the relation intended from such associations and to escape the illusion that philosophical language can be really precise and unambiguous."³ This procedure also allows Plato to use the term in other than strictly philosophical contexts, such as those in which we have already seen it used in the pre-Platonic authors. He uses κοινωνία to express relationships within man or among men, in the polis or in the

¹Edith Watson Schipper, "Perceptual Judgments and Particul-
2Ross, op. cit., 116.
³Cornford, Plato's Theory of Knowledge, 256.
cosmos, between these various levels or with the world of Forms. In all of these instances however, the general rule established for Κοινωνία among the Forms—that Κοινωνία is possible in some but not all ways—applies equally to these other relationships.

The cosmos animated by soul but also having participation in a bodily nature, exemplified for Plato the natural order and harmony which he felt should exist in all things. He emphasized the study of astronomy because it illustrated the Κοινωνία and kinship of the stars with one another and their natural harmony. Since the number is essential for harmony, anything which was lacking in grace and rhythm and harmony he considered deficient in number. Earth, air, fire and water he described as "variegated in their shapes and combinations and formulations." The formation of images in mirrors and in bright and smooth surfaces he attributed to the "combination with each other of the inner and outer fires, every time that they unite on the smooth surface and

---

1 Pol. 269D.
2 Demosthenes Against Aristogeiton II 27, trans. J.H. Vince (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 592-593, comments: "To sum up: we shall find nothing venerable or admirable which is not associated with law, since the whole round world, the heavenly bodies and what we call the seasons are plainly, if we can trust our senses, controlled by law and order."
3 Rep. 531D.
4 Epin. 978A.
5 Tim. 61C.
are variously deflected.\textsuperscript{1}

Man for Plato was a microcosm of the cosmos, also animated by soul and having participation in a bodily nature. He advanced some considerations dealing with physiology and pathology and sense perception in his discussions, though these were never his main concern. For instance, in the Timaeus it is stated that a disproportioned body is not only ugly to look at but shares in much pain because of its awkwardness.\textsuperscript{2} The Stranger of the Laws comments on the preludes and tunings-up common to all utterances and things in which the voice participates.\textsuperscript{3}

It is said in the Philebus that the mixture of sickness and health produces certain results in each case,\textsuperscript{4} and that some bodily conditions seems to be a combination of both pleasure and pain.\textsuperscript{5}

Salt is said by its nature to blend well "with the combinations which affect the sensation of the mouth."\textsuperscript{6} Things which have a pungent quality somehow "share in the heat of the mouth and are made smooth thereby."\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{1}Tim. 46A.
\textsuperscript{2}Tim. 87E.
\textsuperscript{3}Leg. 722D.
\textsuperscript{4}Phil. 25A.
\textsuperscript{5}Phil. 46B.
\textsuperscript{6}Tim. 60D.
\textsuperscript{7}Tim. 65E.
But it is man as a κοινωνία of body and soul which is Plato's main concern, and he is convinced that this κοινωνία is essentially detrimental to the soul. In Book VIII of the Laws, the Athenian stranger asserts that there is no respect in which this κοινωνία is a better thing for soul and body than dissolution is.¹ Socrates states in Book X of the Republic:

Well, then, that the soul is immortal our recent argument and our other proofs would constrain us to admit. But to know its true nature we must view it not marred by communion with the body and other miseries as we now contemplate it, but consider adequately in the light of reason what it is when it is purified, and then you will find it to be a far more beautiful thing and will more clearly distinguish justice and injustice and all the matters that we have now discussed. ²

In the Phaedo, the philosopher is described as one who "more than other men, separates the soul from communion with the body."³ This he does for the sake of arriving at truth more easily, because the body is not a good partner in the search for wisdom.⁴

The soul will be best able to think when it withdraws and "avoiding, so far as it can, all association or contact with the body, reaches out toward reality."⁵ The soul is thwarted in at-

¹Leg. 828D.
³Phaed. 64E-65A.
⁴Phaed. 65A.
⁵Phaed. 65C.
taining truth and wisdom in direct proportion due to the influence of the senses upon it.\footnote{Phaed. 66A.} The only συνωνία the soul should allow itself with the body is whatever is absolutely necessary.\footnote{Phaed. 67A.}

At death the soul which "departs pure, dragging with it nothing of the body, because it never willingly associated with the body in life, but avoided it and gathered itself into itself alone..." will depart "to the realm of the god of the other world in truth" and will not be "straightway scattered and destroyed when it departs from the body, as most men say."\footnote{Phaed. 80E. Trans. Harold North Fowler, Phaedo (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), 281.} The myth of the winged horses and the charioteer in the Phaedrus confirms the view that the συνωνία of soul and body is an unnatural and hampering association as far as the soul is concerned. There the soul is described as winged, because, "more than any other thing that pertains to the body it partakes of the nature of the divine," in that it soars upwards carrying what is heavy along with it to the abode of the gods.\footnote{Phaedr. 246DE.}

But the soul which has lost its wings is borne along until it gets hold of something solid, when it settles down, taking upon itself an earthly body, which seems to be self-moving, because of the power of the soul within it; and the whole, compound of soul and body, is called a living being, and is further designated as mortal.\footnote{Phaedrus 246C. trans. Harold North Fowler (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: 1938), 473.}
The soul, or anything else which participates in something else is inevitably modified in some way.\(^1\) By its κοινωνία with the body, the soul is modified by being hindered from living according to its nature in freely contemplating the ideas. It becomes most truly itself, even while in the body, when it participates in the virtues. So its actions which share in justice may be designated as just actions.\(^2\) And to the same degree they partake of justice they also partake of beauty. The same is true of the passions which by sharing in justice also become to that extent beautiful.\(^3\) Socrates claims that the beautiful "is, of all inspirations, the best and of the highest origin to him who has it or who shares in it."\(^4\) And so the soul, whenever it sees anything here below which is beautiful because of the "presence or communion (call it which you please) of absolute beauty"\(^5\) "remembering the true beauty, feels his wings growing and longs to stretch them for an upward flight, but cannot do so, and, like a bird gazes upward and neglects the things below."\(^6\)

\(^{1}\)Leg. 645D.

\(^{2}\)Leg. 859E.

\(^{3}\)Leg. 860A. Isocrates Encomium ad Helen X, 54-55, trans. LaRue Van Hook (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), III, 91, says that all virtues are despised "except in so far as they possess in some degree this outward form, beauty, and it is for this reason that virtue is most highly esteemed, because it is the most beautiful of ways of living."

\(^{4}\)Phaedr. 249E.

\(^{5}\)Phaed. 100D.

\(^{6}\)Phaedr. 249D.
Political Koinonia in Plato and Aristotle

The element of soul in man is continually directing him to the contemplation and imitation of the virtues of justice, courage and the like in his being and his actions. Plato recognizes that it is the polis par excellence which is able by its nature and function to educate the man to the practice of these virtues. He explores the nature, purpose and function of the polis most explicitly in the Republic and the Laws.

Scholars vary in their opinions about the nature and purpose of these two dialogues however. Barker states:

The Republic has come down to us with a double title—'the State'...or concerning Justice.' In spite of these two titles, it must not be assumed that it is a treatise either on political science or on jurisprudence. It is both, and it is yet more than both. It is an attempt at a complete philosophy of man. 1

Hoerber holds that it is a metaphorical rather than a political interpretation of the ideal state. 2 Both Lodge and Greene think that the Republic is essentially a treatise on education. 3 Jaeger says the "main theme" of the Republic is justice, but its

1Ernest Barker, Greek Political Theory (New York: University Paperbacks, 1961), 168.
"principal theme" is education.\footnote{1}

The \textit{Laws} is regarded as having an intimate connection with the \textit{Republic}. Since the ideal, the philosopher-king who rules in accordance with wisdom as proposed in the \textit{Republic} will not be easily found, Plato establishes in the \textit{Laws} "the philosophic legislator, who should imbue even the letter of law with the spirit of wisdom and understanding."\footnote{2} Thus Rexine regards the \textit{Laws} as a "sort of compromise on the \textit{Republic}... We might describe it as a description of the best possible state under the practical conditions then existent."\footnote{3} Other writers refer to the \textit{Laws} as a "concretization of the \textit{Republic}"\footnote{4} and an "applied idealism."\footnote{5}

One problem of interpretation in the \textit{Republic} centers on the question of the relationship between the tripartite nature of the soul and the tripartite state and between justice in the individual and in the state.

Barker,\footnote{6} Jaeger\footnote{7} and Hoerber take the position that "the

\footnotesize
\begin{verbatim}
2 Barker, op. cit., 129.
4 Leo Ferrari, "The Origin of the State According to Plato" \textit{Laval Theologique et Philosophique}, XII, No. 2 (1956), 150.
6 Barker, op. cit., 189.
7 Jaeger, op. cit., II, 199.
\end{verbatim}
\normalsize
purpose of the state as outlined in the Republic is mainly to illustrate the soul of the individual. ¹ Friedlander admits a "homology between soul and state"² by which, according to Murphy, it is possible to "compare the city with a person" rather than "to personify the parts of the soul" or to "depersonify the parts of the city."³ Grene regards this as a testimony of Plato's belief that "there is a true and vital relationship between the soul of the individual man, the state, and the perfect form, which is the pattern of both."⁴ Hackforth argues that it is impossible to determine whether the tripartite soul or the tripartite state was prior in Plato's thought since the "conceptions of the Ideal State and the rightly constituted human soul grow out of one another and react on one another."⁵ Demos makes the distinction between the individual as citizen and the individual as such.

In so far as they are citizens men in the ideal city will indeed represent one part of the soul and one function: as rulers, reason; as warriors, Ἐνυμος; as producers, appetite. So they will be incomplete only in their capacity as members of a political body. As persons, however they remain whole and self-ordering. ⁶

¹ Hoerber, op. cit., 38.
² Friedlander, op. cit., 189.
In regard to the relationship of the justice in the individual to the justice in the state, Demos\(^1\) and Barker\(^2\) hold that it is the former which is primary for Plato, while Grene\(^3\) and Foster\(^4\) hold that it is the latter. Murphy\(^5\) and Hall\(^6\) regard them as mutually dependent. Hall states: "Only in the just state can citizens acquire personal justice, but only if they are personally just can the citizens adequately perform their social function and so bring about the justice of the polis."\(^7\)

Maguire may have solved both of the problems posed here by suggesting that we are asking the wrong question when we inquire whether the individual—either in terms of justice or the tripartite soul—is prior to or for the sake of state or vice versa.\(^8\) He admits that formally the justice of the individual is the theme of the Republic and that ostensibly the state is nothing more than an enlargement and projection of the individual soul.\(^9\)

\(^{1}\) Ibid., 171.
\(^{2}\) Barker, op. cit., 204.
\(^{3}\) Grene, op. cit., 151.
\(^{5}\) Murphy, op. cit., 11.
\(^{7}\) Ibid.
\(^{9}\) Ibid., 146, n. 4.
But then he indicates that the state, as Plato describes it, is certainly more than just an enlargement of the soul. "It is, in fact, vital as a producer of individual justice, as the area in which that justice manifests itself, and indeed as the condition of its definition."\(^1\) He points out that Plato does not "analyze the society as an aggregate of individuals, but as a synthesis of diverse groups of individuals; and it is not the character of the individuals which determines the character of the society...but the relations of the groups."\(^2\) Thus it is not the individual but the class which is "the actual unit in Plato's theory of the state."\(^3\) The relationship for Plato is between the state and the classes and between the class and the individual, not between the state and the individual.

At the beginning of the Republic, Plato established economic necessity as the basic historical reason why the original four or five men came together as κοινωνία and constituted the polis.\(^4\) This was motivated by the realization that it was more beneficial and profitable for each man to exchange the products of his labor for those of another, rather than attempting to be

\(^1\)Ibid., 146-147.
\(^2\)Ibid., 147.
\(^3\)Ibid., 145.
\(^4\)Aristotle Politics 1291a 22-24 criticizes Plato's original κοινωνία composed of four or five original members because it does not have "authority to dispense justice, and to determine what is just."
absolutely self-sufficient. As soon as he has established the original polis of four or five members, however, Plato proceeds to discuss them not as individuals but as examples each of "a different species of productive art." As the polis developed, other craftsmen with other arts were in turn invited to join the original koivneoi in order to make the polis self-sufficient. A merchant class developed to conduct the procedure of buying and selling in the agora, as well as a laboring class who, though not intellectually worthy of being admitted into the koivnei of the city, were able to benefit the polis by selling their strength for money. Thus the "healthy" state developed organically from the four or five members who constituted the original polis.

The "sickly" state came into being when ease and luxury became prevalent in the polis. Greed for more land resulted in the appropriation of neighboring territory. This in turn provoked war and necessitated the development of an army, skilled in the art of war, to defend the wealth and luxury of the polis.

After a purge and purification of this luxurious polis, the military class was separated by education into the ruling class and helpers.

Hence the final stage, the ideal state, appears as a composite, or 'community,' of three diverse classes, one of

---

1Rep. 369BCE, 370A.
2Maguire, op. cit., 146.
3Rep. 370D.
4Rep. 371E.
which performs the productive function of the primitive society; another the martial function of the luxurious society; and the third its own specific function of organizing the whole. ¹

Each of these three classes of the state was characterized by the practice of a specific virtue: temperance for the producing class, courage for the warrior class; and wisdom for the ruling class. The three classes by operating together and each fulfilling its own function practiced the virtue of justice.

Man is structured according to the same pattern as the state. Each of the three parts of the soul must exercise the virtue proper to the corresponding part in the state. Conversely, then, the relationship existing between a wise man's head and senses is also the model of the relationship of the three parts of the state.²

With regard to the appetitive element of soul and state, Socrates suggests in the Gorgias "that it is by the possession of justice and temperance that the happy are happy." It is essential that one not let

one's desires go unrestrained and in one's attempts to satisfy them--an interminable trouble--leading the life of a robber. For neither to any of his fellow men can such an one be dear, nor to God; since he cannot commune with any, and where there is no communion, there can be no friendship...heaven and earth and gods and men are held together by communion and friendship, by orderliness, temperance and justice; and that is the reason, my friend, why they call

¹Maguire, op. cit., 148.
²Leg. 969B.
the whole of this world by the name of order, not of disorder or dissoluteness. 1

In fact, Socrates points out in the Republic, there are some things for which a relationship of ἱσότης is impossible. He asks, "Can there be any communion between soberness and extravagant pleasure?" "How could there be," his partner answers, "since such pleasure puts a man beside himself no less than pain?" 2

In the Laws, the citizen who shares or is willing to share his goods with others is praised for his practice of temperance and wisdom for the good of the entire polis, "while if a man is jealous and unwilling to share any good thing with anyone in a friendly spirit, then the man himself must be blamed, but his possession must not be disesteemed any more because of the possessor." 3 For the foundation and security of the state lie in moderation in one's possessions, and in a willingness to share them with those in need, "partly by remissions and partly by distributions." 4 In the regulation of the water supply, it is suggested that a man and the farmer in particular 5 be conscious of the needs of his neighbor, and if his neighbors are also stinted in their supplies, he shall apply for a ration of water from the

1 Gorg. 507E-508A.
2 Rep. 402E.
3 Leg. 730E.
4 Leg. 736DE.
5 Leg. 844C.
land stewards, and fetch it day by day, and so share the water with his neighbors. Laws are also established for the sharing of the fruit harvest. These laws forbid foreigners to share in the "coarse" fruit, though they may take the choice fruit freely as a gift of hospitality. Regarding the crop of fruits such as apples, pears, pomegranates: "a foreigner shall be allowed to share in these fruits in the same way as the grape crop; and if a man above thirty touch them, eating on the spot and not taking any away, he shall have a share in all such fruits, like the foreigner."

The spirited element in man and state, characterized by the virtue of courage, is said not to unite with the desires against the reason. When the courageous soul lays hold of truth, it is then most ready to partake of justice. But if the courageous and spirited element of the soul is not complemented with a like development of the gentle and philosophic element, by contact with the Muse, it will end up like a wild beast.

The rational element of the soul becomes "truly self-re-

---

1 Leg. 844B.  
2 Leg. 844D.  
3 Leg. 845C.  
4 Leg. 845B.  
5 Rep. 440B.  
6 Pol. 309DE.  
7 Rep. 411C.
strained and wise, so far as the state is concerned" when it par­
takes of certain opinions about honor, justice, goodness, but "if
it lacks participation in such qualities, does not it very justly
receive the shameful epithet of simpleton?"\(^1\)

Justice consists in each part, both of the state and of
the soul, functioning according to the virtue which is character­
istic of it. The minimum required of citizens is that they deal
justly in relation with their neighbors.

Citizens\(^2\) effect their \(κοινωνία\) through the exchange of
goods, "the very purpose of our association and establishment of
a state."\(^3\) Such economic \(κοινωνία\) are naturally regulated by
the virtue of justice. Although the Athenian Stranger in the
\(Laws\) holds that "in dealings and intercourse between citizens,
injuries committed by one against another are of frequent occur­
rence and they involve plenty of the voluntary as well as the in­
voluntary,"\(^4\) yet Socrates in the \(Republic\) parenthetically observes
that the just man, who makes a better \(κοινωνία\) in money matters,
is also the one at a disadvantage in the dissolution of such a
partnership.\(^5\) The unjust man, on the contrary, because he has a
reputation for justice, is able to conduct his dealings and form

---

\(^1\) \(Pol.\) 309E.
\(^2\) \(Alc.\) I 125E.
\(^3\) \(Rep.\) 371B, \(Leg.\) 738A, \(Alc.\) 125D, \(Rep.\) 333A.
\(^4\) \(Leg.\) 861E.
\(^5\) \(Rep.\) 343D.
partnerships with an eye to his own advantage. Thus the lawgiver in the Laws is admonished "to keep a watch on the methods employed by the citizens in gaining and spending money, and to supervise the associations they form with one another, and the dissolutions thereof, whether they be voluntary or under compulsion."\(^1\)

The unjust man acts in defiance not only of men but also of Zeus and Athena "who are partners in the constitution."\(^2\)

This indicates, according to Jowett, that though human society springs from human need, it has its origin in the divine.\(^3\) Therefore, it is essentially natural and not, as the Atomists said, based "to a small extent in nature, but mostly in art."\(^4\)

Art and the arts in general do, however, contribute no small measure to Plato's ideal state. In addition to the arts involved in establishing the economic self-sufficiency of the Polis, other arts also play an important part in achieving its general welfare.

Measurement is an art in which "a person at first sees only the unity or common quality of many things," but "he must not give up until he sees all the differences in them, so far as

\(^1\)Leg. 632B.

\(^2\)Leg. 921C.

\(^3\)The Laws of Plato, ed. E. B. England (Classical Series of the Publications of the University of Manchester, III-IV; Manchester: 1921), II, 529, n. to c#3.

\(^4\)Leg. 889D.
they exist in classes."¹ The art of measurement itself is con­ceived as having a twofold nature: "one part is concerned with relative greatness or smallness, the other with the something without which production would not be possible."²

The individual is said to have κοινωνία with his tools,³ and in the Statesman, the arts which produce spindles, shuttles, and various other tools are said to share in the production of clothing.⁴

Some of the arts are closely related to one another. "In each of these pairs, of course—medicine and gymnastic, justice and legislation—there is some intercommunication, as both deal with the same thing; at the same time they have certain differ­ences."⁵

Of all the arts, the one proper to any social institution as such without which it cannot be conducted well, is the art of ruling or commanding beneficially.⁶ Numerous examples of the art of ruling are evident in the polis. Having a share in the pilot's art "makes men know how to rule over fellow sailors," just as the chorus teachers' art enables them to "rule over their fellow-

¹Pol. 285AB.
²Pol. 283D.
³Hip. Min. 374E.
⁴Pol. 281E.
⁵Gorg. 464C.
⁶Leg. 639C-640A.
singers." And it is the draught-player who is a good and useful κούνων in playing draughts and the harpist in striking the chords. ¹ Likewise, the Master of the Symposium is a man who is to command friends in friendly association with friends in time of peace. ² But among the arts of commanding, "no other art would advance a stronger claim than that of kingship to be the art of caring for the whole human community and ruling all mankind." ³ On the other hand, those who participate in any form of government other than monarchy are to be regarded not as statesmen but as rebels. ⁴ Closely related to the art of kingship is that art of oratory which "persuades men to justice and thereby helps to steer the ship of state." ⁵

The polis, composed of three classes of citizens practicing various arts, is ultimately ordered to the Good, which consists in the harmonious pursuit of the four virtues of temperance, courage, wisdom, and justice, both by the individual citizen in relation to his class and by each class with respect to the polis as a whole. It is the function of the polis to educate its citizens to the practice of these virtues, according to Plato, "effec-

¹Alc. I 125DE; Rep. 333AB.
²Leg. 640B.
³Pol. 276B.
⁴Pol. 303B.
⁵Pol. 304A.
tive social life depends on adequate education. Thus, the Republic gives extensive consideration to the education of the guards, of the women, whom Plato considers the equals of the men in all the activities of the polis, and of the ruler. The Laws provides for a nocturnal synod of magistrates to see that the laws regarding education are carried out.

The virtue of temperance plays an important role in insuring that the social relationships which develop among the members of the polis are formed primarily with the good of the polis in mind. In regard to marriage, though it is admitted that sexual intercourse between male and female is a naturally pleasurable act, yet the union and partnership of marriage is so significant for the polis that it must be regulated according to the following rule: "Each man must seek to form such a marriage as shall benefit the State, rather than such as best pleases himself."

Ignorance must not be the cause of an undesirable union. The quality most to be desired in a wife is her suitability for the

---

1Brumbaugh, op. cit., 93.
2Rep. 453A; 457A; Leg. 804E.
3Jaeger, op. cit., II, 209.
4Leg. 968A.
5Leg. 636C.
6Leg. 721A.
7Leg. 773B.
8Leg. 771E.
joint procreation of children. 1 Sons of rich families are urged to seek their wives among families of moderate means, 2 so that the state may be like a bowl of wine mixed with water—a good and moderate mixture. 3 The Statesman also mentions that persons too often marry without proper regard to the procreation of children. 4 A fine proportioned to his wealth is to be imposed upon the man who refuses to obey the marriage laws and remains unmarried after he is thirty-five years old. 5 Just as koinwnei in any enterprise produce good results only when they decide to, so must the bride and groom, as koinwnei , intend to produce the best and most beautiful children for the state. 6 Sexual intercourse with any other partner during the ten-year child-bearing period is punishable by law. 7

As the marriage laws indicate, the abstraction "from the differences between the two sexes in regard to procreation" results in a situation where marriage itself becomes almost an

---

1 Leg. 772D.
2 Leg. 773A; 773C.
3 Leg. 773D.
4 Pol. 310B.
5 Leg. 774A. England, op. cit., I, 611 comments apropos of this passage: "koinwnei does not denote merely the absence of the marriage tie ("alienus ab hoc consortio" Fic.), but unsociable in character and behaviour; for marriage is a duty to the state.
6 Leg. 783E.
7 Leg. 784E.
In regard to relationships between men, the Laws holds that the union of male with male is unnatural, "adducing as evidence thereof the nature of wild beasts, and pointing out how the male does not touch the male for this purpose." More important, however, is the fact that such relationships will not produce virtue. Socrates in the Phaedrus says that the lover tries to keep the beloved weaker and inferior to himself. Because the lover will stunt the intellectual development of the beloved, he is "by no means a profitable guardian or associate." Madness and licen­ence can have no part in the love of "lover and beloved who rightly love and are loved." If a man is truly a lover, then he is able to bring forth the best in the soul of the beloved,"so that men in this condition enjoy a far fuller community with each other than that which comes with children, and a far surer friendship." Thus each man who knew the friendship of Socrates according to Alcibiades in the Symposium, "had his share of philosophic frenzy and transport." No wonder then that foreign princes are loathe to encourage such alliances when they see what strong

1Leg. 631D.
2Leg. 836C.
3Phaedr. 239C.
4Rep. 403B.
5Sym. 209C.
6Sym. 218B.
friendships and κοινωνία, which love is apt to create.\(^1\)

The members of the polis are brought together on the march, in warfaring, or in some other common undertaking, whether a religious festival, or a campaign, or as shipmates or fellow-soldiers or for that matter in actual battle.\(^2\) Common meals (whether or not the women should be included is to be decided)\(^3\) and banqueting\(^4\) are also discussed as important areas of social relationships in which the virtue of temperance must be exercised.

The virtue of courage is developed in the citizens by festival contests designed to exercise them in the techniques of war, and in which the women as well as the men participate. The wisdom of allowing the women an equal share with the men in this training for war is shown by the practice of the Sarmatian Amazon women living in the Pontus area "upon whom equally with men is imposed the duty of handling bows and other weapons, as well as horses, and who practice it equally."\(^5\) If this system of equality were not adopted, then another system would have to be introduced, such as that practiced by the Thracians or the Athenians or the Laconians. The inferiority of these systems is indicated by the facts that the women take no share in military service and

---

\(^{1}\text{Sym. 182C.}\)
\(^{2}\text{Rep. 556C.}\)
\(^{3}\text{Leg. 783B.}\)
\(^{4}\text{Leg. 639D.}\)
\(^{5}\text{Leg. 805A.}\)
do not know how to handle weapons. Girls over thirteen are to participate in the races until they are married. Women are not obliged to take part in archery contests or javelin throwing, "but if, as a result of earlier training which has grown into a habit, their nature allows, and does not forbid, girls or maidens to take part, let them do so without blame." In regard to the devices some have introduced in boxing and wrestling, however, since they are aimed at empty glory but are useless in the business of war, they are not to be imitated.

The importance of the contribution of the warrior to the welfare of the polis can be seen in the fact that members of this class, in virtue of their participation in war, insofar as their age and ability allows, are qualified to elect the officials of the polis. Military commanders duly nominated by the Law-wardens are also to be selected by those duly qualified according to the same criteria.

The virtue of wisdom, according to the Athenian Stranger of the Laws, is fostered by music which is well suited to turning out both a good soldier and a man who can manage the state as well. Older men, he observes, "are eager to take a part in that

---

1 Leg. 805CD-806AB.
2 Leg. 833D.
3 Leg. 834D.
4 Leg. 796A.
5 Leg. 752C.
6 Leg. 755C.
music which is noblest” during festivals and public occasions.\(^1\) In addition, lawgivers can learn something about the institutions and rules of ethics from observation of the κοινωνία of music and harmony.\(^2\) Rau comments:

The social implication of song and dance are obvious to him; choric art fosters community of feeling by joining men together in expressing their joy. And the aim of good government is to promote freedom (in moderation, he qualifies this prescription cautiously), friendship, fellow-feeling and happiness. He assumes contests in music and gymnastic to be an indispensable factor in the life of the just city.\(^3\)

Wisdom is necessary in those holding the highest offices of the state for many reasons, one of which is so that they may observe the formation of seditious groups intent on overthrowing the polis and punish them. It is not sufficient that they merely refrain from taking part in such seditious actions themselves.\(^4\) The state is also to legislate in such a way as to avoid involving itself in sedition.\(^5\)

The virtue of justice is the result of the harmonious interaction of the three virtues of temperance, courage and wisdom. Because justice is the common property of those practicing the other virtues, all citizens are allowed to have a share in judge-

---

\(^1\) Leg. 667AB.

\(^2\) Leg. 967E.

\(^3\) Catherine Rau, Art and Society: A Reinterpretation of Plato (New York: R. R. Smith, 1951), 75.

\(^4\) Leg. 856B.

\(^5\) Leg. 757DE.
ing private suits, "for the man that has no share in helping to judge imagines that he has no part or lot in the State at all."¹ Likewise the citizens are to have a part in judging offenses against the State; the decision is left to the common agreement of a committee of "three of the highest officials mutually agreed upon by both defendant and plaintiff."²

Religion is another "aspect of the political life of a political society."³ Both the Republic and the Laws assume that common descent gives the individual polis the right to share in the religious observances at the sanctuaries common to all members of the race.⁴ The polis is to send its most distinguished citizens "to take part in any public sacrifices, congresses or other such sacred assemblies,"⁵ such as "to Apollo at Pytho and to Zeus at Olympia and to Nemea and the Isthmus, to take part in the sacrifices and games in honour of these gods."⁶ Severely censured are the "licentious and outrageous acts of the young... directed against sacred things, and...against objects which are public as well as holy, or partially public, as being shared in

¹Leg. 768B.
²Leg. 768A.
³Barker, op. cit., 9.
⁴Leg. 708C; Rep. 470E.
⁵Leg. 947A.
⁶Leg. 950E.
by the members of a tribe or other similar community.¹ Lack of
respect for the sanctity of the property, rights and beliefs of
other persons "attacks the most vital part of the body when reli-
gion is attacked, and sacred places and sacred things are out-
raged."²

In the Symposium Eurymachus refers to sacrifices and cer-
emonies controlled by divination as "means of communication be-
tween gods and men."³ It is the noble man, whose prayers to the
gods are a κοινωνία of prayer and religion,⁴ who, according to
the Laws, "by paying honour and reverence to his kinsfolk, and
all who share in the worship of the tribal gods and are sprung
from the same blood,"⁵ will be blessed by the gods in the procre-
ation of children.

By definition, a citizen is one who has the right and
privilege of sharing in the κοινωνία of the state in its vari-
ous manifestations. But if a citizen act in a manner unworthy of
a citizen, such as the man who takes for himself any man’s goods
lying on the wayside and dedicated to the goddess of the wayside,
he will be considered ἀνελεόθερος and ἀκοινώνητος νόμον .⁶

¹Leg. 884A.
²England, op. cit., II, 444.
³Sym. 188BC.
⁴Leg. 801E.
⁵Leg. 729C.
⁶Leg. 914C.
So important is it, both for the individual and for the state, according to the Statesman, that the lives of the citizens be well-ordered that those men "who have no capacity for courage and self-restraint and the other qualities which tend towards virtue..." are to be removed from society by death, exile, or deprivation of their civic rights.¹ The punishment for serious crimes, likewise, is to be deprived of one's right to share in the κοινωνία of the polis by one or more of these means.² A mother or father who slays a child is to be exiled for three years like all other slayers, but after they return, "the wife must be separated from the husband and the husband from the wife, and they must never again have a child, nor shall they ever share a home with those whom the slayer has robbed of child or brother, nor shall they take part in their worship."³

The husband or wife who kills the marriage partner, or a brother or sister killing the other is to be banished, and upon returning home may not worship or eat with the family.⁴ A man who is convicted of outrageous assault on his parents is to be

¹Leg. 909A; Pol. 308E.
²The story is told by Demosthenes of the unscrupulous orator Aristogeiton who, once when he was in prison, bit off the nose of another inmate, at which point the prisoners "passed a resolution not to share fire or light, food or drink with him, not to receive anything from him, not to give him anything." Against Aristogeiton I, 61, trans. J. H. Vince (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 552.
³Leg. 868D.
⁴Leg. 868E-869A.
banished for life from the city. He is to avoid all the sacred places. If he attempts to return to the polis, he will be punished with death. Citizens are also forbidden to have any kind of social relationship with such a person. And if any free man voluntarily eat or drink or hold any similar intercourse with such an one, or even give him merely a greeting when he meets him, he shall not enter any holy place or the market or any part of the city until he be purified, but he shall regard himself as having incurred a share of contagious guilt.¹

Plato communicated his interest in political speculation to his pupil, Aristotle, but in Aristotle this political interest had a different orientation. Contrary to Plato who found all reality including the model for his state in the world of Ideas, Aristotle regarded the sensible world of individual things as the source of true and unchanging knowledge which forms the basis for philosophy and science. Thus he developed his political theory from a study of some one hundred fifty-eight known political constitutions rather than from contemplation of the Ideas, a theory which he rejected and emphasized the possible rather than the ideal. Despite this basic difference of orientation, however, both Plato and Aristotle agreed that "there was no real individual life apart from the Polis, because it was a community embracing all spheres of life, and because the citizens were also the rulers, and their interests, properly understood, coincided with

¹Leg. 881D.
those of the Polis.\textsuperscript{1} for Aristotle described any association in which diversity and equality were combined for the purpose of attaining some good.\textsuperscript{2} The first form of \textit{koinw尼亚} which he considered in the \textit{Politics}\textsuperscript{3} was that of the household or family, composed of at least three members: husband/master, wife, slave.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} Victor Ehrenberg, \textit{The Greek State} (New York: The Norton Library, 1964), 92.


\textsuperscript{3} Jaeger maintains that there were two versions of the \textit{Politics} written by Aristotle at various periods of his development, and that the version we now have is a conflation of the two. Op. cit., 273. W. D. Ross, \textit{Aristotle: A Complete Exposition of his Works and Thought} (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1959), 186-187, regards the \textit{Politics} as a "conflation of five separate treatises: (1) on the household - a proper preliminary to the study of the state since the state springs from the household (Book I); (2) on proposed ideal commonwealths and the most esteemed existing constitutions (Book II); (3) on the state, the citizen, and the classification of constitutions (Book III); (4) on the inferior constitutions (Books IV-VI); (5) on the ideal state (Books VII-VIII). All these sections except the second are unfinished or mutilated. On the whole, the traditional order (which goes back at least to the first century, A.D.) gives the most consecutive line of thought, except that Book V is better read after Book VI." Ernest Barker in his edition of the \textit{Politics} (\textit{The Politics of Aristotle}, op. cit.) distinguishes six sections in the work which he feels "all belong to the period of the Lyceum, and are all - so far as chronology goes - on exactly the same footing," (xliv) but regards the work as we have it as a unified whole. (xlv, passim).

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Pol.} 1257a 19-20; 1252b 9-10.
The household is bound together first of all by the natural koinwvia between husband and wife which nature has created for the propagation of the race.\(^1\) Since procreation cannot take place without this koinwvia, it is natural and necessary.\(^2\) To this end nature has structured men and women differently.\(^3\) On this level the koinwvia of husband and wife does not differ essentially from the koinwvia of animals or of slaves for reproduction.\(^4\)

On a higher level, however, man's social nature, based on his ability to communicate ideas by means of speech\(^5\) enables him to participate in a higher type of koinwvia and to form communities.

---


\(^3\) Oecon. 1342b 26-28.


ties with those to whom he is related by blood. And it is this unique ability to communicate ideas which constitutes human happiness:

none of the other animals, which are inferior in nature to men, share in the designation 'happy,' for a horse is not happy, nor is a bird nor a fish nor any other existing thing whose designation does not indicate that it possesses in its nature a share of something divine.

For "the person who humanly speaking enjoys bliss is he that lives by the standard of justice without pain and in purity, or participates in some form of divine contemplation." 

Between husband and wife, this κοινωνία can even approximate friendship, a relationship which involves a type of social justice.

The wife is inferior to her husband, yet closer to him than others (of his household), and in a sense is more nearly his equal than they. Married life, therefore, is closely akin to the partnership between citizens; so that in a sense the Justice that operates between the pair is of a kind more social than that between the others.

1Eud. Eth. 1242 a 26-27, trans. H. Rackham (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952). All citations of the Greek text and English translations of the Eudemi-an Ethics are based on this edition. Xenophon Mem. IV, 3.12, trans. E. C. Marchant (Loeb Library ed.; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1938) takes the same position, stating that κοινωνία among men is greatly facilitated by "the power of expression, which enables us to impart to one another all good things by teaching and to take our share of them."

2Eud. Eth. 1217 a 24-29.

3Eud. Eth. 1215 b 12-14.

4Eud. Eth. 1242 a 32-33.

5Mag. Mor. 1194 b 24.

The relationship between master and slave in the formation of the household is based on the instinct for self-preservation—α κοινωνία "naturally instituted for the satisfaction of daily recurrent needs."¹ For the members of the household have κοινωνία in all things² without any need for the art of exchange. "Accordingly there would be partnership, and justice of a sort, even if there were no state."³

Higher than this, however, the κοινωνία between master and slave as slave cannot go. Aristotle's attitude to the slave is, in his historical situation, not surprising. He regards the slave as one "capable of becoming (and this is the reason by which he also actually becomes) the property of another, and... participates in reason to the extent of apprehending it in another, though destitute of it himself."⁴ But, as Barker points out, "Slavery is not justified by the fact that the slave has only a minor reason; that will only justify a certain guardianship."⁵ There can be no κοινωνία between master and slave as slave, for "the former is one, and the latter a part of that one, not one itself, nor is the good divisible between them, but that of both

¹ Pol. 1252b13-14.
² Pol. 1257a23.
³ Eud. Eth. 1242a27.
⁴ Pol. 1254b21-23.
belongs to the one for whose sake they exist... a slave is as it were a member or tool of his master."¹ No equality exists between master and slave as slave on which a relation of justice and legal partnership² and friendship can be based. However, Aristotle weakens his case by admitting that the things which are impossible to the slave as slave are possible to the slave as a man, "and the admission that he can be regarded as a man destroys that conception of his wholly slavish and non-rational (one might say non-human) character, which was the one justification of his being treated as a slave."³


³Barker, Political Thought, 366.
When the scope of this elementary κοινωνία of the family broadens, it brings into being the κοινωνία of the village, "which is also the first to be formed from more households than one, and for the satisfaction of something more than daily recurrent needs."

The final and perfect κοινωνία is the polis, which is formed from a number of villages. There is "an immanent impulse in all men towards an association of this order." In fact, "the man who is isolated—who is unable to share in the benefits of political association, or has no need to share because he is already self-sufficient—is no part of the polis, and must therefore be either a beast or a god."

Aristotle maintains that "the good of the community is clearly a greater and more perfect good" than that of the individual. The polis or political κοινωνία is the "most sovereign and inclusive association" which "includes all the rest and will pursue this aim most, (e.g., the good) and will thus be directed

1 Pol. 1257a21.
2 Pol. 1252b16.
4 Pol. 1252b29.
5 Pol. 1253a30.
6 Pol. 1253a28-29.
7 Nic. Eth. 1094b8.
8 Pol. 125a1-2.
to the most sovereign of all goods."\(^1\)

Because the polis "is the completion of associations existing by nature, every polis exists by nature, having itself the same quality as the earlier associations from which it grew."\(^2\) It has a κοινωνία in the "perception of good and evil, of the just and the unjust, and of other similar qualities."\(^3\) It likewise shares with the family in the art of acquisition which provides things necessary and useful for the preservation of life.\(^4\) The polis may also be considered as "an assemblage of houses, lands, and property sufficient to enable the inhabitants to lead a civilized life. This is proved by the fact that when such a life is no longer possible for them, "the polis is dissolved.\(^5\) In fact, all associations may be regarded as parts of the association which we call the polis.\(^6\)

---

\(^{1}\) Pol. 1252a10. Apropos of this passage, Ross, op. cit., 232, comments: "He (Aristotle) is here implicitly attacking two views which had found favor in Greece: (1) the view of some of the sophists, such as Lycophron or Thrasyvachus that law and the state are merely products of convention, interferences with the liberty of the individual which are either forced on him by his masters or adopted by him merely as a safeguard against injury; and (2) the view of the Cynics, that the wise man is sufficient to himself and should be a citizen of no country but only of the world--a view which was encouraged with the defeat of Chaeronea."

\(^{2}\) Pol. 1252b31.

\(^{3}\) Pol. 1253a18-19.

\(^{4}\) Pol. 1256b28-30.

\(^{5}\) Oecon. 1343a11-13.

\(^{6}\) Nic. Eth. 1160a8; 1160a28-30.
The individual and the family are prior in the order of time, according to Aristotle, but the polis is prior in the order of nature, just as the whole is necessarily prior to the part.\(^1\)

And the aim of the whole is self-sufficiency.\(^2\)

In a later passage of the *Politics* Aristotle indicates some of the factors which enable the polis to achieve self-sufficiency, but which, taken individually, do not in themselves constitute a polis. A common geographical location is certainly a unifying factor, but a site embraced by a single wall is not thereby a polis.\(^3\)

Neither does a system of intermarriage between

\(^1\text{Pol. 1253a21-22.}\)

\(^2\)Barker, *Political Thought*, 222, makes the following statement. "But the State, the final goal or form of such movement, is most of all Nature's, most of all by nature. And this brings us to one of the most fundamental things in Aristotle's political philosophy. While he holds primitive society to be natural...he also holds the final State to be natural and still more natural...Nay, he would hold that primitive society was only by nature because it was an approximation to the State, and through the State to Nature itself." According to Harry V. Jaffa, "Aristotle" in Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey, *History of Political Philosophy* (Chicago: Rand, McNally, and Co., 1963), 65, "According to Aristotle, 'community' is the genus and 'political community' a species. The specifying characteristic of the political community or polis is that it is the community that includes all other human communities, while itself being included by none. Because of its all-inclusiveness, the polis includes or assimilates within its own end or purpose the end or purpose of every other form of community." And again, p. 66, "But the polis, while it embraces the ends of all lesser forms of community, is not the sum of them, because it is in no sense an aggregate. Aristotle sometimes conceives of the polis upon the analogy of a living organism. Just as the function of the human organism cannot be conceived as the sum of the functions of heart, liver, hands, and brain, so one cannot conceive of the function of the polis as the sum of any parts or components."

\(^3\)Ehrenberg, op. cit., 28, gives examples of poleis where
two cities constitute a polis "even though intermarriage is one of the forms of social life which is characteristic of a polis."¹
Nor is a polis established "if a number of persons—living at a distance from one another, but not at so great a distance but that they could still associate—(have) a common system of laws to prevent their injuring one another in the course of exchange."²
People "associated in nothing further than matters such as exchange and alliance"³ though not lacking contiguity in such association⁴ cannot be described as a polis. It is clear, therefore, that a polis is not an association for residents on a common site, or for the sake of preventing mutual injustice and easing exchange. These are indeed conditions which must be present before a polis can exist; but the presence of all these conditions is not enough, in itself, to constitute a polis.⁵ Any polis, truly so called, must be composed of an initial population large enough to make it self-sufficient,⁶ and have as its end the encouragement of goodness. If it does not do so, the political

territory belonged to another state.

¹Pol. 1280b16-17.
²Pol. 1280b18-20.
³Pol. 1280b21-23; 1280b25-29.
⁴Pol. 1280b24-25.
⁵Pol. 1280b30-33.
⁶Pol. 1326b7-9.
becomes only an alliance.\footnote{Pol. 1230b9-10.} One would also be mistaken in thinking that property, for example, were the end for which men came together and formed a political κοινωνία.\footnote{Pol. 1230a26.} If that were so, then a man's ability to share in state offices would be dependent on his share of property. Aristotle concludes:

What constitutes a polis is an association of households and clans in a good life, for the sake of attaining a perfect and self-sufficing existence. This consumation, however, will not be reached unless the members inhabit one and the same place and practice intermarriage. It was for this reason that the various institutions of a common social life—marriage-connexions, kin-groups, religious gatherings, and social pastimes generally—arose in cities. But these institutions are the business of friendship. It is friendship which consists in the pursuit of a common social life. The end and purpose of a polis is the good life, and the institutions of the social life are means to that end. A polis is constituted by the association of families and villages in a perfect and self-sufficing existence; and such an existence, on our definition, consists in a life of true felicity and goodness. It is therefore for the sake of good actions, and not for the sake of social life, that political associations must be considered to exist. Those who contribute most to an association of this character have a greater share in the polis than those who are equal to them in free birth and descent, but unequal in civic excellence, or than those who surpass them in wealth but are surpassed by them in excellence.\footnote{Barker, Politics, 120. "In other words, contiguity and consanguinity are necessary conditions, or sine quibus non; but the essence and the causa causans, is co-operation in a common scheme of good life. Social life (to suzen), arising from the ties of contiguity and consanguinity, is a necessary basis; but the essential structure which arises on this basis is a good life (to eu zen)." Barker, Political Thought, 232, says "Differentiation, and a consequent exchange, are therefore of the essence of association. And thus it issues in a common action, which, in the sphere of ordinary labour, is the product of material wealth, but in that of political activity is the realization of virtue."}
So, we may conclude that Aristotle saw the \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \chi \) of the polis, toward which man has a natural impulse, as essentially aimed at the good life, and based on virtue or principle of justice which regulates not only the political \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \chi \) but indeed every type of social \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \chi \). For according to the Nicomachean Ethics, the word "just" can be "applied to whatever creates or conserves for a political association its happiness or the happiness of some part thereof."^3

Justice involves the observance of the mean in all forms of social \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \chi \), whether of words or deeds.^4 Every \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \chi \) supposes some rule of justice governing the relations between the partners^5 and some friendly feeling between them.^6 Such friend-

"In the developed city he attains all things—life, society (or common life), morality (or good life). But what he particularly finds—and what is the real truth of the State and its essential purpose—is moral life." (269) "As an association, the State is a system of different organs, which by their membership of the system attain a fullness of life otherwise impossible. So far, the individual is dependent upon the State for his fullness of life, but Aristotle goes further, and lays it down that he is dependent upon the State for his very life." (277) Pol. 1280b34-35; 1281a1-2; 1281a4; 1282a5-9.

^1 Pol. 1253a39.
^2 Pol. 1283a39-41.
ships, however, extend only as far as the mutual advantages produced by the κοινωνία.\(^1\) Aristotle therefore maintains that there cannot be κοινωνία between two doctors because no reciprocal advantages are involved.\(^2\) No "true exchange" or κοινωνία occurs without reciprocity. When a degree of reciprocity is established, then men can enter into an association with one another because their case admits of such equality.... But if reciprocal proportion could not be arrived at in this way, there could be no association between the parties. That it is demand forming as it does a single standard, that holds such associations together, is shown clearly in the circumstance that, where there is no demand for an exchange of services from one or both parties, they do not enter into association.\(^3\) For example, the shoemaker cannot have κοινωνία with the farmer unless their products are equalized by proportion.\(^4\) Money is the great equalizer which acts as a bond of the political κοινωνία to make possible κοινωνία for the purpose of exchange.\(^5\) For, "without exchange there could be no association, without equality there could be no exchange, without commensurability there could be no equality."\(^6\)

\(^1\) Nic. Eth. 1159b29; 1160a14; 1160a18-20.


\(^3\) Nic. Eth. 1133b4-5; 1133b7.

\(^4\) Eud. Eth. 1243b31.

\(^5\) Mag. Mor. 1194a24-25.

\(^6\) Nic. Eth. 1133b16-17. Apropos of this passage, Ross, op. cit., 207 comments: "But there is no moral virtue in commercial justice as described by Aristotle. 'Justice' here is not a virtue but a sort of 'governor' in economic machine which keeps exchange prices from swinging far from the actual value, for human
Friendship is absolutely essential to κοινωνία in the polis. Envy and contempt are completely removed from the spirit of friendship and the temper of the political κοινωνία. Where enmity exists instead of friendship, men will not even share the same path. Friendship exists wherever there exist reciprocal rights. "Now there are reciprocal rights between stranger and citizen, slave and master, citizen and citizen, son and father, wife and husband; and in these and all other human relationships, friendships too are possible between the parties." Some think "that a friendship ought to be like a partnership in business, where the partner who contributes the largest amount of capital pockets the lion's share of the profits." But friendship implies ideally that the friends have κοινωνία in some things or in all things. A friendship in which "one of the two is out for pleasure and the other for gain, and the one has his wish and the other not" is not a successful κοινωνία. Friendship demands a certain equality in which the things shared are either numerical-

1 Pol. 1295b24-25.
2 Mag. Mor. 1211a45.
4 Nic. Eth. 1159b32.
ly equal or proportionately equal.¹ When one of the parties who contributes less of something and demands back more of that thing, the other partner seems to lose and the friendship seems to be a charity rather than a partnership.²

In dissimilar friendships, according to Aristotle, a ratio or proportion is necessary to restore equality and preserve the friendship. Such is the case between a teacher and a student of philosophy. The payment made to the philosopher for sharing his knowledge should be whatever the student has in his power to pay.³ Mention is also made of the practice of some communities where there is no legal procedure under which action for breach of a voluntary economic κοινωνία can be brought, since they think that once a man has trusted another enough to form a κοινωνία, the transaction should be carried through on that basis.⁴

Friendship, for Aristotle, is a κοινωνία ⁵ in which a man stands in the same relation to his friend as to himself, and in which a man wishes to share with his friend whatever occupation forms for him the essence and aim of his existence--bodily pleasure, artistic study, philosophy.⁶ From this it follows that

¹ Eud. Eth. 1242b10-12.
² Eud. Eth. 1242b18.
³ Nic. Eth. 1164b3.
⁵ Nic. Eth. 1171b33.
⁶ Eud. Eth. 1245a19-23.
"the friendship of the unworthy is evil, for they associate in unworthy pursuits; and so becoming more and more like each other they turn out badly. But the friendship of the good is good and increases in goodness in consequence of their association."\(^1\)

But if it is pleasant to live well oneself and for one's friend also to live well, and if living together involves working together, surely their partnership will be preeminently in things included in the End. Hence we should study together, and feast together—not on the pleasures of food and the necessary pleasures (for such partnerships do not seem to be real social intercourse but mere enjoyment), but each really wishes to share with his friends the End that he is capable of attaining, or failing this, men choose most of all to benefit their friends and to be benefitted by them. It is therefore manifest that to live together is actually a duty, and that all people wish it very much and that this is most the case with the man that is the happiest and best. \(^2\)

"In fact, the whole of justice in general is in relation to a friend, for what is just is just for certain persons, and persons who are partners, and a friend is a partner either in one's family or in one's life."\(^3\) In another passage Aristotle distinguishes between the κοινωνία of friendship between kinsmen and that between members of a social fraternity. He regards the latter as having a κοινωνία more obviously built upon some compact or mutual understanding. \(^4\)

Although justice operates in every human relationship,

\(^1\) Nic. Eth. 1172a8-10.
\(^2\) End. Eth. 1245b3-9.
\(^3\) End. Eth. 1242a21-22.
\(^4\) Nic. Eth. 1161b11-15.
all these "partnerships are a constituent part of the partnership of the state--for example that of the members of a brotherhood, or a priesthood, or business partnerships,\(^1\) so that there are as many species of justice and partnership as there are of friendship.\(^2\) The Magna Moralia, therefore, regards justice in the strict sense as that practiced in the social \(\kappaοινωνία\) of the polis,\(^3\) "for the fellow citizens are partners in common, and accept a fundamental parity, though their characters differ."\(^4\) Political societies were formed by a number of persons\(^5\) and continue in being for the advantage of the citizens.\(^6\) "Political justice is manifested between persons who share a common way of life which has for its object a state of affairs in which they will have all they need for an independent existence as free and equal members of the society."\(^7\)

In the Politics Aristotle attempts to formulate an acceptable definition of citizenship by declaring what is not essential to it. Citizenship is not constituted by virtue of residence in a given place, because resident aliens and slaves also have

\(^1\)Eud. Eth. 1241b25-26.
\(^2\)Eud. Eth. 1241b16.
\(^3\)Mag. Mor. 1194b28-29.
\(^4\)Mag. Mor. 1194b10.
\(^5\)Nic. Eth. 1135b12.
\(^6\)Nic. Eth. 1160a12.
\(^7\)Nic. Eth. 1134a27.
in the same geographical location. It is not constituted by sharing in the right of being entitled to sue and be sued in the courts, because aliens also have *koinwvia* in this right by virtue of a treaty--though in some places resident aliens have only partial *koinwvia* in this right. "The name of citizen cannot be given to persons who share in the constitution (but whose interests are not regarded) or, if the name is to be given, they must have their share of the benefits." Citizenship essentially, according to Aristotle, is constituted by *koinwvia*.

1Pol. 1275a8.

2Pol. 1275a10-14.

3Pol. 1279a33. Ehrenberg, op. cit., 90, says: "Polis society came to include at least part of the metics...It is therefore not quite accurate to speak generally of the identity of state and society." Ross, op. cit., 241-242, says: "In his selection of the functions which are to constitute the citizen, Aristotle follows the Athenian practice of his time; to be a juryman and a member of the assembly -- these are the minimum functions. The former must seem somewhat accidental to the notion of a citizen. There may be modes of government in which there is no jury system and yet citizenship is widely diffused. Again, membership of the sovereign assembly is no necessary part of citizenship; Aristotle fails to foresee the possibilities of representative government. It is in the possession of a voice in the choosing of the members of the assembly that we should be inclined to find the minimum of citizenship." Jaffa, op. cit., 96, says: "The absolute or unqualified definition of citizenship is that it is nothing other than a sharing in the administration of justice and in office. This means participating in what we would call legislation and adjudication, with these two "powers" being sufficiently broad to assimilate what we would understand by administration or execution of the laws. Indeed, Aristotle generalizes from this first definition, saying that what he really means is participation in 'indefinite office.'"
in the deliberative or judicial offices of the polis, although not every officer of the political κοινωνία can be considered a magistrate. To accept a political office "is to enter into relations with others and to become one member of an association."  

Since citizenship is limited to those who have the right to κοινωνία in office, others, such as mechanics, may be described as merely "necessary conditions" of the polis without being integral parts of it, because the polis is an association of equals and only of equals.

The next topic for consideration is the theory of the constitution. "A constitution may be defined as 'an organization of offices in a state, by which the method of their distribution is fixed, the sovereign authority is determined, and the nature of the end to be pursued by the association and all its members is prescribed." It is obvious, then, that any change in constitution will affect the nature of the polis. But before beginning this discussion, Aristotle states: "We must first ascertain

1 Pol. 1275b19.
2 Pol. 1299a16-17.
3 Nic. Eth. 1130a2-4.
4 Pol. 1277b35.
5 Pol. 1328a25-27.
6 Pol. 1289a15-18.
7 Pol. 1276b5-8.
two things—the nature of the end for which the state exists, and the various kinds of authority to which men and their associations are subject." Man's natural impulse to social life, as we have already seen, leads to the formation of the polis. A political κοινωνία may also be formed for the sake of life itself. The good life, however, is the chief end of the polis, both for the community and for the individual.

All political constitutions have something in common, as well as their own unique aspects. They "are partnerships, (in fact, 'partnerships on a friendly footing') and every partnership is founded on justice." Therefore, some kind of equality must necessarily exist or be established among the partners. As in the κοινωνία of friendship, this equality may be either numerical or proportional. Democracy, like the friendship of comrades, is a κοινωνία based on numerical equality. Aristocracy and kingship, on the other hand, like the friendship of father and son, and business partnership are based on proportional

1 Pol. 1278b16-18.
2 Pol. 1278b25.
3 Oecon. 1345b17.
4 Eud. Eth. 1242a11.
6 Eud. Eth. 1241b35-36.
7 Nic. Eth. 1160b25.
8 Eud. Eth. 1241b40.
equality. On the other hand, "tyranny...is the single-person government of the political association on the lines of despotism." However, a passage in the Eudemian Ethics does not make this distinction and regards the political partnership as proportional. The types of justice provided by the various constitutions is also an important consideration. For Justice "does what is to the advantage of another, whether he is in authority or just a partner." Justice in the political κοινωνία may be either distributive, as "shown in the distribution of honour or

1 Pol. 1279a36-37.

2 Pol. 1279b16-17, however, defines tyranny as "single person government of the political association on the lines of despotism."

3 Eud. Eth. 1243b30.

4 Nic. Eth. 1130a5-6. Jaffa, op. cit., 74, says: "The common burdens and the common advantages must be divided and shared by rules which must themselves be decided upon by the shapers in the common good. What these rules are, and how they are to be applied, is what we mean by the administration of justice in the broadest sense. And it is participation in this which makes a man a citizen, and the partnership in justice is the political community. The family and the village are too narrow for self-sufficiency, and hence too narrow for justice. Hence the polis, as the only community adequate for the fulfillment of man's specifically human potentiality, must be prior to the family in one of the senses that the oak tree is prior to the acorn. The polis is also prior to the family as, in our former analysis, the chair is prior to the carpentering which produces it. That is, it is prior in the order of final causality. The polis is also prior to the single human being, as the whole man is prior to the hand or any other organ of the whole. For except as he lives in a polis a man cannot live a fully human existence, he cannot function as a man. For man is the rational and political animal."
money or such other possessions of the community as can be divided among its members, "1 or corrective, in regard to private transactions or business deals.

The κοινωνία of the polis exists because of the κοινωνία of citizens in a given constitution. 2 Citizens (as well as sailors) are members of a κοινωνία. 3 As such, "the end which they all serve is safety in the working of their association; and this association consists in the constitution." 4 Therefore, these constitutions which consider the common interest are right constitutions, judged by the standard of absolute justice. Those constitutions which consider only the personal interest of the rulers are all wrong constitutions, or perversions of the right forms, whereas the polis is an association of free men. 5

Constitutions are distinguished upon the basis of whether all the groups of which the polis is constituted have κοινωνία in constitutional rights, or whether only some of them do. 6 As an example, Aristotle mentions in the Politics the ultimate form of democracy in which all the members of the state have κοινωνία in constitutional rights 7 due to the numerical superiority of the masses and

---

1 Nic. Eth. 1132b31-32.
2 Pol. 1276b1-2.
3 Pol. 1276b21.
4 Pol. 1276b29-31.
5 Pol. 1279a18-22.
6 Pol. 1292b24-25.
7 Pol. 1319b2; 1291b36.
a revenue ample enough to provide opportunity for the leisure for participation in the assembly and courts by a system of payment for attendance.\(^1\) He also agrees, however, that this form "cannot be borne by all states, and can hardly itself endure, unless it is properly constituted in point of laws and customs."

After considering the various types of constitutions based on the amount of participation the citizens enjoy, Aristotle moves on to a consideration of the best constitution. He concludes that the best constitution will be one in which most men will be able to have κοινωνία and which it will be possible for most states to enjoy.\(^2\) It should be one "which men can be easily induced, and will be readily able, to graft onto the system they already have."\(^3\) In actual practice, the best form of political κοινωνία vests its power in the middle class,\(^4\) drawing elements from both oligarchies and democracies.\(^5\) As an example of how elements can be drawn from both forms of constitutions mentioned above, he suggests paying the poor for attendance at assemblies

\(^1\)Pol. 1293a4-6.
\(^2\)Pol. 1295a30-31.
\(^3\)Pol. 1289a2-4.
\(^4\)Pol. 1295b35.
\(^5\)Jaffa, op. cit., 118-119, says: "Polity is a kind of virtuous mean between the two vicious extremes constituted by the claims of wealth and poverty... It is, as has been said, a blend of democracy and oligarchy, and the better the blending, the easier it will be for democrats to confuse it with democracy and oligarchs with oligarchy."
and court sessions and fining the rich for non-attendance. "On this plan all would share in a common constitution; on the other, the constitution belongs to one side only." Aristotle also suggests that "in matters other than property (e.g., honours and ceremonies) a position of equality, or even of precedence, may well be given to those who have fewer constitutional rights—in a democracy to the rich; in an oligarchy to the poor." 

Aristotle also indicates the importance of establishing a system for deciding suits and for enforcing decisions in an institution such as the polis where men share a common life.

General opinion, according to Aristotle, establishes that the individual good and the good of the state are identical. To have *koinwnia* in the activity of the state is more desirable than to live absolved from the ties of political *koinwnia*. But, he concludes, whether we assume *koinwnia* in the activity of the state is desirable for all or only for a majority, with regard to the best constitution and disposition of a state, it is clear that "The true end which good law-givers should keep in

1 *Pol.* 1297a42. Glenn R. Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the Laws* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 530, n. 18, says that this is an "irrelevant...pedantic discussion."

2 *Pol.* 1309a29.

3 *Pol.* 1322a8.

4 *Pol.* 1324a15-16.

5 *Pol.* 1324a19.
view, for any state or stock or society with which they may be concerned is the enjoyment of partnership in a good life and the felicity thereby attainable.¹

States which are isolated need not be inactive. There can be κοινωνία among the various sections of the state.² The same is true for the individual human being. "If it were not so, there would be something wrong with God himself and the whole of the universe, who have no activities other than those of their own internal life."³

It is advantageous to a polis to have κοινωνία with the sea.⁴ The polis which has a port separate from but in with the sea enjoys a favorable circumstance.⁵

Among the elements necessary for the existence of a polis --since the state is not merely a casual κοινωνία --Aristotle includes food, arts and crafts, public worship, and a system of deliberation and jurisdiction. But not all the members of a polis need have κοινωνία in all these services.⁷ Some are necessary for all; others should be divided among the members. He al-

¹ Pol. 1325a9-11.
² Pol. 1325b27.
³ Pol. 1325b28-30.
⁴ Pol. 1327a11.
⁵ Pol. 1327a37.
⁶ Pol. 1328b16-19.
⁷ Pol. 1328b25.
so suggests that, under usual circumstances, those ruling and those being ruled should be merged together in a single body in the political \textit{koivwia} rather than being distinguished for life.\textsuperscript{1} He encourages the legislator to provide for the regulation of the marriage \textit{koivwia} as vital for ensuring healthy future citizens.\textsuperscript{2} He forbids young persons to see mimes or comedies until they reach the age "when they are allowed to share with the older men in the right of reclining and taking wine at the common tables."\textsuperscript{3} In requiring music as a part of the educative experience, the lawgiver has in mind more than "sharing in the common pleasure which all men derive from music."\textsuperscript{4} The musical education must be in terms of taking part in actual musical performances, participation in which should be continued throughout life.\textsuperscript{5} Having performed, they will be better able to be good judges of others.\textsuperscript{6} The kind of music they should participate in is another important question.\textsuperscript{7} Unlike objects of sight which bear little resemblance to states of character,\textsuperscript{8} musical compositions are

\textsuperscript{1} Pol. 1332b12-15.
\textsuperscript{2} Pol. 1334b34.
\textsuperscript{3} Pol. 1336b20-23.
\textsuperscript{4} Pol. 1339b40-42.
\textsuperscript{5} Pol. 1340b33-34; 1340b41-42.
\textsuperscript{6} Pol. 1340b22-26.
\textsuperscript{7} Pol. 1341a2.
\textsuperscript{8} Pol. 1340a32-33.
representations of states of character.

Another element necessary for the existence of the state is that the citizens personally bear arms, "partly in order to maintain authority and repress disobedience, and partly in order to meet any threat of external aggression."¹ His criticism of the political arrangements proposed by Hippias of Miletus is directed to this point:

The artisans, the farmers, and the military class all share in the constitution, in the sense of possessing the active franchise; but the farmers share without possessing arms, and the artisans share without possessing either land or arms, which makes them both, in effect, the slaves of the class in possession of arms.²

Aristotle was well aware that the amount of equality among citizens has an influence on the nature of the political constitution and acknowledges that some of his predecessors had also come to this same realization.³ This leads him to the consideration of what form of political association would be the ideal for those who can count upon the material conditions of their life being, as nearly as possible, just what they would themselves wish,⁴ and suggests that there are three possibilities: a κοινωνία of all things; κοινωνία in nothing; κοινωνία in some things. He rejects outright the second possibility because it is

¹ Pol. 1328b8-10.
² Pol. 1268a17-20.
³ Pol. 1266b15-16.
⁴ Pol. 1260b28-29.
clearly impossible to have \( \kappa \sigma \iota \iota \nu \nu \eta \iota \iota \) in nothing.\(^1\) "The constitution of a polis involves in itself some sort of association and its members must initially be associated in a common place of residence. To be fellow citizens is to be sharers in one state."\(^2\) Aristotle next asks whether it is better for the well-constructed state to share everything possible for it to share, or to share only in some things.\(^3\) The idea of having \( \kappa \sigma \iota \iota \nu \nu \eta \iota \iota \) in all things leads him to a consideration of the plan for \( \kappa \sigma \iota \iota \nu \nu \eta \iota \iota \) of wives, children, and property which Socrates proposed in Plato's Republic.\(^4\)

In Book IV of the Republic, Socrates cautiously alluded to \( \kappa \sigma \iota \iota \nu \nu \eta \iota \iota \) of women, children, and goods as one effective means of achieving the ideal state which they were planning.\(^5\) This idea was not original with Socrates as is indicated by its appearance in the Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes, produced in Athens twenty years before the Republic was completed. However, Socrates' friends react immediately by asking him to explain how such a system would work.\(^6\)

Socrates proposes that in the guardian and helper classes

\(^1\text{Pol.} 1260b38-39.\)
\(^2\text{Pol.} 1260b40-42.\)
\(^3\text{Pol.} 1261a1-3.\)
\(^4\text{Pol.} 1261a4-6.\)
\(^5\text{Rep.} 424A.\)
\(^6\text{Rep.} 449CD; 450C; 461E.\)
of their ideal state all females would be common to all males, with none living together as husband and wife, and the children they produce would be raised by the state and thus common to all the members of the class.\textsuperscript{1} This, Socrates, hoped, would create that κοινωνία of pleasure and pain in which "all the citizens rejoice and grieve alike at the same births and deaths."\textsuperscript{2} For the best city is one "in which the greatest number use the expression 'mine' and 'not mine' of the same things in the same way."\textsuperscript{3} He compares the city to a man:

For example, if the finger of one of us is wounded, the entire community of bodily connections stretching to the soul for "integration" with the dominant part is made aware, and all of it feels the pain as a whole, though it is a part that is how we come to say that the man has a pain in his finger.\textsuperscript{4}

The result of κοινωνία in the body politic will be that these citizens, above all others, will have one and the same thing in common which they will name mine, and by virtue of this communion they will have their pleasures and pains in common...And is not the cause of this, besides this, the general constitution of the state, the community of wives and children among the guardians?\textsuperscript{5}

By common activities, common intercourse, common children, common education,\textsuperscript{6} and common sacrifices made to them after death,\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Rep. 464B.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Rep. 462B.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Rep. 462C.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Rep. 462C.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}Rep. 464A.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}Rep. 466CD.
  \item \textsuperscript{7}Rep. 540C.
\end{itemize}
Socrates hoped that the unity of the state would be absolutely secured in a way most fitting to both male and female natures. When his friends ask if he thinks that "such a community can be brought among men, as it exists among animals" Socrates is quick to reply that it can.\(^1\)

Aristotle acknowledges with Socrates the role of education in making the polis a community and giving it unity. Women and children must share in this educational experience because, "women are a half of the free population; children grow up to be partners in the government of the state."\(^2\) But he "abandons Plato's view that, though woman is the weaker vessel, her function is the same as the man's."\(^3\)

Aristotle also opposes the theory of the koinwnia of women, children, and goods as presented by Socrates because he feels that the absolute unity toward which it was directed has never been proved satisfactorily to be the end of the political community. In fact, he feels that too much unity will actually lead to the destruction of the polis by breaking down, as it becomes more a unit, first into a household, then into an individual. Secondly, since it is essential that the polis be composed

\(^1\) ReP. 466D.  
\(^2\) Pol. 1260b20.  
\(^4\) Pol. 1261a18-20.
of different kinds of men to establish its self-sufficiency, all men should take turns in ruling and being ruled. However, he does agree that it would be better for the political κοινωνία if the same men were always the rulers. Finally, since the κοινωνία of the polis can only exist when there is a large enough and diversified enough group for the polis to be self-sufficing, the lesser degree of unity is more desirable than the greater.

Aristotle next launches into a criticism of the means suggested in the Republic for achieving unity in the polis:

Even if it were the supreme good of a political association that it should have the greatest possible unity, this unity does not appear to follow from the formula of "All men saying Mine and Not mine" at the same time, which, in view of Socrates, is the index of the perfect unity of a polis. Aristotle distinguishes between the individual and the collective sense of the word "all" commenting that the use of "all" collectively is not conducive to harmony in the state.

Another difficulty which Aristotle envisions in regard to the κοινωνία of women and children is that injuries done to persons become more serious when committed against close relatives. Therefore, in regard to the κοινωνία of women and children in the political situation, Aristotle feels that the unity which it is supposed to effect would be only a "watery sort" of

1 Pol. 1261a38-39.
2 Pol. 1261b14.
3 Pol. 1261b15-21.
Plato's fallacy, according to Aristotle, lies in thinking that, if unity is necessary for the polis, total unity is the ideal. But, as Barker comments,

Plato had never thought that material means would of themselves reform humanity; he had not even thought that they ought to be the first means employed for that end. Spiritual means—a common education—had been his primary object; and a scheme of education is the subject which engages his attention most closely and most constantly.

Aristotle moves next to a consideration of the proper regulation and then to a criticism of the κοινωνία of property which Plato had suggested for the distribution of property under an ideal constitution. Aristotle indicates three possibilities, plots of land owned individually, but crops shared in common; plots held in common, but crops divided for individual use, a form of κοινωνία practiced by some barbarian tribes; plots and crops both held in common. He observes:

It is generally true that it is a difficult business for men to live together and to be partners in any form of human activity, but it is specially difficult to do so when property is involved. Fellow-travellers who are merely partners in a journey furnish an illustration; they generally quarrel about ordinary matters and take offence on petty occasion.

1 Pol. 1262b15-16; 1262b36. Flaws are discernible in Aristotle's criticism of Plato's Republic. Ross, op. cit., 237, notes: "It is only within two of those, the ruling and warrior classes, the community of wives and children is ordained, and only within these classes that Aristotle would be justified in saying that Plato aims too much at unity."

2 Barker, Political Thought, 395.

3 Pol. 1263a7-8.

4 Pol. 1263a15-19.
And again,

those who own property, and share in its management, are far more often at variance with one another than those who have property in severality—though (we tend to be misled by the fact that) those who are at variance in consequence of sharing in property look to us few in number when we compare them with the mass of those who own their property privately. 1

Aristotle believes that the evils which a system of κοινωνία of property is directed against are not caused by the absence of this κοινωνία but are due to the wickedness of human nature. 2 In addition,

Justice demands that we should take into account not only the evils from which men will be liberated when once they have turned their property into a common stock, but also the benefits of which they will be deprived. The life which they are to live appears to be utterly impossible. 3

Commenting on this problem, Barker states: "It is exactly this power of knowing ourselves as separate individuals which Plato really destroys, when he abolishes property; for property is a necessary basis of any conscious sense of an individual self. 4

Aristotle also objects that "Plato has not explained, nor indeed is it easy to explain, the position of the different members" 5 under his ideal constitution, especially that of the third class which composes the bulk of the state. He suggests three

---

1 Pol. 1263b24-27.
2 Pol. 1263b23.
3 Pol. 1263b29.
4 Barker, Political Thought, 156.
5 Pol. 1264a11-12.
alternatives in their regard: 1) that they have all things in common; 2) that property and marriage be private; the whole community would then be based on a scheme in which there would almost seem to be two states in one: "the guardians being made into something of the nature of an army of occupation, the farmers, artisans, and others being given the position of ordinary citizens." Aristotle finds it "difficult to discover...how the farming class is to be constituted if the common life of the guardians is to be preserved"; 3) that there be community of wives, but private property. As Barker here indicates

Aristotle does not mention the fourth possibility—that ownership and use may both be private. Nor does he proceed, after stating his three alternatives, to examine each in turn. What he actually does is (1) to examine, in 3-4, some difficulties of the Platonic scheme of communism, apparently on the assumption that it corresponds to the last of his three possibilities; (2) to discuss, in 5-10, the advantages of a system of private property combined with common use—a system which more or less corresponds to the first of his three alternatives; and (3) to return, in the rest of the chapter, to a detailed criticism of the Platonic scheme—a criticism which sometimes fails to do justice to its real character. The second of the three alternatives is thus left unexamined—except in so far as Aristotle's own preference for the first alternative (which is the opposite of the second) implies its rejection.

After his analysis of the Republic, Aristotle moves on to an examination of the constitution of the Laws, since he feels

---

1Pol. 1264a24-25.
2Pol. 1264a26-28.
3Pol. 1264a39-41.
4Barker, Politics, 55, n. 1.
that "in the Republic Plato has only attempted to solve a very small number of issues--mainly the proper method for ensuring community of wives and children and community property, and the proper way of distributing power under the constitutional system."¹ He concludes that, with few exceptions, "In all matters other than community of wives and of property, Plato provides identical institutions for both of his states."²

A scrutiny of other constitutions then follows. Aristotle criticizes the Spartan constitution in that it does not require the Council of Elders to participate in a close scrutiny of their public conduct.³

One of the objections he makes to the Cretan system is that it is not a constitution at all, but an arbitrary form of oligarchy, in which the Cretan nobles break up the people and their own followers into many factions; to set up, on that basis, as many monarchies; and then to quarrel and fight. In effect, and as long as it lasts, such a state of things simply means the disappearance of the state and the dissolution of political society.⁴

¹Pol. 1264b29-31. Morrow, op. cit., l11, n. 44, says "In view of Plato's lengthy discussion of this problem (e.g. means for keeping the population constant) it is hard to understand why Aristotle should criticize him for not taking it into account (Pol. 1265a38). This and other discrepancies between Aristotle's criticisms and the Laws as we have it suggests that Aristotle's comments are based upon an earlier version which was corrected and added to after this part of the Politics was written."

²Pol. 1265a5-6.
³Pol. 1271a4-5.
The Attic orators frequently used *koinwvía* in reference to the many kinds of political relationships, legal and illegal, free and coercive, selfish and altruistic, which characterized the politics of the fourth century B.C. About 397 B.C., just after the end of the Peloponnesian War, Isocrates wrote a speech for the son of Alcibiades who was a defendant in an action for damage for the sum of five talents. The young Alcibiades based his defence on a eulogy of his father's contributions to Athens, which would still be remembered so soon after the defeat of the Peloponnesian War. He reminded them of how his father had been exiled by the ruthless Four Hundred who then abolished the democracy. Though he was recalled when the Four Hundred were overthrown, he was again exiled by the oligarchs when one of his lieutenants was defeated at the Battle of Notium in 407 B.C. Thus, young Alcibiades reminded the Athenians, "did my father's misfortunes affect the city and he share in her disasters."²

¹Jebb, *op. cit.*, II, 229. On pp. 231-232 Jebb paraphrases this speech thus: "His loyalty to the democracy was proved by his sufferings. His banishment was the first preparation for the oligarchy of the Four Hundred, and the first consequence of the oligarchy of the Thirty. His interests were, indeed, closely bound up with yours. The Tyrants knew this; and while they drove others from Athens, drove Alcibiades from Hellas; thinking that it would be vain to level the walls, unless they removed him who could restore them."

Isocrates' first political discourse, the Panegyricus, which was either read or circulated at a Panhellenic meeting at Olympia c. 380 B.C., urged the Greeks to rally from the intolerable conditions resulting from the defeat of Athens, the supremacy of Sparta, the humiliation of the ill-kept Peace of Antalcidas in 387 B.C., the general exhaustion caused by war and civil strife. He began by saying that, while the athletic victors who do no real service for the people are greatly honored, to wise men "who had toiled in private for the public good and trained their own minds so as to be able to help also their fellowmen they apportioned no reward whatsoever." He extolled the man who attains wisdom, for "all men will reap the benefit who are willing to share his insight." The wise man in this instance is of course Isocrates himself, proposing that the Greeks unite to conquer Persia. "It were well to make the expedition in the present generation, in order that those who have shared in our misfortunes may also benefit by our advantages." He encouraged them to accept Athenian leadership in this enterprise, despite the fact that those who had κοινωνία in the Spartan decarchies have openly denounced Athenian policy and integrity. Since "we have

1 Jebb, op. cit., II, 148-149.
3 Pan. IV 167.
4 Pan. IV 110.
shown ourselves to be of such character and have given so convincing proof that we do not covet the possessions of others."¹

Not only was Spartan supremacy in Greece resented, however. The citizen of Plataea, in whose mouth Isocrates' Plataicus, ca. 372-371 B.C., was placed, said of the Thebans who had attacked and destroyed the town of Plataea and annexed the territory in 373 B.C.: "For my part, I consider that there exists no people more overbearing than those who blot out the cities of each of us and compel us, when we have no use for it, to participate in their form of polity."² He begged the Athenians not to abandon the Plataeans who had been their allies since the Persian Wars when they "alone of those who lived outside the Peloponnesus shared in their (the Athenian) perils and thus helped them to save their city."³ He lamented over the woes of the Plataeans:

¹Jebb, op. cit., II, 164-165 comments: "Foremost among its authors works in merit of execution, the Panegyricus stands first also in the interest of its subject matter...But whatever was, at the time, the political worth of the Panegyricus, its permanent historical worth can hardly be overrated. To the history of Greece it contributes a vivid picture of the whole Hellenic world, and of the barbarian world in contact with Hellas, at a critical moment. To the history of Athens it contributes a striking sketch of the growth and influence in Greece of the specially Athenian ideas, religious, political and social. For the personal history of Isocrates it is of surpassing interest; it is the earliest and most complete expression of the ruling thought of his life: the thought which he afterwards urged upon Dionysius, upon Archidamus,—at last upon Philip."


³Plat. XIV 57.
For who could be found to be more unhappy than we are who in one day deprived of our city, our land, and our possessions, and being destitute of all necessities alike, have become wanderers and beggars, not knowing whither to turn, and whatever our habitation, finding no happiness there? For if we fall in with the unfortunate, we grieve that we must be compelled, in addition to our own ills, to share in the ills of others; and if we encounter those who fare well, our lot is even harder to bear, not because we envy them their prosperity, but because amid the blessings of our neighbors we see more clearly our own miseries. 1

The ascendancy of Thebes after the Battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C. made her the main threat to the other Greek city-states and drew Athens and Sparta more closely together. According to Xenophon, Athens did not approve of the conduct of the Thebans after the battle of Leuctra. She was ashamed to make war on Thebes and in addition did not think it expedient, and she refused any longer to take part with them in what they were doing, inasmuch as they saw that they were campaigning against the Phocians, who were old friends of the Athenians, and were annihilating cities which had been faithful in the war against the barbarian and were friendly to Athens. 2 After Archidemus returned with his forces from Leuctra, the Athenians invited all cities willing to participate in the King's Peace to meet in Athens. "And when they had come together, they passed a resolution to take...(an) oath, in company with such as desired to share in the peace." 3

1 Plat. XIV 46.
3 Hell. VI 5.2.
It is conjectured that Isocrates' oration Archidamus was a rhetorical exercise which tried to project what the sentiments of the son of the Spartan king Archidamus would be at the Congress which met in 366 B.C. at Sparta to discuss peace with Thebes.¹ The Peace of Pelopidas in 367 B.C. had stipulated that the newly colonized city of Messene be recognized as independent. Here Isocrates pictured Archidamus as opposing this stipulation and holding up to the Spartans Athens as the ideal defender of what is one's own possession. He reminded them how the Athenians during the Persian War "leaving their own country, and adopting Freedom as their fatherland...shared the dangers of war with us, and wrought such a change in their fortunes that, after being deprived of their own possessions for but a few days, they became for many years masters of the rest of the world."² In fact, Isocrates seemed at one point to envision Archidamus as the man to lead the united Greeks against Persia. In a letter to Archidamus written c. 356 B.C.³ Isocrates tried to rouse him to such an undertaking by reminding him of the Greeks in Asia "whom by the treaty we have delivered one and all into the hands, not only of the barbarians, but also of those Greeks who, though they share

³Jebb, op. cit., II, 245.
our speech, yet adhere to the ways of the barbarians."¹

At the conclusion of the Social War (357-355 B.C.) in which the Athenians lost such important allies as Chios, Cos, Rhodes, and Byzantium, Isocrates composed a discourse on the public safety called the Areopagiticus. In it he encouraged a return to the restricted democracy of Solon and Cleisthenes. At that time, he reminded them, the Athenian people "not only were... of the same mind regarding public affairs, but in their private life as well they showed that degree of consideration for each other which is due from men who are right-minded and partners in a common fatherland."²

In the same year, 355 B.C., Demosthenes delivered in person his first speech on a public question. He opposed a certain Leptines who had a law passed "which revoked all immunities granted in the past and made them illegal for the future, with the exception of those enjoined by the descendants of the tyrannicides, Harmodius and Aristogeiton,"³ in order that the depleted Athenian treasury might be replenished. Demosthenes argued: "with regard to the alleged poverty of the Exchequer, you must reflect that you will not be a whit the better off if you abolish these exemp-


tions, for the expenditure of these services has nothing to do with the revenues or the surplus of the State."¹

In 354 B.C., rumor reached Athens that the Persians were arming against Athenian allies. Some in Athens wanted to declare war on Persia immediately. We might imagine Isocrates was foremost among them. Demosthenes took part in the debate and succeeded in averting a declaration of war by his oration On the Navy Boards. His proposed reform of the triarchy, which however was not adopted for years, included a suggestion that the register of the wealthiest citizens should be increased to 2000 citizens, so that "after striking out wards, orphans, settlers in colonies, joint holders of estates, and everyone otherwise ineligible," there might still be c. 1200 persons willing and able to contribute for the general good of the state.²

In 346 B.C. Isocrates reiterated his favorite theme: the Greeks should unite in common cause against the King of Persia.³

¹ Against Leptines, 20.25.


³ Jaeger, Demosthenes, 153 says: Isocrates "had long since come to recognize the impossibility of resisting Macedonia, and he was only trying to find the least humiliating way to express the unavoidable submission of all the Greeks to the will of Philip. Here again he found the solution in a scheme for Macedonian hegemony over Greece. For it seemed as if Philip's appearance in this role would be the most effective way to mitigate his becoming so dominant a factor against the culturally and ethnically alien character of the Macedonians. Isocrates tried to make this acceptable both to Philip and to the Greeks by employing the mythical symbol of Heracles as the first to carry Greek civilization in triumph to Asia. As Heracles' successor, Philip, scion of the Heraclidae, was now to lead Greece to victory over the bar-
In an Address to Philip, written just after the Peace of Philocrates, he tried to persuade Philip to unite and lead the Greeks, saying:

I am not unaware that when I am proposing this course many will look at it askance, but that when you are actually carrying it out all will rejoice in it; for no one has had any part in what I have proposed but when the benefits from it shall have been realized in fact, everyone without fail will look to have his portion. 1

During the same year, Demosthenes delivered his oration On the Peace in which he urged the Greeks not to let Philip have κοινωνία in the Amphictyonic Council2 despite the alliance made by Philip and Athens in the Peace of Philocrates.

The accusation that Athenian interests had been betrayed by the embassy which was sent to Philip and which concluded the Peace of Philocrates in 346 B.C. were clearly enunciated in two orations delivered in 343 B.C. In De Falsa Legatione Demosthenes protested that he had been forced to reveal the κοινωνία of Aeschines and Philocrates with Philip to free himself from the suspicion of having been "a reputed accomplice in scandalous and wicked actions."3


Though denied a hearing on this matter earlier, due to the intrigues of his opponents, he continued to protest that he had no knowledge or *κοινωνία* in the promises made in securing the Peace of Philocrates.\(^1\) The guilt of Philocrates in accepting bribes from Philip had been established in an earlier trial and he was exiled from Athens. Demosthenes however protested that Aeschines still maintained his *κοινωνία* with Philocrates and still preferred "disrepute, prosecution, any punishment this court may inflict rather than to do anything disagreeable to Philip."\(^2\) He reminded the Athenians that they had passed censure on all the results of the Peace and refused *κοινωνία* in the doings of the Amphictyonic Council and were suspicious of Philip, yet they refused to condemn a man who was the cause of the Peace itself.\(^3\) He then invited all those who were innocent of these indictments as colleagues of Aeschines in the embassy to prove themselves honest men by freely coming forward to testify that they were not *κοινωνοί* in Aeschines' actions.\(^4\)

If Aeschines would accuse Demosthenes of not being loyal to him after all they went through together, Demosthenes offered as an example of his own justification the practice commanders and nearly all public authorities who have *κοινωνία* in worship

\(^1\)De Fals. Leg 19.45.355.
\(^2\)De Fals. Leg. 19.119.
\(^3\)De Fals. Leg. 19.132.381.
\(^4\)De Fals. Leg. 19.157.390.
and libations, yet do not "give impunity to delinquent colleagues on account of these observances." He also defended himself against Aeschines' charge that he was a κοινωνὸς in all the acts which he was then denouncing. By the testimony of his actions and witnesses to the fact. He protested that he had everything to gain by becoming their κοινωνὸς—a gift of money from Philip, and the friendship both of Philocrates and Aeschines and of Philip himself.

He reminded the assembly that some of the most outstanding citizens whom they had "allotted by statute a share of...libations and drink offerings in every temple and at every public service" had, in spite of this, been subject to the due process of law for their unjust actions. Aeschines should be no exception, he urged. No denunciation of the general Chares by Aeschines would swerve him from his object. "He is not concerned in the present inquiry," said Demosthenes.

As might be expected, Aeschines retorted in his oration, On the Embassy, by continuing to accuse Demosthenes of being a κοινωνὸς with the guilty Philocrates in the Peace.

---

1 De. Fals. Leg. 19.190.400.
3 De Fals. Leg. 19.222.410.
4 De Fals. Leg. 19.280.431.
5 De Fals. Leg. 19.334.448.
The judgment of history seems to be against Aeschines and in favor of Demosthenes.\(^1\)

The next year, 342 B.C., Demosthenes delivered an oration On Halonnesus. An island off the Thessalian coast which belonged to Athens, Halonnesus was seized by pirates whom Philip then drove out, keeping the island for himself. When Athens sent an embassy to demand the island back, Philip offered to give them the island or to submit the case to arbitration. Demosthenes replied to this proposal of Philip in the oration On Halonnesus. He reminded the Athenian people that they had wished all the Greeks who had no ἱερατική in the Peace of Philocrates to remain free and independent, but that if one of them were attacked, both Philip and Athens should unite to defend them. Philip's predatory actions at Halonnesus, however, clearly indicated that he had no intention of fulfilling the terms of the agreement.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Jaeger, Demosthenes, 166-167: "Aeschines' authority must have been seriously shaken now that the memory of all the human events leading up to the peace had been again brought to light. Shortly before, his associate Philocrates, for whom the peace was named, had been impeached by Hypereides and had fled the country. The court condemned him to death. It would be foolish for us to spend our time today in trying to decide once again whether these men were guilty or innocent, trusting ourselves to examine the arguments for and against. In these battles Demosthenes is bent on ruthlessly stamping out any resistance to the idea of war, using all the resources of and overwhelming passion with such a volley of epithets that everyone who steps in the path of the raging avalanche is called traitor and swept away...In judging Demosthenes politics we are always coming up against the critical problem of whether he may not have deceived himself."

While Philip was being severely censored at Athens by Demosthenes, he received a letter from Isocrates who viewed him as the man to lead a common Greek expedition against Persia. Word had reached Athens that Philip had been wounded fighting the Thracians. Isocrates exhorted him not to strive for the honor that comes from foolhardy daring or "such virtue as even ignoble men share, but only of those of which no base person may partake." In other words, not to waste his energy on the Thracians but to turn his energies to conquering the Great King himself.

Demosthenes reproached the Greek city-states individually and collectively in his Third Philippic of 341 B.C. for that spirit of exclusiveness which was about to make their overthrow by Philip possible. He said:

We are in such a miserable position, we have so entrenched ourselves in our different cities, that to this very day we can do nothing that our interest or our duty demands; we cannot combine, we cannot take any common pledge of help or friendship; but we idly watch the power of this man, each bent (or so it seems to me) on profiting by the interval afforded by another's ruin, taking not a thought, making not an effort for the salvation of Greece.  

Demosthenes suggested that, since the Athenians could not hope to defeat Philip alone, they should waste no time in sending ambassadors to the whole area—the Peloponnesus, Rhodes, Chios, the Great King—in the hope of gaining in the danger

---


and expense of withstanding Philip and preserving Greek liberty.\textsuperscript{1}

In the \textbf{Fourth Philippic}, written about the same time as the previous oration and perhaps not by Demosthenes himself, the Athenians were urged "to share equitably with one another the privilege of citizenship, the wealthy feeling secure to lead their own lives and haunted by no fears on that account, but in the face of dangers making over their property to the commonwealth for its defense."\textsuperscript{2}

Isocrates' last great oration, the \textbf{Panathenaicus}, which was completed in 339 B.C. when the orator was 97 years of age, was commenced by glorifying Athens at the expense of Sparta. Sparta was criticized for laying waste to cities in the Peloponnesus which

deserved the greatest possible rewards from the Hellenes because of the expedition against Troy in which they took the foremost places and furnished as its leaders men possessed not only of the virtues in which many of the common run of mankind have a part, but also of those in which no ignoble man may share.\textsuperscript{3}

Also censured were the early wars of the Lacedaemonians in which masses of people were subjected, while the other Hellenes "suffered the opposing party to live with them and share in all the

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Third Philippic IX.} 71.


Those, he said, who praised the Lacedaemonians for their conduct then and in subsequent events "are not aware that they are betraying their own thought and showing that they would praise also men who, already possessing more wealth than they need, would not scruple to slay their own brothers and friends and associates so as to obtain their possessions also."  

The oration Against Neaera, spuriously attributed to Demosthenes but included in the Demosthenic corpus and dated 339 B.C. refers to the inscription on the tripod at Delphi, commemorating the victory at Plataea in 479 B.C., on which the names of all the Greek states "who were κοινωνοὶ in the work" were inscribed.

Despite Demosthenes' most valiant efforts to preserve Greece for the Greeks, Philip succeeded in conquering them by his victory at the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C. He effectively established himself in control of the constitution of the Corinthian League. In 337 B.C. the League and Philip agreed to jointly wage war against the Persian king under Philip's command. However, Philip of Macedon was murdered at the wedding of his daugh-

1 Panathenaicus XII. 178.

2 Ibid., XII. 184.


Alexander succeeded his father as King of Macedon and was elected commander-in-chief of the Greek forces on land and sea. A general peace was proclaimed. Demosthenes opposed the son as fervently as he had opposed the father. In the oration, On the Treaty with Alexander, by one of Demosthenes' party, the Athenian people are reminded that they had agreed "that anyone who acts as Alexander has acted shall be the enemy of all the other parties to the compact, and his country shall be hostile territory, and all the parties shall unite in a campaign against him." The compact had further established "that it shall be the business of the delegates at the Congress and those responsible for public safety to see that in the states that are parties to the contrary to the laws established in those states, no confiscation of property, no partition of lands, no cancelling of debts, and no emancipation of slaves for the purpose of revolution." Nor are exiles to be allowed to leave the states which are κοινωνια in the peace, bearing arms against any other states which are κοινωνια in it. The oration concluded that war should be declared on Alexander because these and other agreements of the peace treaty had been violated.

2 Ibid., 17.15.
3 Ibid., 17.16.
The enmity between Aeschines and Demosthenes after the trial in 342 B.C. concerning the embassy to Philip in 346 B.C. was never healed. The two remained bitter rivals. So when in 336 B.C. a certain Ctesiphon proposed that a golden crown be publicly awarded to Demosthenes at the Dionysia in recognition of his constant devotion to the state, Aeschines challenged the motion as illegal. For some reason or other, the case was delayed six years and only brought to the court in 330 B.C. In his oration Against Ctesiphon, Aeschines accused Demosthenes of being leagued with Callias of Chalcis to swindle Athens of money given to oppose Philip while Callias proclaimed at Athens in 340 B.C. "that there would be no lack of money or men." He also charged Demosthenes with being a κατεχόμενος with the Boeotarchs in securing Athenian support for Thebes before the Battle of Chaeronea. Finally, he accused all Demosthenes' witnesses of being κατεχόμενοι in his bribes.

The De Corona was Demosthenes' response to this attack. He put blame for the conclusion of the much disputed peace on one Philocrates of Hagnas, a κατεχόμενος of Aeschines. He also re-

---

2 Against Ctesiphon III. 145.
3 Ibid., III. 257.
minded Aeschines that "if I had really intrigued with Philip to stop a Panhellenic coalition, it was your business not to hold your peace, but to cry aloud, to protest, to inform the people. You did nothing of the sort." But Demosthenes also, of course, recognized that the real question was whether or not he had been a loyal and useful citizen. In his defense on these grounds, he stated:

As for his proposing that a crown should be given to me, and the decoration proclaimed in the Theatre without adding the words, "provided he shall first have rendered his accounts," I conceive that that also is related to my public acts, whether I am, or am not worthy of the crown and of the proclamation before the people. 2

"Demosthenes came before the public tribunal of Athens as a victor, and received the crown, while his opponent, defeated, left Athens forever." 3

Eight years later, however, the cause to which Demosthenes had given his life, the preservation of the autonomy of the Greek states and Athens in particular, was lost. The victory of the Macedonian forces at the Battle of Crannon in 322 B.C. effectively terminated the age of the polis. Rather than submit to the new order, Demosthenes took his own life.

In addition to these actual instances of κοινωνία in fourth century Athenian politics, κοινωνία also occurs with

---

1 De Corona 18.23.
2 De Corona 18.58.244.
3 Jaeger, Demosthenes, 196.
some frequency in the authors of the classical period to describe various other relationships—military, political, social, intellectual, commercial, legal, nefarious, genealogical.

The commanders and soldiers in an army are unified by sharing together many toils and dangers, but the soldiers must feel they will have a share in the rewards of battle as well. An even greater bond is created, however, when leaders and soldiers have a spirit of "freedom, friendliness, and mutual interchange of reason," among themselves.

This spirit of "friendliness and fellowship" is also necessary between ruler and ruled in any political context, and among those ruling, if the rule is shared. Because Dionysius I of Syracuse was unable to make anyone worthy of being a konwvos in his government, Plato described him as seven times more unhappy than Darius who trusted men who neither were his brothers nor raised up by himself but merely colleagues who had helped him to crush the Mede and the Eunuch; and he divided amongst them seven provinces, each greater than the whole of Sicily; and these colleagues he found loyal, neither did they make any attack either on himself or on one another.

1 Plato Laws 686A.
3 Plato Laws 694B.
4 Laws 695D.
6 Plato Epistle VII 332AB.
In Xenophon's *Hiero*, an account of an imaginary conversation between King Hiero of Syracuse and the poet Simonides of Ceos, Hiero complains that despots have so little κοινωνία in friendship.  

Simonides suggests that "he who wants to be loved must love first; he who wants to be loved by his subjects in order to be genuinely honored by them must love them first; to gain favors he must first show favors."  

Since Virtue is the "best partner in friendship," then "in public life it is a gain to make friends with the best, and to see them partners and fellow-workers in a common cause, and not rivals."

Demosthenes advised the Athenians to seek out advisors who had κοινωνία in "intelligence, sound judgment, and ample forethought," rather than in recklessness. Plato encouraged friendship between his two pupils Erastus and Coriscus and Hermias, the tyrant of Atarnaeus, since he believed their association would be mutually beneficial.  

Isocrates praised the young Alexander for associating with Athenians "whose constant companion-
ship would not cause regret and with whom association and partnership would not result in harm or injury to you--just such men, indeed, as should be chosen as associates by the wise."  

Similar reasoning was undoubtedly behind the request of Lysimachus and Melisias in Plato's Laches when they invited Socrates to be a κοινωνός with them in the education of their sons.  

A participant in a discussion is referred to as a κοινωνος; in Xenophon's Oeconomicus, Critobulus comments on how pleasant it is for κοινωνος in a dialogue to come to agreement on certain points. Such a group may be said to "have formed a partnership in wisdom," or to share knowledge with one another. They are called variously κοινωνος of an argument, a discussion topic, an opinion or point of view, or of perplexity over an argument, or in a starting point for a discussion.  

\[1\] Isocrates Epistle V to Alexander 2.  
\[4\] Xenophon Oeconomicus VI. 3.  
\[5\] Plato Gorgias 487C.  
\[6\] Plato Cleitophon 410C.  
\[7\] Plato Laches 197E; Laws 891B.  
\[8\] Plato Cratylyus 434BC.  
\[9\] Plato Crito 49D; Rep. 335E; 450A; Pol. 260B.  
\[10\] Plato Alcibiades II 147E.  
\[11\] Plato Crito 49D.
may be κοινωνία in the investigation of the laws\(^1\) or in drawing up a constitution.\(^2\) From the usage of κοινωνία to designate a group of similar interests, a club, a common type of association in the ancient world, came to be known as a κοινωνία. Isaeus mentions one whose members were dedicated to Heracles.\(^3\)

Friends have κοινωνία in one another's private affairs and share good fortune, but they should never take advantage of a friend's misfortune for personal gain.\(^5\) If a friend commits a serious offense, one should withdraw from the κοινωνία of his friendship, but should not become a κοινωνίας with his enemies in prosecuting him.\(^6\) In his Address to Demonicus, Isocrates offers the following advice: "Prove your friends by means of the misfortunes of life and of their fellowship in your perils; for as we try gold in the fire, so we come to know our friends when

---

\(^1\) Plato \textit{Laws} 810C.

\(^2\) Plato \textit{Laws} 753A; 969C.


\(^5\) Isocrates \textit{Antidosis} XV.105, trans George Norlin and LaRue Van Hook (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), II, 244-245.

we are in misfortune. "¹ No one should be asked to become a κοινωνία of one who does not obey the laws.²

κοινωνία is commonly used to designate various types of commercial relationships also. Mention is made of κοινωνία in the management and working of a mine.³ In the orators, κοινωνία is a term frequently used to designate the partners who loan money for commercial ventures, or to designate the men who have borrowed the money. Since the suits for which these orations were written were often brought to court because the borrowers failed to fulfill the terms of the contract, the term κοινωνία in reference to them often has a derogatory connotation. One or both meanings occur in the Orations of Demosthenes Against Zenothemis,⁴ Against Phormio,⁵ Against Lacritus,⁶ Against Timotheus,⁷ Against Callipus,⁸ Against Dionysidorus.⁹

²Plato Epistle VII 337D.
⁴Demosthenes Against Zenothemis 32.7; 32.15; 32.17; 32.21.
⁵Demosthenes Against Phormio 34.8; 34.36; 34.38.
⁶Demosthenes Against Lacritus 35.16.
⁷Demosthenes Against Timotheus 49.31.
⁸Demosthenes Against Callipus 52.3
⁹Demosthenes Against Dionysidorus 56.1; 56.5; 56.7; 56.9; 56.10; 56.11; 56.24; 56.42; 56.45.
In less noble contexts, various persons are said to be involved as κοινωνεῖ in crime, in murder, in political activities as well as in misdeeds of sacrilege, impiety, embezzlement, in drinking bouts as well as "in such great and such reckless malignity and villainy and impudence and outrage," in conspiracies to rob someone of a rightful inheritance and to get hold of an estate in order to split the profits.

Natural and legal kinship are also described as a κοινωνία. A man is said to be a κοινωνεῖ in the character of his ancestors. Kinship implied the right to have κοινωνία in the same sacrifices and in the ancestral tomb common to all the members of a gens.

Xenophon's Oeconomicus describes the good wife as an essential κοινωνεῖ in the successful management of an estate.

1 Demosthenes Against Ophobus III. 29.20.
2 Demosthenes Against Meidias 21.120.
3 Demosthenes Against Timocrates 24.159.
4 Ibid., 24.177.
5 Demosthenes Against Conon 54.33.
6 Ibid., 54.37.
7 Demosthenes Against Macartatus 43.30.
8 Demosthenes Against Olympiodorus 48.28.
9 Plato Laws 699D.
10 Demosthenes Against Theocrines 58.40.
11 Demosthenes Against Eubulides 57.28; Against Macartatus 43.79.
"Good" in this context means able to control the spending of the money which the husband earns. When both κοινωνοί of the home are satisfied with the accounts, domestic tranquillity is sure to ensue. Isochomachus the main figure in the dialogue, tells Socrates of a conversation he had with his wife shortly after they were married, reminding her that he had chosen her and her parents had chosen him as "the best partner of home and children that we could get." And now that they are married, he tells her, it is not the one of them who has contributed the most in material goods, but the one who proves the better κοινωνός who makes the more valuable contribution to the home they share. As husband and wife, they are bound by a double tie: god makes them κοινωνοί in sexual union "chiefly in order that they may form a perfect partnership in mutual service," and also that they may be κοινωνοί of children. The law also appoints them κοινωνοί in the home. Isochomachus tells her that the better κοινωνός she is to him and the better housewife she is to the children "the greater will be the honour paid to you in our home." He

1 Xenophon Oeconomicus III.15.
2 Ibid., VI.3.
3 Ibid., VII.11.
4 Ibid., VII.13.
5 Ibid., VII.18.
6 Ibid., VII.30.
7 Ibid., VII.42.
tells her that he has no right to under- or overestimate their material resources to her as a κοινωνός χρημάτων and takes the opportunity to remind her that she should not try to enhance her physical resources by the use of cosmetics, just as she would not like it if he tried to do that. She agrees that they are both κοινωνοι in their possessions and in their bodies, and quietly accepts the remonstrance.

Isocrates comments that he has no patience with the perversity of men who take women in marriage and make them partners in all the relations of life, and then are not satisfied with the compacts which they have made but their own lawless pleasures bring pain to those whom they expect never to cause them pain; and who, though honest in all other partnerships, are without conscience in the partnership of marriage, when they ought to cherish this relationship the more faithfully inasmuch as it is more intimate and more precious than all others.

In the Constitution of the Lacedaemonians, the author tells how Lycurgus made it lawful for a man who did not want to establish a home but still wanted children, to choose a woman of good family and, with her husband's consent, father his children on her. Lycurgus, according to the writer, thought this a good arrangement, "for the wives who want to take charge of two house-

1Ibid., IX.3.
2Ibid., X.5.
3Isocrates To Nicoles III.40.
4This work has been long thought to be the work of Xenophon but it is now considered by K.M.T. Chrimes, The Republca Lacedaemoniarum Ascribed to Xenophon: Its Manuscript, Tradition and General Significance (Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester, no. 1; Manchester, 1948), 41, to be the work of Antisthenes.
holds, and the husbands want to get brother for their sons, brothers who are members of the family and share in its influence, but claim no part of the money.\textsuperscript{1}

Isocrates, in the oration \textit{Against Stephanus} II, cites the instance of a man who gave his own wife in marriage to a good friend thus making him "a partner in his own fatherhood."\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{Conclusion}

\textit{Koin\w{u}nia} and its cognates, as used by the authors of the classical period to describe social, philosophical, and political phenomena, provide interesting insights into the life and thought of the fourth century B.C.

Plato and Aristotle reflect the outlook of the upper classes on marriage and the family, namely that these relationships were not the source of companionship in life. Plato's suggestion of the possibility of the \textit{koin\w{u}nia} of women and children for his ideal state in the \textit{Republic} and his emphasis in the \textit{Laws} on marriage as an institution for the good of the state and therefore subject to careful regulation are illustrative of this attitude. Aristotle affirms the pivotal role which the family plays in relation to the state, but his impersonal references to marriage and the family completely neglect the affective and psychological aspects of these relationships. Among the lower classes,

\textsuperscript{1}Constitution of the Lacedaemonians I.9.
\textsuperscript{2}Isocrates \textit{Against Stephanus} II 46.17.
however, the woman who worked side by side with her husband undoubtedly helped to introduce a measure of equality into the marriage partnership. This development seems to be reflected in the writings of Xenophon who maintains that equality and mutual respect are necessary for a successful marriage.

Also revealed by the use of Κοινωνία and its cognates are the humane as well as the less noble relationships which make up the stuff of daily living. Included among the former are the interchange of love and friendship among friends, either formally as among members of a club or informally in discussions or in various types of relationships such as that commonly established between rulers and philosophers during this period. Illustrative of the latter type of relationship are partnership in crime, murder, sacrilege, impiety, embezzlement, drinking bouts, and inheritance robbing.

Κοινωνία and its cognates are also used in contexts descriptive of commercial relationships. Most often these business partnerships were formed between men who loaned money for commercial ventures, usually involving shipping, and the men who borrowed the money. Since the majority of the citations of Κοινωνία in this context are taken from orations written for suits brought to court because the borrowers failed to fulfil the terms of the contract, the terms often have a derogatory connotation.

In the political sphere, the writings of the period reveal that the fate of the polis and the conception of man as a
political animal were hanging in the balance during the fourth century B.C. The events which led to Plato's rejection of the contemporary political life at Athens have already been discussed: his disillusionment with the political atrocities of the Thirty and the injustice of the restored democracy in their condemnation of Socrates. It seems that the impossibility of authentic participation in the existing polis led him to the discovery of Justice and the other virtues in the world of the Ideas. His creative development of the implications of the phenomenon of participation led him to a further explanation of reality in which men and the cosmos were seen as related to the Ideas by means of soul. While Plato's philosophical intuition and its development in this manner cannot be said to be a direct outgrowth of earlier Greek philosophical speculation, yet the influence of such men as Parmenides, Heracleitus, and the Pythagoreans on his thought cannot be denied.

Aristotle, a pupil of Plato for twenty years, rejected his master's theory of Ideas. It was his belief that the individual things perceived by the senses were the primary realities and that only in this world of individual things would it be possible to find the true and unchanging objects of knowledge which form the basis of philosophy and science.

Both the similarities and the differences in the thought of Plato and Aristotle can be seen in their treatment of the polis. Both regarded it as natural and essential to man and as
based on justice. In stating this, they were taking a position directly contrary to that of some of the sophists who thought that the state was a product of convention and to that of the cynics who believed that man was self-sufficient. But while Plato was concerned with establishing the ideal polis, or later, the best polis possible considering the human situation, Aristotle's study of actual constitutions led him to discuss more realistically what was possible in politics as well as what might be desirable. Plato described the origin of the polis as the konwvía of four or five men practicing various arts. He then proceeded, however, to discuss the state not in terms of individuals but of classes. Perhaps this was the result of viewing the reality of the world of Ideas in terms of classes, as he did in the Sophistes. The ideal state, as it was finally constituted, consisted of the ruling class, the military class, and the productive class. The good of the state was the harmonious pursuit of wisdom, courage, and temperance, together with justice which consisted in each of the parts perfectly fulfilling its own function. Each individual was to be led, under the direction of the philosopher-king, to the contemplation of virtue insofar as each was able.

Aristotle described the polis as having developed structurally from the family through the clan and the village. Though he acknowledged that the family was prior in order of time, he held that the polis was prior in order of nature. He regarded the polis as the fulfillment of all the associations existing by
nature. Justice consisted in the observance of the mean in all forms of social κοινωνία and was aimed at achieving either numerical or proportional equality. Though he distinguished between ethics or virtue in the individual—and politics or virtue of man in society,—yet since virtue could only be practiced in the context of the polis, the two were not essentially different. Both the individual and the state were directed to the attainment of happiness as a final goal. Virtue for him was not an absolute existing in another realm but a mean between two extremes. Happiness was man's final goal and it consisted in the possession and exercise of the intellectual and moral virtues together with a possession of a sufficiency of material goods.

Aristotle made valid criticisms of Plato's ideas when he objected that Plato seemed to be destroying the polis, which he had established on the principle of diversity, by too much unity, at least in the two upper classes. He was correct in saying that the Republic neglected to discuss the relation of the third class to the other two. But perhaps Aristotle did not sufficiently realize that Plato's main concern was paideia rather than politics. Any system which would make possible the greatest opportunity for the contemplation and practice of virtue with the least amount of material involvement was the best for Plato, whether or not it contradicted basic political principles.

The fate of the polis and the political man were also the concern of men like Demosthenes and Aeschines and Isocrates. Be-
ing practical politicians, they knew the importance of the Koiv-wía established among men and among states for the welfare of the polis and the citizen. Demosthenes entered into a death struggle to maintain the polis as it was, despite the fact that "sober reason shows us that it was hopeless." 

Isocrates, like Aristotle, believed in the necessity of Greece being unified by a military leader, but "absorbed in this scheme, and believing it as a cure for all evils, he does not seem to have contemplated the probable permanency of such a leadership." 

Aeschines vacillated between these two positions. The speeches of these orators tell the story of the political partnerships among men and states which were formed during the fourth century and which affected the immediate destiny of Athens and every other Greek polis more forcefully than the theoretical speculations of Plato and Aristotle were ever able to do.

Athens was left exhausted by the long drawn out Peloponnesian War. The victor, Sparta, was not in much better condition. Soon her heavy-handed rule began to be resented by the other states of Greece who returned to alliance with Athens as she began to recover from the disaster of the Peloponnesian War. Supposedly the King's Peace of 387 B.C. put an end to such alliances, but this situation lasted only temporarily. The next few decades

---


witnessed the attempt of one city-state after another to win the hegemony of the whole of Greece. No city-state, however, was successful in gaining and maintaining this hegemony for any length of time. Only Philip of Macedon and his son Alexander were able by various means to successfully unite the Greeks under their hegemony. Isocrates and Aeschines believed that a Panhellenic koivuvía was so necessary for the greatness of Greece that they backed the man who was able to achieve it: Philip. Demosthenes could never relinquish his vision of a Panhellenic union under Athens. He died by his own hand when he realized his dream would never become a reality and that he would have to submit to Macedonian supremacy. Aristotle, too, felt the impact of these events on his own personal life. In 323 B.C. he was forced to leave Athens because of an outburst of anti-Macedonian feeling. He retired to Chalcis and died there in 322 B.C.

The polis died with the advent of Macedonian supremacy in Greece. For Aristotle, that meant the death of his political thought as well as of his ethics, which were "practical arts within the framework of the polis." The death of the polis did not have the same consequences for Plato's thought, however. Though he had set out originally on a quest for the best state, he found a much more meaningful world, the world of Ideas, where the things which appeared in the polis existed in their perfection. He came to the realization that man was not just a creature of this world of becoming but that he was able to participate in the Ideas in
the unchangeable world of being through the power of his soul. He saw the harmony which existed in the world of Ideas imitated in the world of the cosmos and realized that this same order based on justice must also exist in the soul of the individual and the state. Soul, state, and cosmos—all were necessarily oriented to the world of Ideas and destined to be fulfilled in one complete harmony of being. It was this vision, not confined to the context of the polis for its realization, which Plato bequeathed as a living legacy to subsequent generations.
CHAPTER IV

KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN PLUTARCH AND RELATED AUTHORS OF THE HELLENISTIC-ROMAN PERIOD

Introduction

The second author in whose writings the use of κοινωνία and its cognates is to be studied in detail is Plutarch of Chaeroneia. As far as can be determined from indications in his own works, Plutarch was born about 46-47 A.D. at Chaeroneia in Boeotia. His great-grandfather was named Nicarchus and his grandfather Lamprias. There are indications that his father may have been named Nicarchus or Autobulus. He had two brothers named Lamprias and Timon.¹

Plutarch came from a wealthy family and received a good education. As a young man he studied at Athens where he was the pupil of Ammonius of Lamptrae, "a Peripatetic philosopher deeply

¹An interesting but inconclusive discussion has been raised by Benedict Einarson in the article "Plutarch's Ancestry," Classical Philology, XLVII (April, 1952), 99, as to whether or not Timon was Plutarch's brother or whether they might be half-brothers. Konrat Ziegler in an article entitled "Plutarch's Ahnen" in Hermes, LXXXII (1954), 499-501 opts for the latter view indicating that the two men had the same father but different mothers. Einarson replied to him in "Plutarch's Ancestry Again" Classical Philology, L (October, 1955), 253-255 by saying: "The odds favor full brother against half-brother in a monogamous society; and it may be added that where one half-brother has an illustrious ancestor the odds are even that the other has him too." (253). The problem awaits further proof.
imbued with the religious idealism of the Academy."¹ He travelled widely in Greece and visited both Egypt and Asia Minor. Chaeroneia remained his home, however, and he entered actively into the life of the town. He held magistracies there and was sent on several emissarial posts of importance for his native city. During the years 75-90 A.D. he spent a considerable amount of time in Rome, where he engaged in business of state and lectured. These associations undoubtedly did much to increase his appreciation of Rome.² By his personal contact with the Romans and as well as by his study, Plutarch became "an expert on Roman life and antiquities such as few Greeks were."³ About the year 95 A.D. Plutarch became a priest of Delphi in Greece and apparently retained this office for the remainder of his life. He died ca. 120 A.D.

Plutarch's literary works include a series of moral or ethical essays known as the Moralia and biographical essays on famous Greeks and Romans known as the Lives. A catalogue of two-hundred twenty-seven of Plutarch's writings, supposedly the work


³E.D. Philips, "Three Greek Writers on the Roman Empire," Classica et Mediaevalia, XVIII (1957), 104.
of his son Lamprias, appeared sometime after his death, but it is not considered to be a complete catalogue of his works. The first forty works mentioned in the catalogue are titles of the *Lives*; the remainder are apparently the titles of the moral essays.\(^1\)

Plato had an important, though not exclusive, impact upon Plutarch's philosophical thought, the literary form in which he wrote, and his conception of the nature of biography and history.

Most scholars agree that Plutarch's philosophical thought was greatly influenced by Plato,\(^2\) though some would not place too much emphasis on this relationship since he "owed something to

\(^1\) Babbitt, op. cit., XVIII.

all the Schools."¹ He was dependent on Aristotle, especially in
the areas of ethics and psychology.² He even borrowed at times
from the Epicureans and the Stoics, although he was basically
opposed to them. He also made good use of the arguments of the
Academic sceptics.³ But as Roger Miller Jones, whose work on the
Platonism of Plutarch is still definitive, stated: "the point of
view in Plutarch's philosophical works is uniformly that of a
Platonist, and whatever elements have been added from other
sources are not incompatible with his interpretation of Plato.⁴
Although Plutarch cannot be ranked as one of the world's great
creative philosophers, he does show "a distinct independence, if
not originality about his eclecticism."⁵ His work is valuable as
an insight into the interpretations of the philosophy of Plato.

¹ John Oakesmith, The Religion of Plutarch: A Pagan Creed of
Apostolic Times (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), xvii.
Cf. also Martin Rist, "Two Isiac Mystics: Plutarch the Theologian
and Apuleius the Priest" (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation,
University of Chicago, 1934), 3.

² Roger Miller Jones, The Platonism of Plutarch (Menasha:

³ DeLacy, op. cit., 82-84, who has examined Schroeter's
argument for this position and finds it "unconvincing, would say
rather that his position was one of caution. He regards this
position as the "middle ground between dogmatism and scepticism,
as it is equally congenial to Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and
the later Academy."

⁴ Miller, op. cit., 9.

⁵ K.M. Westaway, The Educational Theory of Plutarch (London:
University of London Press, 1922), 143.
and the thinkers of the other philosophical schools which were current in Greece during the first century A.D.

Plutarch is one of the last of the classical writers to imitate Plato in the use of the dialogue form.\(^1\) However, as Babbitt comments, "the dramatic value of the dialogue as developed by Plato is quite neglected by Plutarch, and his dialogue very frequently becomes a monologue."\(^2\)

Plutarch's adoption of a strongly Platonic philosophy resulted, according to Westaway, in the conflict between history and biography which is observable in his writings.

Platonism regarded present phenomena from an individualistic standpoint, allowing unity, or even connection, only in the world of ideas. It had no place for historical sequences or interactions. Thus Plutarch's grave fault as a writer of history is that, setting out in the first instance with an ethical prejudice, he tries to base his whole account of his heroes on their individual characters and moral judgments. He cannot see that an historical personage is but a component part of an indefinitely large organic whole, in no way free and independent of conditions of time and place. History and literature together constitute the record of the actions and thoughts of past ages. Plutarch fails with the one as he does with the other.\(^3\)

Other scholars are not so severe in their judgement of Plutarch, despite his factual errors, undiscriminating use of sources, and at times obvious bias.\(^4\) Den Boer does not wish to condemn

---

\(^1\) Greard, op. cit., 364.

\(^2\) Babbitt, op. cit., xii.

\(^3\) Westaway, op. cit., 104-105.

Plutarch outright for his chronological errors. And Martin suggests that because Plutarch was "more interested in biographical than historical truth," he chose each of his sources not so much for its historical accuracy, but because "it conformed with his general concept of a man's character." 

Trench, following Heeren, protests vigorously in Plutarch's defense:

that the authorities which he used were generally the best within his reach; that he used them intelligently and honestly; that his standard of what an historian should be was high; and that for the most part he only fell short of this as every man of this world of imperfection must fall short of any high ideal which he sets before him. 

The problem of the conflict between history and biography in Plutarch has also led to an investigation of his sources. Etheridge holds that Plutarch showed an intimate acquaintance with Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics which he regards as the basis for his De Virtute Morali. The Stoic Sphaerus and "a collection

---


2Hubert Martin, Jr., "The Character of Plutarch's Themestocles," Transactions of the American Philological Association, XCII (April, 1961), 337, n. 34.


5Agatha A. Buriks, "The Sources of Plutarch's Phoenix, IV (Autumn, 1950), 69.
of inconsistencies in the works of Chrysippus\footnote{F.H. Sandbach, "Plutarch on the Stoics," Classical Quarterly, 34 (1940), 21, 23.} have been suggested as sources for several of Plutarch's other philosophical treatises. The poets were also familiar to Plutarch who used them however 'to moralize rather than for the sake of poetry itself.'\footnote{Hans Schläffer, Plutarch und die klassischen Dichter: Ein Beitrag zum klassischen Bildungsgut Plutarchs (Zurich: Juris-Verlag, 1950), 59-60.}

Herbert\footnote{Kevin Barry John Herbert, Ephorus in Plutarch's Lives, dissertation summary in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 63 (1958), 510-513.} and Westlake\footnote{H.D. Westlake, "The Sources of Plutarch's Pelo\v{g}idas," Classical Quarterly, XXXIII (January, 1939), 32.} suggest that Plutarch relied on the historians Ephorus and Callisthenes in some of his works. Rose, in his study of the \textit{Roman Questions}, concludes that Plutarch used Juba, Verrius, and Varro extensively, intelligently, and critically, despite the fact that there are certain obvious errors in the work.\footnote{H.J. Rose, ed. trans., com., The Roman Question of Plutarch (Oxford, 1924), 43-44.}

Biographical works, collections of letters, and historical compilations have been suggested as the basis of other of Plutarch's writings.\footnote{R.E. Smith, "Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives," Classical Quarterly, 34 (January-April, 1940), 1-10.} Westlake concludes about Plutarch's sources:

\footnote{J. Enoch Powell, "The Sources of Plutarch's Alexander," Journal of Hellenic Studies, LIX (1939), 230.}
His Lives are not invariably founded upon secondary biographies, nor invariably upon primary historical authorities; his choice was directed partly by the limitations of his library and to a greater degree by his conception of the function of biography. He did not always select the earliest or most reliable of the available authorities, because he aimed rather at moral enlightenment by means of psychological studies than at historical accuracy. Although a painstaking writer, he was also inclined to choose an authority which supplied him with material in a convenient form and on a convenient scale.

Most modern critics reject the hypothesis of Eduard Meyer that Plutarch relied almost solely on Hellenistic sources for his information and agree that in general his sources were used intelligently and critically in terms of "his conception of the function of biography."³

Regarding the Plutarchian authorship of all the works included under the title Moralia, H.J. Rose makes the following comment:

As might be expected, several works of doubtful authorship, such as a letter of consolation to an unknown Apollonius on the loss of his son, have been included in the collection because of certain resemblances in tone and subject to Plutarch's own works, while others quite unlike anything he ever wrote have made their way in, the most unlikely being the so-called Lesser Parallels..., a rubbishy collection of Greek stories, each collection of Greek stories, each capped by a Roman one, generally a manifest innovation.

¹Westlake, op. cit., 22.

²Kevin Herbert, Review of Plutarch and die Geschichte, by Carl Theander, Classical Journal, XLIX (1953), 240.

³Westlake, op. cit., 22.

⁴H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1950, 408. All of the works of Plutarch contained in the Teubner editions of his works have been utilized for the study of Plutarch's use of
Koinonia and its Cogantes in Plutarch

Plutarch frequently uses κοινωνία and its cognates to express the interrelationships which he believes are intrinsic to all reality: among the gods, between the gods and men, in the cosmos and in nature among animals, within man himself, and in man's relations with others, both personal and political.

Because interrelationship is characteristic of every level of reality, the deity cannot exist in solitary splendor. It is necessary that other gods and other worlds exist where he can exercise the social virtues intrinsic to his nature. According to Plutarch it is the demons who effect κοινωνία among the gods as well as between gods and men. For as the air establishes κοινωνία between the moon and the earth, so the demons serve as κοινωνία and its cognates.


2 De Defectu Oraculorum 415A. However the gods as individuals may not have a relationship of κοινωνία with the other gods. For instance in the De Sera Numinis Vindicta 566C it is said that Apollo has no κοινωνία with Night. 566C.
interpreters and messengers between gods and men.¹

The interactions and interrelationships observable in the cosmos Plutarch attributes to the deity under the title of "harmonizer and musician...because he has the authority over the association and disunion of heat and cold in the universe, to see that they observe due measure in their combination and separation, and because, by eliminating the excess of either, he brings both into proper order."² In other passages he attributes this order in the cosmos to nature, the author of community and harmony.³ By means of moderation and order, produced by the

¹De Defectu Oraculorum 416E. Plato’s demons to whom should be attributed any evil which formerly had been attributed to the gods, served to purify the concept of divinity, according to Oakesmith, op. cit., 136. However, Rist, op. cit., 48, comments: "In theory, he is careful to distinguish between gods and demons, but in practice this distinction is erased so that there is little differences in their respective functions and character." Moses Hadas, "The Religion of Plutarch," The Review of Religion, VI (March, 1942), 278, n. 8 has enumerated several distinct aspects of Plutarch’s demonology. They are variously (1) supermundane godlike powers, but subject to feeling and perishable, (2) souls free of bodies, (3) souls separated from bodies or who have received none; (4) hostile genii. There is really no difficulty. Plato had suggested and the national religion demanded, such intermediaries; Plutarch believed in their existence but admitted several possibilities as to their nature, origin and fate." Cf. also Guy Soury, La Demonologie de Plutarque: Essai sur les Idées Religieuses et les Mythes d’un Platonicien Eclectique, (Paris: Société d’Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1942).

²De Primo Frigido 946F.

³De Primo Frigido 951D.
power of harmony and number, nature is able to make mutual
society and sympathy arise out of discord and dissimilitude.¹
She uses contrary things to sustain the universe, not contraries
which will obliterate one another but those which are inclined
"to communicate and co-operate one with another, and to effect a
harmony between the opposing qualities."²

In the beginning, the four principles of earth, fire, water,
and air had no κοινωνία with each other because they lacked God
or mind or soul.³ But when Aphrodite or Eros became present a
universal concord and community developed: "in which things
moist and hot, partake of one nature in the same body, and by
their consent and agreement engender the best and most pleasant
temperament and harmony."⁴

Many of the opposite found in nature are able, by means of
κοινωνία, to produce "many combinations that are pleasant and
grateful to the senses."⁵ Air, for instance, is an element
neither hot nor cold but a combination of both.⁶ κοινωνία is not

¹De Procreatione Animae In Timaeo 1030A.
²De Primo Frigido 951D.
³De Facie in Orbe Lunae 927A.
⁴De Facie in Orbe Lunae 927A.
⁵De Fraterno Amore 478F.
⁶De Primo Frigido 946E.
⁷De Primo Frigido 951DE.
possible, however, when there is an absence of mutual benefit.¹ Fire can gain nothing by κοινωνία with water,² though when water is heated by fire it can be beneficial.

The physical phenomenon of the force of gravity is suggested in the De Facie in Orbe Lunae as proof that the earth is the center of the cosmos, since "those bodies which when thrust away from the earth fall back to have again some affinity and cohesion with her."³

Aristotle's opinion is advanced in the De Placitis Philosophorum that the heavenly bodies have κοινωνία in soul, possess sensitive, rational, and intellectual faculties and are guided by reason and providence;⁴ thus they have the same double κοινωνία with the Same and Other which characterizes all of nature.⁵

Man and animals are likewise constituted by this κοινωνία of soul and body. In stating that man's soul has a share in the divine nature,⁶ Plutarch is reminded of Plato's comparison

¹De Primo Frigido 946DE.
²Aqua an Ignis Utilior 957D.
³De Facie in Orbe Lunae 924D.
⁴De Placitis Philosophorum 886E.
⁵De Animae Procreatione In Timaeo 1026E.
⁶Platonicae Quaestiones 1004D.
of the soul to a wing as that which is most like the divine
nature\(^1\) because of its likeness to beauty which moves the soul.
Eros is described in the Amatorius as the great harmonizer
accompanied by φιλία and κοινωνία which together form a "winged
communication that soars to the region of the fairest and most
divine realities."\(^2\) It is even possible for the soul to experi­
ence a state of madness which is not merely induced by a bodily
state but one "which shares and participates in a power that is
divine."\(^3\)

The soul, however, does not enjoy this lofty destiny of
being closely united with the divine unimpeded. Its κοινωνία
with the body inevitably pulls it down to the irrational, mater­
rial sphere and is profitable to the soul in only a very few ways
such as when it enables the person to have κοινωνία with external
objects.\(^4\) Sight is produced when an effluence from the eye
mingles with the light about the object and blends into one so
that neither element prevails, but a third common power comes
into being.\(^5\) Creatures which can see in the dark have a weakness

\(^1\)Platonicae Quaestiones 1004C.
\(^2\)Amatorius 763F. 'trans., E.L. Minor, Jr., F.H. Sandback,
W.C. Helmbold. (Loeb Library ed; Cambridge, Mass., 1965), IX.
\(^3\)Amatorius 758E.
\(^4\)De Placitis Philosophorum 899E.
\(^5\)Quaestionum Convivalium 626C.
of eyesight which results in the fact that the light from the eye is not proportioned to the light surrounding the object during the day, "but it is proportionable and sufficient for the feeble splendor of the stars and so can join with it and co-operate to move the sense."\(^1\)

Negatively, the *koinwē* between the sentient and cognitive faculties of reason\(^2\) in man results in the rational part bearing "a resemblance and share in the body's passions and...being contaminated by it, since it has entered into the body and has become merged with it."\(^3\) Because of this, our judgments can be depraved and our bodies diseased, since any suffering of soul or body inevitably affects the other part.\(^4\) Plutarch expresses that hope that if:

we have no more to do with the body than what decency and necessity require, if we break off all commerce with it, and keep ourselves pure from its contagion, till God shall give us a final release, and then being pure and freed from all its follies, we shall converse (it is likely) with intelligences as pure as ourselves, with our unaided vision beholding perfect purity,—and this is truth itself.

The idea of life after death occurs in Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Uxorem*. He admonished his wife not to pay attention to the

\(^1\) *Quaestitionum Convivalium* 626E.

\(^2\) *De Anima* *Procreatione in Timaeo* 1024D. and 1032B.

\(^3\) *Epitome Libri De Anima* *Procreatione*

\(^4\) *De Recta Ratione Audiendi* 450E.

\(^5\) *Consolation Ad Apollonium* 104C.

\(^6\) *Consolatio Ad Apollonium* 108C.
Epicurean doctrine that there is nothing after death, saying: "I know that you are better grounded in the doctrines delivered down to us from our ancestors, as also in the sacred mysteries of Bacchus, than to believe such stories; for the religious symbols are well known to us who are of the fraternity."  

In this life man by reason of his soul has a natural impulse to mutual society and friendship because the deity implanted these virtues in the soul when he was ordering it. They are preserved by the Muse or Siren to whom is allotted the region between the earth and the moon. She uses \( \kappa\omicron\iota\nu \nu\nu \nu \) "to cast her calming spell on the tumultuous element in us, and gently to recall our errant \( \tau\e\nu\pi\epsilon\s\varsigma \) when they have lost the path and set them in their place."  

Man shares this impulse to social life with the animals. In the De Sollertia Animalium Autobulus, Plutarch’s father, affirms that there are many examples of brute animals who excel in the "observance of society, fortitude, and foresight as to their particular economy and making provision for themselves." Aristotimus, another participant in the dialogue, maintains that

1 Consolatio ad Uxorem 611D.
2 De Anima Procreatione In Timaeo 1027A.
3 Questionum Convivialium 746A.
4 De Solertia Animalium 962D.
their social nature is one of the strong indications that animals have reason.¹ He points to the friendship that can be discerned in the mutual society of ants.² He also refers to the many instances of "love and observance of society joined with understanding and prudence" among elephants which had been cited by the author Juba³ and to the social instincts found among lions.

It is more difficult to adduce examples of the social instincts among marine animals⁵ but Aristotimus does manage to give some examples "which show not only this same understanding and knowledge, but the community and mutual understanding of fish"⁶ thus proving that they are no less intelligent than the land animals. In regard to the mutual society of fish⁷ Aristotimus shows how the tunny fish use mathematics to preserve their mutual love and society with one another by forming their schools in a cube figure and by swimming in that formation.⁸ Numerous

¹De Solertia Animalium 966B.
²De Solertia Animalium 967D.
³De Solertia Animalium 972B.
⁴De Solertia Animalium 972D.
⁵De Solertia Animalium 975E.
⁶De Solertia Animalium 977C.
⁷De Solertia Animalium 977E.
⁸De Solertia Animalium 979F.
other fish also swim in schools and observe mutual society.  

However, none of these examples of \textit{koinw
\text{\textit{n}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{a}}} are as remarkable as that which exists between the generally savage and unsociable crocodile and the little bird, the trochilus or plover. 

Such relationships are much more valid examples of \textit{koinw
\text{\textit{n}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{a}}}, according to Aristotimus, than those given among ants or bees who have no such concern for one another. For although each of them contributes to the common task, "none of them has any interest in or regard for his fellow individually." 

Contrary to Aristotle's opinion, Plutarch maintains in Book VII of the \textit{Quaestitionum Convivalium} that Man has a certain \textit{koinw
\text{\textit{n}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{a}}} with the animals in regard to such pleasures as that of music. Man is even able to establish a kind of relationship of \textit{koinw
\text{\textit{n}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{a}}} with house animals, although never with the fly or the swallow. 

He is similar to the ants and bees in that the inclinations of both to society and affection to the state continue until the end of life. 

---

1 \textit{De Sollertia Animalium} 980A.  
2 \textit{De Sollertia Animalium} 980D.  
3 \textit{De Sollertia Animalium} 981B.  
4 \textit{Quaestitionum Convivalium} 704F.  
5 \textit{Quaestitionum Convivalium} 728A.  
6 \textit{An Seni Sit Gerenda Res Publica} 783EF.
These examples of the social impulse at work among animals are impressive, and indeed "even wild beasts put off their fierce and savage ways when they partake of a gentler mode of life."\(^1\) However, Soclarus, another of the participants in the discussion of the De Sollertia Animalium, remarks, it is an even more wonderful thing to "observe how much man differs from all other creatures in probity of manners, in industry, and in all those things that relate to justice and common society."\(^2\)

Plutarch's treatment of man's social relationships, as expressed by κοινωνία and its cognates, can be divided into two broad categories, that of individual personal relationships and that of political relationships. In the first category are included the relationships of marriage and family, teknopoia, paederasty, those fostered by the symposium and those involved in friendship, slavery, business enterprises, human expression, and religion. The second category includes a discussion of the elements necessary to constitute a polis, primarily the active participation of the citizens in the affairs of the polis, and concrete illustrations of κοινωνία in various political contexts, taken from the lives of noble Greeks and Romans.

In the discourse An Virtus Doceri Possit, Plutarch claims

\(^1\)Life of Pompey 633E.
\(^2\)De Sollertia Animalium 963A.
that men cannot "enter without censure the fellowship of a household, a city, a marriage, a way of life, a magistracy, if they have not learned how they should get along with fellow-beings," any more than they can know how to behave at a symposium unless they "begin to learn from a boy how to eat and drink handsomely in company." The basic relationship which prepares a man to exercise κοινωνία in all the areas mentioned above seems to be that found in the family. Plutarch comments in the Comparison of Aristides with Marcus Cato:

Man has no higher capacity than that for conducting cities and states, as is generally admitted. But the ability to conduct a household enters in no small degree into this higher political capacity, as most believe. For the city is but an organized sum total of households, and has public vigor only as its citizens prosper in their private lives.

This position is affirmed again in the Banquet of the Seven Sages

1An Virtus Doceri Possit 439E.
2An Virtus Doceri Possit 439E.
3Comparison of Aristides with Marcus Cato 354A.
4There have been objections to attributing this work to Plutarch. However, Jean Defradas has tried to show from internal and external evidence that this is a true work of Plutarch in his edition, Le Banquet des Sept Sages. Texte et Traduction avec une Introduction et des Notes. Paris, 1954. The introduction to the Loeb Library Edition of this work describes it as "a collection of dialogues purporting to reproduce the after-dinner conversation of Plutarch and his friends and relatives on various occasions. They differ widely in dramatic liveliness, and in the degree to which they seem to be based on recollection, or on memoranda, of actual conversations. Their subject matter ranges from scientific or philosophical questions, more or less serious, to antiquarian, historical, and ethical topics; some deal with the symposium or dinner party itself."
where it is said that no matter what kind of house a man may live in, if he has his children, his wife, friends and attendants there, having κοινωνία with him in the ordinary conveniences of life, this man is living a happy and fortunate life.  

Plutarch's realization of the impact of the private lives of the citizens on the political community is undoubtedly the reason why he devotes so much space to a discussion of the marriage κοινωνία. The ideal attitude to the marriage partnership is described by Portia speaking to her husband Brutus:

Brutus, I am Cato's daughter, and I was brought into thy house, not, like a mere concubine, to share thy bed and board merely, but to be a partner in thy joys, and a partner in thy troubles. Thou, indeed, art faultless as a husband; but how can I show thee any grateful service if I am to share neither thy secret sufferings nor the anxieties which crave a loyal confidant?

Wives are advised in the Coniugalia Praecepta to share in all of their husbands' moods, and husbands are cautioned that if they do not let their wives enjoy their company, the wives will find pleasure somewhere else. Husbands and wives should mutually sympathize with one another, that, just as the strength of ropes comes from the twining and interlacing of fibres together, so the marriage vow may be confirmed and strengthened by the

---

1 Septem Sapientum Convivium 155C.
2 Life of Brutus 989F.
3 Coniugalia Praecepta 140A.
4 Coniugalia Praecepta 140A.
interchange of mutual affection and kindness."¹

Means to bring about this single-mindedness between husbands and wives are the sharing of possessions² and of intellectual interests.³ In the Coniugalia Praecepta, it is stated that "philosophy weaves a spell over those who are entering together into a lifelong partnership and renders them gentle and amiable toward each other."⁴

The Amatorius praises the "thousands of men and women conjoined together in wedlock who have reciprocally and inviolably observed a community of affection and loyalty to the end of their lives."⁵ A striking example of marital fidelity is provided by the story of Comma the Galatian whose husband was murdered by Synorix to gain her hand. She revenges this crime by murdering Synorix and then makes the following speech before she herself commits suicide:

This day, said she, my most dear and beloved husband, I have long expected, as having lived, deprived of thee, a desolate and comfortless life. But now receive me joyfully; for thy sake I have revenged myself upon the most wicked among men,

¹Coniugalia Praecepta 140E.
²Coniugalia Praecepta 140F.
³Coniugalia Praecepta 145E.
willing to have lived with thee, and now no less rejoicing to die with him.¹ Arete has the opposite predicament of being "at a loss how to greet and address her husband now that she had lived with another man."²

The ceremonies prescribed for the Roman weddings are designed to emphasize the importance of a spirit of κοινωνία in marriage. The newly married woman touches fire and water to symbolize that she and her husband "must never forsake each other, but must communicate in every fortune, and although there be no goods, yet they may participate with each other in fire and water."³ By repeating the phrase, "Where thou Caius art, there am I Caia," the bride indicates that "by mutual agreement she enters presently upon participation of all things, even to share in the government."⁴

This "affectionate, sociable, coupling impulse"⁵ must have

¹Amatorius 768D.
²De Sollertia Animalium 980AB.
³Quaestiones Romana 263EF Apropos of this passage the comment is made by H.J. Rose, The Roman Questions of Plutarch, a new translation with introductory essays and a running commentary (Oxford, 1924), 169, note to I, 1.3: "That fire and water represent the male and female principles respectively is a common enough doctrine in Plutarch...That fire derives its nutriment from moisture is a doctrine so common that it hardly needs an example."
⁴Quaestiones Romana 271E.
⁵Amatorius 757C.
Eros as the "witness and overseer, a supreme governor and director, of conjugal affection, which terminates in concord and happy society."¹ He effects a complete union when he presides over the conjugal state, "whereas the union of those that live together without love resembles only the friction and concussion of Epicurus' atoms in collision and recoil."² Any marriage which is "a loveless union, devoid of god-given friendship"³ will not long endure.

The marriage κοινωνία also involves both the husband and wife in the conception⁴ and in the rearing of children.⁵ Autobulus, in the De Sollertia Animalium refers to the Stoic tenet "that love of one's offspring is the very foundation of our social life and administration of Justice."⁶ When their two year old daughter Timoxena died, Plutarch wrote in the Consolation ad Uxorem: "I know very well and do comprehend what a loss we have had;...I having been assistant to you in the education of so many children, which we brought up at home under our own

¹Amatorius 757D.
²Amatorius 769F.
³Amatorius 752CD.
⁴Coniugalia Praecepta 145D.
⁵Life of Artaxerxes 1020C.
⁶De Sollertia Animalium 962A.
The children of a family were also expected to have a special relationship with one another. Plutarch in the *De Fraterno Amore* discusses the ideal relationship between brothers in which each, joining the other:

> With himself in all his noble and worthy actions employs his when present, waits for him when absent, and makes the world take notice that he is as fit for business as himself, but of a more modest and yielding disposition,—all of this while has done himself no wrong, and has bravely advanced his brother.

However, if they find they cannot share the same methods for becoming great, it is suggested that they choose completely different means and thus be able to rejoice at one another's successes.

Children also shared in the fortunes of the family. In the life of the orator Lysias, Plutarch mentions that Lysias went to Thurii with his brother Polemarchus when he was fifteen to share in an allotment of land which was their inheritance. Plutarch

---

1. *Consolation Ad Uxorem* 608C.
2. *De Fraterno Amore* 485C.
3. *De Fraterno Amore* 486D.
4. *Oratorum Vitae* 835D.
also discusses the custom of teknopoiia[1] which prevailed in
Sparta, as well as in Rome, according to which a husband could
give his wife to a suitable male friend[2] for the purpose of be­
getting children, or a man could choose a woman for this purpose
and gain consent of the husband. In either case, the lawful hus­
band would be a partner in the fatherhood of the other man.[3]
In
Sparta, the wife usually remained at home and fulfilled all of
her marriage responsibilities during this period.[4] According to
Plutarch, the Spartan's freedom in sharing his wife was made
possible by the custom of having the young husband visit his wife
stealthily for several months after marriage so that they would
never be completely satisfied.[5]

[1] den Boer, op. cit., 216 says: "The rule for τεκνοποίησις,
mentioned by Plutarch (xv, 12-13) is twofold. The old man may
take the initiative. He chooses a young man whom he respects
(Ἀγάπατος) to beget for him a child by his own young spouse.
Also the man who desires to beget a child may be the prime mover
and choose a handsome, strong and married woman with whose hus­
band he makes an agreement. These, according to Plutarch, are
the two manners in which 'polyandry' is brought about...The
question is whether, in a society in which woman seems to have
been as emancipated as she was in Sparta, she could be disposed
of without regard to her own wishes. We should not overestimate
the woman's passivity. The bearing of children was counted an
honour; as the mother of a soldier she rendered a special service
to the community. A woman brought up in a community which
believed in such social ethics would not feel outraged by 'poly­
andry'."

[2] Life of Theseus 5A.
[3] Life of Lycurgus 49A; 76D.
[4] Comparison of Lycurgus and Numa 76E.
[5] Life of Lycurgus 48F.
Quintus Hortensius, the Roman, tried to persuade Cato to give him his daughter Porcia, who was married to Bibulus and had two sons, so that the child she would bear him would "bring his whole family and line into community of kinship" with Cato.¹ Hortensius tried to prevail upon Cato by emphasizing that "community in heirs among worthy men would make virtue abundant and widely diffused in their family alliances."² He promised that he would give Portia back to Bibulus after she had borne him a child and thus established a community of children among Bibulus, Cato, and himself.³ Cato assured Hortensius that he thought highly of him and of a community of relationship with him, but that he did not think it proper to give his married daughter to another man.⁴

The production of good citizens for the state and of worthy offspring for the individual were the alleged reasons justifying the practice of teknopoilia.⁵ However, not all arrangements of this type had these lofty motives.

¹Life of Cato the Younger 771A.
²Life of Cato the Younger 771B.
³Life of Cato the Younger 771C.
⁴Life of Cato the Younger 771D.
⁵den Boer, op. cit., 223 comments: "Originally for a man the possession of a son counts more than the nuptial tie...If, however, a person was married, then the community regarded the TEKNOPOILIA as the natural result of the marriage."
Many have allowed others to share in their venereal enjoyments, prostituting not only their mistresses but their wives like that Roman Galba, who used to ask Maecenas to dinner, and when he saw from his nods and winks that he had a mind to do with his wife, turned his head gently aside as if asleep.

Marriage alliances were often made for solely political reasons. The marriage of Caesar's daughter Julia to Pompey was seen "to have been from the first suspicious and deceptive pledges of a partnership based on self-interest; there was no real friendship in it." Earlier, Pompey had wanted to marry one of Cato's daughters himself and marry the other to his son, but since Cato felt this was an attempt to use a marriage alliance to compromise him, Cato refused. Later, when Pompey became involved in scandal, Cato reminded his family that they would have had \textit{coniuvia} in Pompey's disgrace if they had made the requested marriage alliance. The same story is told in Plutarch's \textit{Life of Cato the Younger}.\footnote{Amatorius 759F.}

\textit{Coniuvia} in the pleasure of sex for its own sake is described in \textit{Septem Sapientum Convivium} as "shameless and brute-like," something which even animals enjoy.\footnote{De Amicorum Multitudine 96E.} "On the other

\footnote{Life of Pompey 656F.}
\footnote{Life of Pompey 642D.}
\footnote{Life of Cato the Younger 774E.}
\footnote{Septem Sapientum Convivicum 158F.}
hand, in the case of lawful wives, physical union is the begin­ning of friendship, a sharing, as it were, in great mysteries."¹

The Egyptians are willing to allow that sexual κοινωνία is possible between a god and a woman, but say that no sexual κοινωνία is possible between a god and a man. Plutarch objects that they "lose sight of the fact that intercourse is a reciproc­al matter, and that both parties to it enter into a like com­munity."² He objects to the idea "that an immortal god should take pleasure in a mortal body and its beauty"³ because the gods have no κοινωνία in generation and corruption.⁴

In regard to relationships between men and boys Protogenes is quoted in the Amatorius as raising the question as to whether it is possible to have an erotic relationship without the sensual element.⁵ "The boys' lovers also shared with them in their honour or disgrace,"⁶ and were accustomed to take part with one another in their undertakings. In the life of Alexander it is mentioned that a Macedonian named Limnus conspired against the

¹Amatorius 769A.
²Life of Numa 62B.
³Life of Numa 62B.
⁴De Stoicorum Repugnantiae 1052B.
⁵Amatorius 752AB.
⁶Life of Lycurgus 51D.
life of Alexander and persuaded his beloved, Nicomachus, to share in the undertaking also.\(^1\) Iolaus, Heracles' beloved, is said to have shared his labors and fought by his side.\(^2\)

Plutarch also considered the symposium, which is "a κοινωνία of serious or merry discourse or actions"\(^3\) as an area of special importance for the development of κοινωνία. In the Septem Sapientium Convivium "the hearth-fire, the hearth, the wine bowl, all entertainment and hospitality" are described as "the most humanizing and essential elements in our mutual relations."\(^4\)

The pleasure people get for "sharing with each other in the table and the banquet" is the most right and proper kind of human pleasure; not to enjoy it is considered shameless and brutelike.\(^5\) κοινωνία at a symposium is achieved by a common participation in wine and conversation.\(^6\) Both are essential elements.

---

\(^1\) Life of Alexander 962E.

\(^2\) Life of Pelopidas 287D.

\(^3\) Quaestiorum Convivalium 708D.

\(^4\) Septem Sapientium Convivium 158C.

\(^5\) Septem Sapientium Convivium 158F. Even the gods enjoy such diversions. Poseidon was defeated in discussion many times by the other gods, but he never held a grudge against them. The Erechtheum, a temple common to him and Minerva, and even containing an altar to oblivion is adduced as proof of his amicable nature. Quaestiorum Convivalium 741AB.

\(^6\) Quaestiorum Convivalium 614E.
Eating alone is not sufficient, because a banquet needs company and agreement to make it palatable and pleasing. But neither is it satisfactory if men come together each to eat his own private meal.

We invite one another not barely to eat and drink, but to eat and drink together. Now this division into messes takes away all society, makes many suppers, and many eaters, but no one sups with another; but every man takes his pound of beef, as from the market, sets it before himself, and falls on.

The ideal situation is to invite "our acquaintances and familiars to participate of our entertainments, mirth, and discourse over a glass of wine." The guests at a symposium should have κοινωνία in everything: the same food, the same discourse, the songs of the same singer, and the music of the same musician. This practice is sanctioned by the custom of the ancients who "not only honored those who lived with them or under the same roof, but also those that drank out of the same cup or ate of the same dish." The poet Pindar also praised the heroes who "maintained society and good fellowship by eating at the same board,"

---

1 Quaestionum Convivalium 697D. Lamprias argues that the Latin name for banquet, which is coena, is much more fitting than the Greek ἀγίνημα since coena comes from the word κοινωνία.

2 Quaestionum Convivalium 643A.

3 Quaestionum Convivalium 707C.

4 Quaestionum Convivalium 643B.

5 Quaestionum Convivalium 643D.

6 Quaestionum Convivalium 643E.
a situation which was in great contrast with that in which "seemingly very good friends cannot so much as eat with one another out of the same dish."¹

However, the man who comes to a symposium "does not come only to enjoy the meat and drink but likewise the discourse,² mirth, and genteel humor which ends at last in friendship and good-will."³ To achieve this spirit of κοινωνία, a sense of equality is absolutely necessary; "the necessity is from nature as well as custom, and is not lately introduced or founded only on opinion."⁴ Expressing this thought poetically, Plutarch says, "as long as Moera and Lachesis (diversion and distribution) kept an equality in feasts, nothing uncivil or disorderly appeared."⁵

The size of the group is an important factor in establishing the spirit of κοινωνία. A crowd is capable of "hindering all familiarity and conversation; and it is more tolerable to let the company have no wine, than to exclude all converse from a feast."⁶ When too many persons are present at a symposium, it

¹Quaestitionum Convivalium 643E.
²In one of the discussions of Quaestitionum Convivalium 718C, Diogenianus suggests that the group make Plato a κοινωνός in the discussion since the day of their discussion was Plato's birthday.
³Quaestitionum Convivalium 660B.
⁴Quaestitionum Convivalium 643F.
⁵Quaestitionum Convivalium 664A.
⁶Quaestitionum Convivalium 679A.
is inevitable that communication among the whole group will be impossible. The guests will divide into small groups and carry on private conversations. However, granted that the number of guests at the symposium is suitable, the guests should be seated with a view to mirth and conversation. The host should try to select as a dinner companion for a guest "such whose acquaintance he hath formerly sought and would now be glad of." Any person uninvited to the symposium should be reluctant to accept the invitation of one of the guests to attend unless "there seems a necessity for some conversation which cannot be put off till another time, or if he is lately come from a journey or designs to go on one."

All of the participants at a symposium must strive to keep the discussion on topics of general interest. A man's concern over his own private affairs or interests should not jeopardize this spirit of convivium. It is just as much a destruction of this spirit to introduce abstruse philosophical discussion as it is to indulge in meaningless conversation such as the man does.

---

1 Quaestionum Convivalium 679A.
2 Quaestionum Convivalium 618A.
3 Quaestionum Convivalium 709B.
4 Quaestionum Convivalium 709D.
5 Quaestionum Convivalium 644D.
6 Quaestionum Convivalium 615A.
who eats unusual food in order to brag about it. Joking is tolerated if the person telling the joke make it reflect on himself as well as on others. Rhetoricians are troublesome guests because they wish to "have no part of this table-talk over the wine." Illiterate persons also are conspicuous at a symposium. They are like mute consonants with vowels, participating in the discussion "in a voice not altogether inarticulate and insignificant."

Finally, the guest at a symposium must be as willing to listen as he is to discuss. In this way he participates in the conversation and proves himself a gentleman and a scholar.

Personal friendships are also reflections of man's social nature. The treatise De Amicorum Multitudine suggests that it is not a wise thing to have too many friends. Friendship is formed through likeness, so that we should associate "only with those who are qualified to keep up the same participation, that is to say, those who are able in a like manner to love and

1 De Tuenda Sanitate 125A.
2 Quæestionum Convivalium 634B.
3 Quæestionum Convivalium 741D.
4 Quæestionum Convivalium 613E.
5 De Recta Ratione Audiendi 45E.
6 De Recta Ratione Audiendi 43D.
participate.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Quomodo Adulator ab Amico Internoscatur} warns not against the kind of flatterer who is always on the lookout for a free meal, but rather the "one who is generally sober and a busybody, and thinks he ought to have a hand in your affairs, and wishes to share in your secrets, and as to friendship plays rather a tragic than a satyric part."\textsuperscript{2}

In regard to \textit{koinw\n}i\n\textit{\n} with slaves, Plutarch states that in the time of Caius Marcius Coriolanus, "the Romans treated their slaves with great kindness, because they worked and even ate with them themselves, and were therefore more familiar and gentle with them."\textsuperscript{3} But he regards Marcus Cato the Elder's treatment of his slaves "like beasts of burden, using them to the utmost, and then, when they were old, driving them off and selling them, as the mark of a very mean nature, which recognises no tie between man and man but that of necessity. And yet we know that kindness has a wider scope than justice."\textsuperscript{4} In the \textit{Aetia Romana} he explains the custom of never leaving the table empty as "a custom of courtesy toward household servants. For they do not love so much to take as to partake, deeming that they hold a kind

\textsuperscript{1}De Amicorum Multitudine 96D, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt (Loeb Library ed.; London, 1928), II.

\textsuperscript{2}Quomodo Adulator ab Amico Internoscatur 50E.

\textsuperscript{3}Life of Caius Marcius Coriolanus 225D.

\textsuperscript{4}Life of Marcus Cato 339A.
of communion with their masters at the table. 1

Another important area is the noun of business relation-
ships. In the treatise De Virtute Morali, Plutarch defines
justice as the virtue which has "to do with men's relations to
one another and their commercial dealings." 2 In the life of
Marcus Cato the Elder, Plutarch says:

He used to lend money also in the most disreputable of all
ways, namely, on ships, and his method was as follows. He
required his borrowers to form a large company, and when
there were fifty partners and as many ships for his security
he took one share in the company himself, and was represented
by Quinto, a freedman of his, who accompanied his clients in
all their ventures. In this way his entire security was not
imperiled, but only a small part of it, and his profits were
large. 3

A certain Sambicus is mentioned in the Aetia Graeca who
with many accomplices cut pieces from the bronze votive statues
at Olympia and sold them. He also despoiled the shrine of
Artemis the Guardian at Elis. "Immediately, then, after this
sacrilege, he was caught and tortured for a year, being interro-
gated about each of his confederates in turn." 4 Finally he died,
and the proverb arose "to suffer more terribly than Sambicus."

To be suspected of being a man's koiwvos, however, could
at times be as devastating as actually having been one. The

1 Aetia Graeca 279B.
2 De Virtute Morali 441A, trans. W.C. Helmbold (Loeb Library
   ed.; London, 1939), VI.
3 Life of Marcus Cato 349B.
4 Quaestiones Graeca 3020.
story is told in the *Septem Sapientum Convivium* of the time Hesiod shared a room with a Milesian when the two were guests of a Locrian. When it was discovered that the Milesian was having relations with the host's daughter, the man thought Hesiod was also involved and vented his anger upon him, though Hesiod was innocent.¹

*Koinwía* is observable in the human activities of language and song. Semivowels are said to have *koinwía* with both vowels and mutes.² Poetry and dancing have *koinwía* "especially in that sort of song called Hyporchema, in which is the most lovely representation imaginable, dancing doing it by gesture, and poesy by words."³

*Koinwía* is also applied to various types of participation in a religious context. The *Amatorius* describes panic terrors and ejaculations as participating in the same nature as the Bacchanal orgies.⁴ Theseus is said to have established a festival in honor of the young people who went to Crete as offerings to the Minotaur. Certain women called *deipnophorai* took part in the festival and in the sacrifice as representative of the mothers of the children on whom the lot fell, who kept bringing bread and

---

¹ *Septem Sapientum Convivium* 1628.
² *Questiones Convivales* 738E.
³ *Questiones Convivales* 748A.
⁴ *Amatorius* 758F.
meat for their children.¹

Man's social nature is also reflected in the political societies and in the relationships based on political considerations which he forms; in the De Sera Numinis Vindicata, Plutarch describes the polis as a united and continuous whole. It maintains its identity and responsibility for itself "so long as the association that creates it and binds it together with interwoven strands preserves it as a unity."² Active participation in the life of the polis is eminently suited to "the life of gentle, civil, and sociable animals, framed by nature to live civilly, honestly, and for the benefit of mankind."³ Plutarch here takes a position directly opposed to that of the Epicureans who by attacking religion and the gods undermined the very foundation of all κοινωνία and law.⁴ He is astounded that "of so many sects of philosophers as have been extant they alone should enjoy the benefits that are in cities without having ever contributed to them anything of their own."⁵

To live a full human life is to live sociably, amicably,

¹Life of Theseus 108B.
²De Sera Numinis Vindicata 559A.
³An Sent Sit Gerenda Res Publica 791C.
⁴Adversus Coloten 1129B.
⁵Adversus Coloten 1127A.
temperately, and justly. Those who act virtuously benefit human society by their honest actions and public-spirited works. Justice or equity is that kind of self-control which operates in private dealing and in public life. The man who makes pleasure the absolute end of his life really overthrows human society. However, a distinction should be made between the kind of intemperance in which reason participates gladly in the sin, and incontinence, where reason shares only reluctantly.

Many other elements also contribute to the establishment of a flourishing polis. One of these is favorable geographical conditions. In the discourse *Aqua an Igis Utilior*, Plutarch suggests that the sea has "united and perfected our manner of living, which before was wild and unsociable, correcting it by mutual assistance, and creating community of friendship by reciprocal exchanges of one good turn for another." Among the citizens, however, is probably the most essential element in successful political community. One of the reasons why the Athenians never cut down an olive tree and held

---

1. *Adversus Coloten* 1108C.
2. *An Seni Sit Gerenda Rex Publica* 786C.
3. *De Fortuna* 97E.
4. *De Stoicorum Repugnantia* 1038E.
5. *De Virtute Morali* 445E.
6. *Aqua an Igis Utilior* 957A.
the fig tree sacred was perhaps to "persuade us to be communi-
cative and grateful to one another." ¹ One of the greatest
punishments a polis can inflict upon a member is to withdraw
from Koinwnia with him. The Athenians, for example, would have
no Koinwnia with the accusers of Socrates. They would not even
wash in the same water with them, "but commanded the servants to
pour it out as polluted." ²

Any man who "upholds the law and society and the constitu-
tion." ³ is deserving of special honor, for the polis is the con-
cern of all, not merely its administrators. And man who "seeks
the public good, loves his country and fellow-citizens, and has
a serious regard to the welfare of the state" ⁴ is for all practi-
cal purposes an administrator of the polis. But in order that
more persons come to feel actively involved in the work of the
state, Plutarch advises statesmen to share their burdens of
administration. "For as the division of the hand into fingers
has not weakened it, but rendered it more commodious and instru-
mental for the uses to which it serves; so he who in the admin-
istration of a state gives part of the affairs to others renders

¹ Quaestio rum Convivalium 703D.
² De Invidia et Odio 538A.
³ De Latenter Vivendo 1129B.
⁴ Praecepta Gerendae Republicae 796E.
the action more efficacious by communicating it." He also suggests that a statesman should know himself well enough to be able to choose as a partner in an enterprise someone whose virtues complement his own. So, he says, "if you are not a good speaker, take an orator as your assistant in a lawsuit or your colleague in an embassy, as Pelopidas took Epameinondas." Those men who have served long and faithfully in public life have the hope of attaining reverence and respect in their old age.

There is no difference between the pilot who has sailed in great danger against adverse winds and waves, and after clear weather and fair winds have come, seeks his moorings, and the man who has struggled in the ship of State a long time against the billows of envy, and then, when they have ceased and become smooth, backs water and withdraws from public life, giving up his political activities.

Older men are encouraged never to forsake their habits of speaking, acting, reasoning, and judging; if they do, "it is reasonable to suppose that love of humanity, public spirit, and graciousness would waste away, none of which ought to have any end or limit." Originaly the polis and the race were identical, being considered as "one entire and continued body...depending upon one

---

1 Præcepta Gerendæ Republīcae 812D.
2 Præcepta Gerendæ Reipublicae 819C.
3 An Seni Sit Gerenda Res Publica 787E.
4 An Seni Sit Gerenda Res Publica 792D.
and the same beginning, and carrying along with it a certain power and communion of qualities."¹ Jupiter was regarded as the guardian of all blood relationships, indicating the importance of the tie of consanguinity.² Men were accustomed to tracing their ancestry and identifying themselves accordingly. Thesius and Heracles were identified as kinsmen, "being sons of cousins-ger-
man. For Aethra was daughter of Pittheus, as Alcmene was of Lysidice, and Lysidice and Pittheus were brother and sister, children of Hippodameia and Pelops."³

A kiss was regarded "as a significant sign of kindred and a note of familiar converse."⁴ The concept of political unity based on intermarriage was introduced, according to Plutarch, by Romulus who hoped to turn the outrage of the rape of the Sabine women into "an occasion for some sort of blending and fellowship with the Sabines after their women had been kindly treated."⁵ He did succeed in turning "his deed of violence and injustice into a most honourable achievement, and one most adapted to promote political partnership."⁶ The results of this action were

¹De Sera Numinis Vindicta 559D.
²Quaestionum Convivalium 679D.
³Life of Thesius 3F-4A.
⁴Aetia Romana 265D.
⁵The Life of Romulus 25D.
⁶Comparison of the Lives of Theseus and Romulus 39A.
twofold. Marriage assumed such a binding character that for 230 years "no man ventured to leave his wife, nor any woman her husband."\(^1\) On the political level, the kings of the two peoples "shared the government in common, and the two peoples the rights and duties of citizenship."\(^2\)

Plutarch contrasts Romulus's accomplishment in effecting a firm κοινωνία between Romans and Sabines with the marriages of Theseus, one of the early kings of Athens, which gained no new friends for them "nor even any community of enterprise whatsoever, but enmities, wars, slaughter of citizens, and at last the loss of Aphidnae."\(^3\) The concept of political obligation based on blood relationship theoretically persisted even down to the period of the Roman empire. In the year 196 B.C., when Titus Flamininus, the Roman general, gave the Greeks their freedom after having checked the incursions of Philip and the Macedonians, the Greeks were overcome, because:

Men of another race, who were thought to have only slight sparks and insignificant traces of a common remote ancestry, from whom it was astonishing that any helpful word or purpose should be vouchsafed to Greece—these men under went the greatest perils and hardship in order to rescue Greece and set her free from cruel despots and tyrants.

After the death or mysterious disappearance of Romulus, it

\(^1\) Comparison of the Lives of Theseus and Romulus 39B.

\(^2\) Comparison of the Lives of Theseus and Romulus 39B.

\(^3\) Comparison of the Lives of Theseus and Romulus 39B.

\(^4\) Life of Flamininus 375D.
was decided that the Romans would choose a king from among the
Sabine people. Accordingly, an embassy came to Numa from Rome,
asking him to become king. His own people, too, begged him to
assume "the royal power there, in order to unite and blend to-
gether the citizens."¹ He accepted the royal power and attempted
to bring about unity between the Sabines and the Romans by the
institution of "social gatherings and public assemblies and rites
of worship befitting each body."² Among his other reforms, Numa
added two new months to the calendar. One of these months, January,
was said to have been named after Janus, "the patron of
civil and social order," because he was "said to have lifted
human life out of its bestial and savage state."³

Of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, Plutarch says, he engag-
ed in no warlike undertakings, and established his constitution
in a time of peace. One tradition held that Lycurgus, with a
certain Iphitus, either founded or revived the Olympic games in
776 B.C.⁴ The evidence supporting this view is Aristotle’s
statement that a discus was found at Olympia on which was in-
scribed the name of Lycurgus.⁵

¹Life of Numa 63F.
²Life of Numa 71D.
³Life of Numa 72F.
⁴Bernadotte Ferrin, "Introduction" to the Life of Lycurgus
⁵Ibid., p. 205.
Hermippus proposed an alternate theory that Lycurgus originally had no κοινωνία with Iphitus in founding the games, but when he heard a voice upbraiding him for not encouraging his fellow-citizens to participate he thought the voice was a heavenly warning and worked with Iphitus in establishing the festival. ¹

Plutarch praises Lycurgus for "his careful attention to boys, by their collection into companies, their discipline and constant association, and...his painstaking arrangements for their meals and bodily exercises and sports."² He also commends him for establishing an iron currency at Sparta to check an inclination to avarice and to equalize the opportunities for all to obtain the necessary and useful things of life. Lycurgus did this "because, better than any other ancient legislator, he foresaw that the helpless, homeless, and poverty stricken citizen was a greater menace to the commonwealth than one who was rich and ostentatious."³ From the time of Lycurgus it became the Spartan ideal "that the people should, as much as possible, have all things in common, and should take thought for them as for their own."⁴

¹ Life of Lycurgus 54C.
² Comparison of the Lives of Lycurgus and Numa 77D.
³ Life of Marcus Cato 354B.
⁴ Institutae Laconica 237D.
In a later period when Sparta fell from the ancient ideal, the king Agis tried to restore the old standards. He attempted to persuade his influential mother to co-operate with him in this design.

For in the matter of property, he said, he could not equal the other kings (since the servants and slaves of the satraps and overseers of Ptolemy and Seleucus had larger possessions than all the kings of Sparta put together); but if in self-restraint, simplicity, and magnanimity he should surpass their luxury and thereby establish equality and community of possession among his citizens, he would win the name and fame of a really great king.

Tyranny seemed the only answer to the political turmoil in Athens at the beginning of the sixth century B.C. But then a movement began to secure a lawgiver who would rectify some of the problems. "At this point, the wisest of the Athenians cast their eyes upon Solon. They saw that he was the one man least implicated in the errors of the time; that he was neither associated with the rich in their injustice, nor involved in the necessities of the poor." ²

And so Solon was chosen to try to resolve the difficult situations at Athens in preference to the establishment of a tyranny.

¹Lives of Agis and Cleomenes 798C.
²Life of Solon 850C.
Themistocles was ostracized from Athens, according to Plutarch, because the people were jealous of his greatness. While he was in exile in Argos, the Spartan Pausanias invited him to become a κοινονός in his schemes against the Athenians. "Themistocles rejected the solicitation of Pausanias, and utterly refused the proffered partnership." When Pausanias was put to death, however, letters were found which cast suspicion on Themistocles. The Athenians recalled him to stand trial before a Congress of Hellenes, but he fled to escape the trial.

At the wish of the Athenian people, Pericles recalled Cimon from the ten years' banishment which were a consequence of

---

1 Hubert Martin, Jr., "The Character of Plutarch's Themistocles," Transactions of the American Philological Association, XCII (1961), 336-337, has shown that this life "is essentially a study in synopsia and philotimia." So, although Plutarch relied on Herodotus, Thucydides and other sources for this life, "he has consistently revised and interpreted the original Herodotean and Thucydidean ideas in the light of his general concept of Themistocles' character." (337).

2 Life of Themistocles 123C.

3 Life of Themistocles 123D.

4 Bernadotte Perrin, "The Austere Consistency of Pericles (Plutarch's Pericles, IX-XV)," (Publications of Yale University; New Haven, 1910), XV, 223, thinks Plutarch tries to reconcile Plato's description of Pericles as a demagogue with Thucydides' portrayal of him as an "austere compelling statesman" by attributing the former characterization to Pericles before he was in power and the latter after that point. Perrin regards this interpretation of Pericles' character as unequally Plutarchean since it does not appear in any of the sources which Plutarch might have used.
his ostracism, despite the opposition of Pericles' own party. Relying on this incident as an indication of Pericles' character, Plutarch refused to give credence to the report of Idomeneus who "accuses Pericles of assassinating the popular leader Ephialtes, though he was his friend and a partner in his political program, out of mere jealousy and envy of his reputation." ¹

Alcibiades was involved in the scandal of the desecration of the Herms at Athens just before the Sicilian expedition. He was allowed to sail with the expedition but later was recalled to Athens for trial. Instead, he fled to the Spartans. But he soon discovered that some of the leading Spartans were envious of him and wanted him put to death. So, although he became a koivwo's ² with them in all their attempts to encourage Athenian allies to revolt, nevertheless he himself avoided coming into their hands.

After the Four Hundred were overthrown at Athens in 411 B.C., Alcibiades was invited to come back to Athens. He wanted to achieve some signal victories for Athens before returning and so successful was he that his soldiers taunted the troops of the defeated Athenian general Thrasyllus by "refusing to share with training or quarters in camp with them." ³

¹Life of Pericles 157EF.
²Life of Alcibiades 204AB.
³Life of Alcibiades 207D.
Timoleon of Corinth was selected to lead an expedition against the Carthaginians who were trying to take Syracuse. When he arrived at Sicily he discovered that Hicetas of Leontini was leagued with the Carthaginians against Corinthian interference in Sicily. Envoys approached Timoleon from Hicetas:

demanding that Timoleon himself, if he wished, should come to Hicetas as counsellor and partner in all his successes, but that he should send his ships and his soldiers back to Corinth since, as they claimed, the war was almost finished, and the Carthaginians were ready to prevent their passage and to fight them if they tried to force one.

Timoleon managed to extricate himself from this situation with the help of Rhegium and in the end succeeded setting the Greeks in Sicily free from the Carthaginians and in putting to death Hicetas and his son as tyrants and traitors.

Lucius Aemilius Paulus, whom Plutarch compared with Timoleon, is praised because of his display of wisdom and valor in his misfortune at the battle of Cannae. Though he was not able to dissuade his colleague from battle with Hannibal, “he took part with him in the struggle, though reluctantly, but would not be a partner in his flight; and, though the one who had brought on the peril left him in the lurch, he himself kept his post and died fighting the enemy.”

After the battle of Cannae, Hannibal found a man named Bantius, who had fought bravely and had killed many Carthaginians.

1Life of Timoleon 239F-240A.
2Life of Aemilius Paulus 256B.
piled among the dead. Because of the man's wounds and his own admiration for him, Hannibal let him go free and made him a friend and guest. In return, Bantius favored the cause of Hannibal and was encouraging a revolt in favor of Hannibal at Nola. When the Roman general Marcellus arrived on the scene, he "thought it wrong to put to death a man so illustrious in his good fortune who had taken part with the Romans in their greatest conflicts." He praised Bantius as "the only man who did not abandon Paulus Aemilius the consul, but encountered and received in his own body most of the missiles aimed at him" and gave him gifts which won Bantius over firmly to the side of Marcellus.

In comparing Pelopidas and Marcellus, Plutarch concludes that while others had a share in the glory of Pelopidas, "Marcellus shared with no one the glory of his achievements." The unwillingness to share one's glory also precipitated the crisis between Marius and Sulla in Africa, according to Plutarch. Sulla had a seal ring made, on which was depicted the surrender of Jugurtha to him by Bocchus. "By constantly using this ring Sulla provoked Marius, who was an ambitious man loathe to share his glory with another, and quarrelsome."  

1 Life of Marcellus 305C.
2 Ibid.
3 Comparison of the Lives of Pelopidas and Marcellus 317C.
4 Life of Caius Marius 411A.
Plutarch also recounts how Sulla was accustomed to give credit for the success of all his undertakings to Tyche; "he accounts even his concord with Metellus, a man his equal in rank, and a relative by marriage, a piece of divine felicity; for whereas he expected much annoyance from him as a colleague in office, he found him most obliging."\(^1\)

Cimon gave his city home to the public and allowed anyone to pick any of his fruit in the country. Plutarch praised this munificence, for "in a certain fashion, he restored to human life, the fabled communism of the age of Cronus,—the golden age."\(^2\)

In the life of Lucullus, Plutarch tells the story of Olthacus whom Mithridates had allowed to attempt the murder of Lucullus. Mithridates:

purposely inflicted upon him sundry marks of disgrace, whereupon, pretending to be enraged, he galloped off to Lucullus, who gladly welcomed him, since there was so much talk of him in the camp. After a short probation Lucullus was so pleased with his shrewdness and zeal, that he made him a able companion and at last a member of his council.\(^3\)

His plot to take the life of Lucullus failed, however, and he rejoined Mithridates.

When Lucullus attacked Tigranes and his son at Tigrano-certa, he overcame them by the speed and force of his attack.

\(^1\)Life of Sulla 454E.
\(^2\)Life of Cimon 485A.
\(^3\)Life of Lucullus 501E.
Tigranes fled when he saw his positions, and when he realized his son was sharing the same plight, he gave him the diadem from his own head and told him to try to save himself by another route.¹

Sertorius, the one-eyed Sabine, fought successfully under Marius against the Cimbri and Teutones who were invading Gaul at the turn of the first century B.C. He was honored and trusted by Marius. After this engagement, he was sent to Spain where his exploits gained him fame. When he later ran for tribuneship in Rome, he was defeated by Sulla, who also secured Marius' exile in 88 B.C. One of the consuls of this year, Octavius, supported Sulla. The other, Cinna, tried to revive the Marian faction. Sertorius joined this group. A battle in the forum between the consuls resulted in the defeat of Cinna and Sertorius, who were forced to flee from Rome. When Marius returned from exile, he wanted to serve under Cinna. Sertorius objected, however, either through fear of himself being overlooked or because he feared Marius' cruelty. "Accordingly, he said that little remained for them to do now that they were already victorious, and that if they received Marius he would appropriate to himself all the glory and the power since he found it hard to share authority and was not to be trusted."² Cinna replied that these considerations of Sertorius were sound, but that for his part he had "perplexing

¹Life of Lucullus 511A.
²Life of Sertorius 570D.
scruples about rejecting Marius after having himself invited him to join their cause."¹ So Sertorius let the matter stand, and the army was divided into three parts, Cinna, Marius and Sertorius each having command over one third.

Plutarch relates that before Alexander the Great² undertook the expedition against Asia, he gave his companions practically all of the crown property. Perdiccas asked him, "But for thyself, O king, what are thou leaving?" And when the king answered, "My hopes," "In these, then," said Perdiccas, "we also share who make the expedition with thee."³ Accordingly Perdiccas and several of the others declined the gifts of Alexander, wishing to be in his hopes more than in anything else.

According to Plutarch, "the very scope and aim of Alexander's expedition speaks him a philosopher, as one that sought not to gain for himself luxurious splendor or riches, but to establish concord, peace, and mutual communication among all men."⁴ The barbarians supposedly were encouraged by the fact

¹*Life of Sertorius* 570D.

²J. Enoch Powell, "The Sources of Plutarch's Alexander," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, LIX (1939), 230, suggests that Plutarch used only two sources for his *Life of Alexander*: a collection of his letters and a "large variorum compilation on the history of Alexander, the same compilation of which Arrian's *Anabasis* is principally a judicious epitome."

³*Life of Alexander* 672B.

⁴*De Alexandri Magni Fortuna* I 330B.
that Alexander wanted an official ἱματικὴ of marriage between himself and Roxana. And when at the same time he married one hundred Macedonians to Persian girls with elaborate ritual, Plutarch in recounting the incident says he would have been moved to cry out:

O dullard Xerxes, stupid fool that spent so much fruitless toil to bridge the Hellespont! This is the way that wise kings join Asia with Europe; it is not by beams nor rafts, nor by lifeless and unfeeling bonds, but by the ties of lawful love and chaste nuptials and mutual joy in children that they join the nations together.

Alexander also:

adapted his own mode of life still more to the customs of the country, and tried to bring them into closer agreement with Macedonian customs, thinking that by a mixture and community of practice which produced good will, rather than by force, his authority would be kept secure while he was far away.

After the unexpected death of Alexander, his Empire was divided among his generals. Plutarch praises one of the generals, Antigonus, because he was not afraid of his son Demetrias, "but allowed him near his person lance in hand," commenting that empire is an unsociable thing, full of ill-will and distrust.

---

1 *Life of Alexander* 691E.
2 E. Badian "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Historia*, VII (October, 1958), 425-444, criticizes W.W. Tarn's view of Alexander the Great and rejects the interpretation of Alexander as "believing in the brotherhood of man in any sense in which Greeks, ever since Homer, had not."
3 De Alexandri Magni Fortuna I 329v.
4 *Life of Alexander* 691D.
5 *Life of Demetrius* 890B.
The Athenians even gave Antigonus and Demetrias the title of king, though "this was the only royal prerogative still left to the descendents of Philip and Alexander which it was thought that others could not assume or share." However, Antigonus failed to retain his supremacy among the successors of Alexander and to pass on this inheritance to his son Demetrias. Plutarch attributes this to the fact that he was excessively harsh, unwilling to compromise and eager to dominate. These attitudes alienated the young and powerful men from him. The showdown came at the Battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C. Antigonus boasted that "their combination and partnership at this time...he would scatter asunder with a single stone and a single shout, as if they were a flock of granivorous birds." However, he was killed in the engagement.

Tiberius Gracchus was murdered for his attempt to introduce social reform at Rome. His brother Caius lived quietly after Tiberius' death according to Plutarch in his Lives of Tiberius and Caius Gracchus. However, in 126 B.C. he was elected by lot to go to Sardinia as quaestor for the consul Orestes. He served well, without much co-operation from Rome. When the senate prolonged Orestes' command in Sardinia, Caius returned to Rome, much to the displeasure of his enemies who accused him of deserting

1Life of Demetrius 893C.
2Life of Demetrius 902A.
his post. After he had successfully justified his action, "other
fresh charges and indictments were brought against him, on the
ground that he had caused the allies to revolt and had been privy
to the conspiracy at Fregellae, information of which was brought
to Rome."¹ But again he was able to establish his innocence and
soon after was elected tribune. During his second tribuneship he
tried to secure the favor of the multitude by initiating laws in
their interest and by "proposing to send colonies to Tarentum and
Capua, and inviting the Latins to a participation in the Roman
franchise."² Plutarch commends Cornelia, the mother of Tiberius
and Caius Gracchus, because "when Ptolemy the king offered to
share his crown with her and sought her hand in marriage, she re­
fused him, and remained a widow."³

Toward the end of Caesar's proconsulship in Gaul, word
reached Rome that he had slaughtered 300,000 Germans during a
truce. Everyone at Rome rejoiced except Cato who said Caesar
should be punished for such a crime. Caesar wrote a letter,
which was read in the senate, justifying his action and denounc­
ing Cato. Cato, then:

Assailing Caesar's plans from the outset and revealing clear­
ly all his purpose, as if he were his fellow-conspirator and

¹Lives of Tiberius and Caius Gracchus 836A.
²Lives of Tiberius and Caius Gracchus 838BC.
³Lives of Tiberius and Caius Gracchus 824D.
partner and not his enemy, he declared that it was not the sons of Germans or Celts whom they must fear, but Caesar himself, if they were in their right minds, and so moved and incited his hearers that the friends of Caesar were sorry that by having the letter read in the senate they had given Cato an opportunity for just arguments and true denunciations.

Plutarch relates that after the defeat of Pompey by Caesar at Pharsalus and his subsequent murder in Egypt, only Pompey's freedman Philip remained to bury his body, joined by an old man who had served under Pompey in his youth and wanted to be a sharer in the privilege of burying "the greatest of Roman imperators." ²

Plutarch's account of the life of Antony refers to the incident after the battle of Pharsalus in which "Dolabella, who was tribune at this time - a newcomer in politics who aimed at a new order of things, introduced a law for the abolition of debts, and tried to persuade Antony, who was his friend and always sought to please the multitude, to take common action in the measure."³ Antony was advised against siding with Dolabella and broke completely with him when he began to suspect Dolabella of taking advantage of his wife.

Antony died after the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C. after he lost to Caesar in his bid for power. According to Plutarch, when news of Antony's death reached Caesar, "he retired within

¹Life of Cato the Younger 784.
²Life of Pompey 661E.
³Life of Antony 919DE.
his tent and wept for a man who had been his relation by marriage, his colleague in office and command, and his partner in many undertakings and struggles."

Plato's relationship with Dionysius, the young tyrant of Syracuse, is described in Plutarch's life of Dion, the uncle of Dionysius. Dion and Plato had hopes of making Dionysius their ideal philosopher king. Plato went to Syracuse to educate Dionysius. At first Dionysius wanted to have ἱκανωμενεῖ with Plato in his philosophical pursuits, but he feared the criticism of those in his court who thought such study would corrupt him. Plato returned to Athens, only to come back to Syracuse a second time to unsuccessfully attempt to make Dionysius a philosopher-king. After Plato's second departure, Dionysius gave his uncle Dion's wife Arete to Timocrates in marriage, against her will. Dion was angered and wanted to wage war on Dionysius. Others encouraged him to free Sicily from the grasp of the young tyrant. He employed mercenaries and in addition tried to secure the co-operation of those who had been banished by Dionysius. "But of those who had been banished by the tyrant, and there were not less than a thousand of them, only twenty-five took part in the expedition; the rest played the coward and abandoned it."
In spite of this, Dion won a brilliant victory, but the Syracusans began to fear that he would spare Dionysius because of their close relationship so they looked for other leaders. The man they turned to was one Heracleides who "was one of the exiles, a man of military capacity and well known for the commands which he had held under the tyrants, but irresolute, fickle, and least to be relied upon as a partner in an enterprise involving power and glory." Heracleides was murdered. This Dion "regarded as a stain upon his life and actions, declared that he was ready now to die many deaths and to suffer anyone who wished to slay him if it was going to be necessary for him to live on his guard, not only against his enemies, but also against his friends." The end was not long in coming. "Many conspired to do the deed" and no one in the room dared to defend him against the assassins.

Sicyon, after the fall of the aristocracy, came under the control of many factions and tyrants. During one of the revolutions, Aratus, a child of seven whose father had been tyrant there and murdered, escaped to Argos. He developed a great hatred for tyranny. When he grew up, the exiles from Sicyon looked to him for leadership. He resolved to overthrow the tyrant Nicocles at Sicyon and was informed about the best place to

\[1\] Life of Dion 972A.

\[2\] Life of Dion 982F-983A.
scale the walls of the city, the only obstacle being that the place was difficult of undetected access because it was guarded by the savage dogs of a gardener. So Aratus got his forces ready and began to scale the wall. The gardener's dogs and the watchdog in the tower began to howl as the men approached. The watchmen asked the huntsman whether there was some trouble afoot but he said no. This heartened Aratus' soldiers "who thought that the huntsman was privy to their design and was trying to conceal it, and that there were many others also in the city who would assist them."¹ Though this was not true, Aratus was successful in securing the city of Sicyon without any bloodshed. As a ruler and later as general of the Achaean League, Aratus "proved not so much a strict friend, as a considerate and mild enemy, changing his ground in either direction according to the exigencies of the state, loving concord between nations, community of cities, and unanimity of council and assembly, beyond all other blessings."² Later in his career, when Antigonus got possession of the strategic Acrocorinth, Aratus resolved to take Acrocorinth himself by a dangerous scheme which became complicated by the fact that his servant met a man "who was not privy to the enterprise and took no part in it"³ and revealed much of the plot to him. The

¹Life of Aratus 1030D.
²Life of Aratus 1031DE.
³Life of Aratus 1035F.
situation was discovered and remedied, however, and the scheme proceeded as planned.

In the life of Artaxerxes, mention is made of a woman named Parysatis who had great influence with the king, playing dice with him, joining in his diversions, and taking part in his amours by her co-operation and presence.¹

During the year of the Four Emperors at Rome, 69 A.D., many were slain who were not involved in plots against the emperors. Vinius, who was conspiring against Galba and in favor of Otho, was slain after Otho assumed control of Rome.²

Plutarch alludes to other examples of political κοινωνία in the moral essays. He tells how a certain Laarchus, who wished to become despot in Cyrene, brought about the banishment or murder of many of the nobles of the city and was able to make the blame fall upon the king Arcesilaus, and thus bring about his death; "then he took over the sovereign rule himself on the pretext that he was keeping it for Arcesilaus's son Battus." His next step was to attempt a marriage with Battus's mother Bryxo, "saying that it was only right and proper to make Battus his own son by marrying her, and to proclaim him colleague in the sovereignty."³ The plan failed, however, because of the courage and

¹Life of Artaxerxes 1019D.
²Life of Galba 1065B.
³Mulierum Virtutes 260F.
loyalty of Eryxos. Laarchus was finally murdered.

At the death of Cambyses, Plutarch relates in De Fraterno Amore "the succession went out of Cyrus's family into the line of Darius, a prince who understood how to share the management of his affairs and even his regal authority not merely with his brothers, but also with his friends."¹

When Pyrrhus attempted to recover the kingdom of Epirus which he had lost to Neoptolemus, he was afraid Neoptolemus might ally himself with one of the other kings, so "he came to terms and made friendship with him on the basis of a joint exercise of royal power."²

The Amatorius mentions Civilis who was the first to stir up a revolt in Galatia and had among his κόινωνία in the rebellion a man named Sabinus, who became known for his fidelity to his wife.³

Hypereides, a pupil of Plato, Lycurgus, and Isocrates, entered public life at Athens when Alexander was interfering in the affairs of Greece. At one point "he was believed to have shared the Persian funds with Ephialtes."⁴

¹ De Fraterno Amore 490A.
² Life of Pyrrhus 385B.
³ A!atoriue 770D.
⁴ X Oratorum Vitae 848E.
The writings of other authors of the Hellenistic-Roman period contain passages which provide distinct points both of comparison and of contrast with the thought of Plutarch as expressed above.

A hierarchy of god, gods, and demons, similar to that of Plutarch, appears also in Plotinus' thought. In discussing the distinction between gods and other spiritual beings, Plotinus says that the latter cannot partake of bodily matter but do partake of intellectual matter and are "thereby enabled to enter into the lower Matter, the corporeal."  

Plutarch maintained that everything from the lowest animal to god was social or communicative by nature. Something of the same theory is reflected in the thought of Marcus Aurelius, Stobaeus, and Philo. According to Marcus Aurelius, the mind of the whole is social and this is reflected in the hierarchical

---

subordination of the inferior elements to the superior. The relationship among the various parts of the whole is achieved by means of the soul, Stoebaeus maintained. The souls of the gods have κοινωνία with the souls of men, and the souls of men with those of the irrational beings. Philo said Moses taught the social nature characteristic of men is also present in animals of irrational nature and various kinds of cultivated trees.

These theories were not universally accepted during this period, however. Epictetus agrees that social instincts are inherent in the nature of man but points out that some would question this statement. He does not attribute social instincts to animals, however, because they lack understanding.


2 Joannes Stobaeus Anthologii Eclogae Physicæ et Ethicae I, 47.8, recensuit Curtius Wachsmuth (Berlin: Weidmann, 1958), I, 303.


5 Epictetus Discourses I.28.20; II.10.14; IV.5.17.
The general principle on which κοινωνία can be posited, according to Philo, is that it is the law of nature, and therefore just, to join all things which can associate, namely the homogeneous; it is unjust to try to force the heterogeneous into κοινωνία. He claims that the Chaldaeans believed in a harmony between earthly and heavenly things, and a κοινωνία and sympathy in all parts of the universe. Aristotle is credited by Aetius with the opinion that the heavens have κοινωνία in all things. The consequence of this cosmic fellowship is that each thing, while retaining its own being, can take over some property of the thing in which it participates. Earth, air, water, and fiery aether have a partnership with one another in the universe and yet remain "free from hostility." If they were to dissolve this κοινωνία they would completely destroy each other. Zeus is called "Guardian of the Race" on account of the

1 Philo De Specialibus Legibus III.204.
2 Philo De Migracione Abrahami 178
4 Plotinus Ennead II.1.7.15.
6 Dio Chrysostom The Fortieth Discourse 36.
tie of kinship which unites gods and men," according to Dio Chrysostom. Chrysippus says that genuine happiness exists only in the κοινωνία of god with god, but then extends this κοινωνία to include everything that has a share in reason. The relationship between rational creatures and the gods is not the kingship of equals however, but is like that between boys *who are said to share the citizenship with men, being citizens by birth though not by reason of conceiving and performing the tasks of citizens or sharing in the law, of which they have no comprehension.*

Plotinus states that when the soul passes from an incorporeal condition and comes into any kind of a body, it may then be said to have κοινωνία with the body.* He further explains:

When the ancient philosophers say that the soul comes into the body, this means that the body enters into essence, and participates in the life of the soul; in one word, to 'come' does not here signify passing from one place into another, but indicates in what way the soul enters into dealings with the body.

In regard to the physical aspects of the κοινωνία of soul and body, the first movements of the soul of which we become participators are: "nourishment, growth, sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch, reason, mind, the parts of the soul, the parts of

---

1 Dio Chrysostom First Discourse on Kingship 40.
2 Dio Chrysostom Borysthenitic Discourse 23.
3 Plotinus Ennead IV.3.9.9.
4 Plotinus Ennead VI.4.16.13.
the body, their activities, in general their natural movements
and states."\(^1\)

\(\text{κοινωνία}\) with the body is not advantageous for the soul, according to Plotinus\(^2\) because the soul exists on a higher level than the body and has more participation in unity.\(^3\) The body nevertheless becomes beautiful by \(\text{κοινωνία}\) in reason which comes from the divine.\(^4\) Wisdom is almost communicative and willing to give herself, so that man is able to live with "his purposes set upon fellowship with Zeus."\(^5\)

The wise man, who lives most perfectly in accord with human nature, is like a light to all who have \(\text{κοινωνία}\) in a rational nature, and sets an example of a life lived not in solitude but in society and action.\(^6\) Reason is the most important element in which human nature has \(\text{κοινωνία}\) and is the "sure and indissoluble foundation for fellowship and justice."\(^7\)

\(^1\) Philo De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 73.
\(^2\) Plotinus Ennead II.9.7.3.
\(^3\) Plotinus Ennead VI.9.1.34.
\(^4\) Plotinus Ennead I 6.2.28.
\(^5\) Epictetus Discourses II. 19.27.
\(^7\) Dio Chrysostom Borythentitic Discourses 31.
One of the most characteristic traits of all rational creatures is fellowship with others.¹ According to Marcus Aurelius, this constitutes their good.² Chrysippus maintains that our social κοινωνία cannot exclude coarse and uncultivated men, as it does irrational animals, because the creator made all men on the same common level with all mankind.³ A man should not regard acts of fellowship as bringing "a smaller return and to be deserving of less pains,"⁴ but rather he should strive always to think and act sociably⁵ and for the common good.⁶ He should always be considerate of his fellow-associates, whether natural or acquired.⁷ For it is the nature of a social being to perceive he is acting socially and he should not be afraid of his social acts.⁸ Nature, according to Philo has "created man the most civilized of animals to be gregarious and sociable, has called him to show fellowship and a spirit of partnership by endowing him with


²Marcus Aurelius Meditations V.16; V.29.2.

³Chrysippus "De Iure et Lege" Ethica VI #346, SVF, III, 85.

⁴Marcus Aurelius Meditations, V.1.7.

⁵Marcus Aurelius Meditations III.4.2; IV.33.3; VI.14.2.

⁶Marcus Aurelius Meditations VII.5.

⁷Epictetus Discourses II.14.8; I.22.10; III.1.21; III.11.3.

⁸Marcus Aurelius Meditations V.6.6.8.
reason, the bond which leads to harmony and reciprocity of feeling."\(^1\) Marcus Aurelius encourages men "to pass from act to act of fellowship, keeping God in remembrance"\(^2\) and to direct all the activities of life toward "a holy disposition and neighbourly acts."\(^3\) He urges men to use dumb animals and lifeless things and objects "generally with a generous and free spirit, because you have reason and they have not; use men because they have reason, in a neighbourly spirit; and in all things call upon the gods for help."\(^4\) He also suggests that "to reverence and value your own understanding will make you acceptable to yourself, and harmonious with your fellows, and in concord with the gods."\(^5\)

Laws were established to preserve social \(\kappa \omega \nu \omega \nu \eta \).\(^6\) Epicurus maintained that laws were just only "when they were expedient for the mutual intercourse of the citizens."\(^7\) When they

\(^1\) Philo De Decalogo 132.
\(^2\) Marcus Aurelius Meditations VI.7.
\(^3\) Marcus Aurelius Meditations VI.30.1.
\(^4\) Marcus Aurelius Meditations VI.23.1.
\(^5\) Marcus Aurelius Meditations VI.16.5.
\(^7\) Epicurus "Ratae Sententiae" XXXVII.153.5, Ethica, ed. Carolus Diano (Florence: Sanson, 1946), XXXVIII.153.2.
ceased to be expedient, they were no longer just. He held that the law was generally the same for all but might vary under different circumstances.

The philosophers were aware that social relationships admitted of degrees. They regarded friendship as the most perfect type of \( \text{koinwv} \). Chrysippus defined friendship as a \( \text{koinwv} \) of life. According to Posidonius and Hecato, friendship was "a common use of all that has to do with life." For Epicurus, friendship was a "partnership in the enjoyment of life's pleasures." He would have agreed with the comic writer Alexis that pleasures which share in pain should be shunned. Zeno claimed that talking about the good tended to draw men toward social fellowship.

Philosophers were called \( \text{koinwv} \) of the philosophy of their masters. This was said of Anaxagoras in relation to

---

1 Epicurus "Ratae Sententiae" XXXVII.152.4.
2 Epicurus "Ratae Sententiae" XXXVI.151.7.
3 Chrysippus "De Bonis et Malis" Ethica II, #112, SVF, III, 27.
4 Diogenes Laertius Zeno VII.124.
5 Diogenes Laertius Epicurus X.120.
7 Diogenes Laertius Zeno VII.99.
Anaximenes and of Leucippus in relation to Parmenides. All of the Pythagoreans had *koinwvia* in the discussions of the school up to the time of Philolaus and Empedocles. But when Empedocles wrote his poem on their doctrines, the Pythagoreans made a law that poets should not be allowed at the discussions.

Men were also described as partners in misfortune or in less reputable activities or, like the parasite, in luck and life.

*koinwvia* was used in reference to sexual intercourse by Amphis and Josephus. Philo distinguished between marriages for pleasure in which the *koinwvia* was between body and body and marriages made by wisdom where *koinwvia* was between "thoughts which seek purification and perfect virtues." Dionysius of Halicarnassus referred to the Roman custom of basing marriage on
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of fire and water\textsuperscript{1} as Plutarch had also done.

Official public documents of the hellenistic period mention the invitation to \textit{koinw
\textnu
\bar{\eta}} in religious rites and the mysteries which one town issued to another.\textsuperscript{2} Towns entering into political alliances with each other agree to have \textit{koinw
\textnu
\bar{\eta}} in citizenship,\textsuperscript{3} in the right to participate in local priesthoods,\textsuperscript{4} and in grain and olives.\textsuperscript{5}

\textit{koinw
\textnu
\bar{\eta}} was used by the historians Polybius and Diodorus Siculus as it was by Plutarch, to describe the political alliances between cities, leagues, countries and kings. After the death of Demetrius II of Macedon in 229 B.C., the Aetolian League in Greece made alliances with Antigonus, king of Sparta.\textsuperscript{6} Almost

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{1}Dionysius of Halicarnassus \textit{Roman Antiquities} II, 30. All Greek passages and English translations of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in this chapter are taken from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, \textit{Roman Antiquities}, trans. E. Cary (7 vols.; Loeb Library ed.; London and Cambridge, 1937-1950).
\item \textsuperscript{3}Frag \#531 SIG, I. 777.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Frag \#531 SIG, I. 778.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Frag \#646 SIG, II. 206.
\item \textsuperscript{6}Polybius \textit{Histories} II. 45.2. All the Greek passages and English translations of Polybius in this chapter are taken from Polybius, \textit{The Histories}, trans. W.R. Paton (6 vols.; Loeb Library ed.; London and New York, 1922-1927).
\end{itemize}
immediately a war broke out between Sparta and the other powerful league of Greek states, the Achaean League. Antigonus supported the latter. During the course of this war, Antigonus and Aratus of the Achaean League destroyed Mantinea and Cleomenes razed Megalopolis. Polybius used the example of the loyalty of the Megalopolitans to their alliance with the Achaean League despite the heavy losses they incurred as an example of "loyalty to... engagements and to true and faithful comradeship." The war ended in 222 B.C. when Antigonus took Sparta. Cleomenes fled to Egypt and died there in 219 B.C. Antigonus died in 221 B.C. and was succeeded by the seventeen year old Philip V of Macedon. The Aetolian League took this opportunity to sever its alliance made previously with Antigonus. Philip refused to tolerate this action. The ephors of Sparta concluded a koivvia with the Aetolian League for war against Macedon. The war finally concluded in 217 B.C. with Philip of Macedon victorious over Sparta and the Aetolian League. Philip then conceived the idea of koivvia with Carthage. This alliance was concluded in 215 B.C.

In 212 B.C. the defeated Aetolian League allied with the Romans in order to take revenge on Philip for his previous victory. In 211 B.C. Sparta was forced to decide between alliance

1Polybius Histories II. 61.11.
2Polybius Histories IV. 35.10.
3Polybius Histories III. 2.3.
with the Aetolians against or with Macedon and the Achaean League. ¹ Lyciscus, an Acarnanian, urged the Spartans to refuse ἱστήμενοι with the Aetolians and to establish an alliance with the Achaean League and Macedon ² because the Aetolian League had betrayed the Greek cause by inviting the Romans to be their ἱστήμενοι. ³ Later, when the Roman general Flamininus defeated Philip in the battle of Cynocephalae in 197 B.C. he insisted on settling the terms and establishing a Roman peace. The Aetolians who had been fighting with the Romans rebuked him for not using their success in a spirit of partnership. ⁴

Other examples of ἱστήμενοι also occur in Polybius. He mentioned that he had learned from Massanissa that the Carthaginians Hannibal and Mago had had ἱστήμενοι with each other in all kinds of enterprises since their youth. ⁵ The Carthaginian general Himilco promised his officers gifts and favors if they would remain loyal

¹Polybius Histories IX. 31.4.  
²Polybius Histories IX. 39.6.  
³Polybius Histories IX. 37.5.  
⁴Polybius Histories 18, 48.7. Maurice Holleaux, "Rome and Macedon: The Romans Against Philip", Cambridge Ancient History, VIII 3rd impression (Cambridge, 1965), 138-198 says that actually the alliance of 212 B.C. had not been renewed between Rome and the Aetolian League, though the latter thought it had been done tacitly. Rome had no formal alliance with any of the states fighting on her side at that point.  
⁵Polybius Histories IX. 25.5.
to him and not participate in the plot of those who had left the
city. ¹ About 163-162 B.C. one of the Ptolemies learned that the
man he had left in charge in Cyrene had κοινωνία with the insur-
gents in an uprising there. ²

The Romans had κοινωνία in the war directed against Pyrrhus of Epirus in 280 B.C. ³ Later, when the Romans were fighting some
tribes of Celts they were afraid to ask their Celtic allies to
have κοινωνία with them for fear their loyalties might waver. ⁴
The people of Marseilles had often been κοινωνοί of the Romans,
and especially during the war with Hannibal. ⁵

Diodorus Siculus mentioned that the inhabitants of Lipara,
an island of the Aeolides, divided their population into two
groups, one to cultivate the islands which had been made the com-
mon property of the community and the other to fight the pirates
who were harassing them; "their possessions also they made com-
mon property, and living according to the public mess system,
they passed their lives in this communistic fashion for some
time." ⁶

¹ Polybius Histories I. 43.3.
² Polybius Histories 31, 18, 6.
³ Polybius Histories I. 6.7.
⁴ Polybius Histories II. 32.8.
⁵ Polybius Histories II. 42.5.
Koinonia in the context of musical harmony occurred in several passages. Koinonia in music consists in the relationship of octaves, fifths, and fourths.\(^1\) The flute and the lyre are said to be in partnership.\(^2\) The music of flute and the lyre have koinonia in festivals.\(^3\) Drawing an analogy with musical terminology, Lucian commented that he had united dialogue and comedy, "though they are not in the least docile and do not easily tolerate partnership."\(^4\)

**Conclusion**

The philosophical, social, and political contexts in which Koinonia occurs in the writings of this period are accurate reflections of the historical situation in each of these areas and the products of their development.

The death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. traditionally marks the end of the classical or Hellenic period of Greek history and the commencement of the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic period is often said to be characterized by a spirit of

\(^1\)Damoxenus "The Συντροφοι ," frag. #2, *FAC*, III. A, 214.


\(^3\)Ephippus "The Merchandise" *FAC*, II. 150.

\(^4\)Lucian Youre a Prometheus in *Words* 6.35. Greek text and trans. by K. Kilburn (Loeb Library ed.; Cambridge, Mass.), VI.
individualism initiated by Alexander, in contrast with the former period, which ended with Aristotle, where man found his identity as a fraction of the polis. The Greek polis still remained after Alexander's death, "but its walls were down, and the security and definite form which, together with some restriction, they gave to life, had vanished."

The Hellenistic man, deprived of the security previously provided by the more of the polis, needed criteria by which he could regulate his own life. These he found in the practical dogmatic philosophies which developed during the period.

New ideas about human brotherhood developed also as he tried to regulate his relations with others. These ideas expressed themselves in the formation of various extra-political organizations which were primarily social and religious in character.

The polis, which often lost much of its identity along with its loss of autonomy, also needed to find a new basis of security. This it did by reverting to another form of government common especially in Northern Greece, the cantonal commune. The development of the federal principle is reflected in the formation of leagues and other forms of common political association, such as the isopolity and sympolity.

Three schools of philosophy developed at the beginning of

1A.H. Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), 114. The survey of Hellenistic-Roman philosophy which follows is based largely on this source.
the Hellenistic period: Cynic, Stoic, and Epicurean. The Cynics, whose chief representative was Diogenes of Sinope, sought imper-
turbable tranquility in complete poverty and detachment from all worldly ties. They were characterized by a cosmopolitan and in-
dividualistic spirit.

The Stoics, represented by Zeno and Chrysippus in the early period, advocated a rule of life founded on a rational doctrine of the universe and man's knowledge of it. Both Zeno and Chrysippus seem to have been influenced by Babylonian astrology and the idea that man is a microcosm of the universe which is governed by an inexorable Fate. They also believed in the theory of a general world conflagration.

Stoicism had three aspects: logic, physics, and ethics. Logic for them included the whole art and science of the expression of thought. Since all of reality, as they conceived it, was materialistic, knowledge was a process of perceiving physical representations of things which were confirmed by reason. Only the Wise Man had this certain knowledge, however. The physical doctrine of Stoicism was based on a doctrine of a universal cosmic fire which was identified variously as God, Divine Providence, or Nature. This fire was also identified as Reason, the ruling principle in man and the cosmos. In the realm of ethics, man was to live according to Reason, the element that gave him Κοιμοσ, with the gods and with all other rational beings. Reason was identified with virtue, while the passions, emotions, and desires
were considered perversions of Reason and were therefore to be eliminated. For the Stoics, there were only two classes of men, the Wise Men whom Chrysippus maintained lived most according to Reason, and the rest of men, an unvirtuous and degenerate horde.

The Stoics maintained the existence of a natural law, by which was meant that the universal decrees of reason were the same for all. One of these laws was an innate love of one's offspring; another, belief in the social nature of man. According to Chrysippus again, the crude and uncultivated man could not be excluded from social activity, as irrational animals were, because he had a rational nature. The Stoics advocated participation in public life as "preferred" action.

Epicurus was the founder of a sect bearing his name. His philosophy consisted in a rule of life based on Reason. Its end was the attainment of imperturbable tranquillity which meant for Epicurus freedom from pain and trouble. Since he believed most human trouble came from belief in the gods, his theory of nature excluded divine activity and asserted the materiality and morality of the soul, a doctrine which Plutarch specifically repudiated.

One aspect of this philosophy was the "Canonic" or criteria for the test of truth. These were: feelings of pleasure and pain, sensation, concepts, and the act of intuitive apprehension. Its physics was an adaptation of the atomism of Democritus, into which Epicurus introduced the concept of the "swerve" as an
attempt to avoid determinism and Fate and affirm human free will. Thus chance became a philosophical principle along with necessity. The soul was composed of small atoms diffused throughout the body, while mind was an aggregate of pure and subtle atoms in the breast. The gods exist but live a life of tranquillity and do not interfere in the lives of men. Religion for Epicurus was the contemplation and imitation of the tranquility of the divine life.

Great emphasis was placed by the Epicureans on the importance of friendship and all human affectionate relationships. This concurred with Epicurus' definition of friendship as a _κοινωνία_ in pleasure. Plutarch protested however that to make pleasure the absolute end of life overthrows human society. Epicurus taught the desirability of avoiding public office and political life, which to Plutarch was incomprehensible since the sect was willing to enjoy the advantages of life in the _polis_. Epicurus believed that justice was merely a matter of social contract, that laws were just only when or for as long as they were expedient, that law, while generally the same for all, could be different in different places.

During the second and first centuries B.C. Stoicism underwent a period of humanization which brought it closer to Platonism. Panætius and Posidonius were two primary figures in this period of Middle Stoicism. The theory of conflagration was abandoned and the doctrine of the eternity of the cosmos was
adopted, a doctrine already common to the Platonists and Aristotleans. Panaetius made Stoicism more palatable for the Romans by placing more emphasis on the relative value of external goods. Posidonius borrowed the doctrine of the tripartite soul from Plato, though all three parts remained material for him, and indicated that man should try to control his passions rather than eradicate them. "He greatly stressed the organic unity of the world and the universal sympathy which binds all things together, and originated the idea of the scale of different kinds of unity, culminating in the perfect unification of the organism, which Plotinus developed further."¹ He made man a bridge between the higher and lower worlds. Dio Chrysostom represents the Stoicism of the first century A.D. He believed in the necessity of the elements of the cosmos, the tie of kinship between gods and men, and reason as the basis of and justice among men.

For Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, the latest Stoics, philosophy was primarily a way of life and was almost exclusively concerned with moral and spiritual direction and self-examination. Epictetus conceived Divine Providence as a personal God. He believed in the social nature of man, but unlike Plutarch, did not believe that animals had a social nature. Marcus Aurelius

¹Ibid., 144.
emphasized the relation between all levels of reality. He believed that rational creatures were made to have social relations with each other and in this was their ultimate good. Man in this life was to keep God in remembrance and to think and act sociably and for the common good.

Platonism enjoyed a revival during the first century B.C. and the first and second centuries A.D. in which it assimilated a large element of Aristotelianism. This revival began with Philo of Larissa. He abandoned the scepticism which had characterized earlier Platonism, and gave much attention to the history of the school and its doctrines. He held that there had been a continuity in its tradition since Plato. His successor, Antiochus of Ascalon, maintained that Zeno was a reforming Platonist, and that Stoic teaching was identical with that of Plato. His doctrine had the appearance of an eclectic Stoicism. Middle Platonism by the second century A.D. could be described as "genuinely Platonic doctrine, differing in many important ways from the teaching of Plato himself, and showing many signs of the influence of Aristotle and of other schools, but going back in many essential points to Plato's own pupil Xenocrates."¹ This period of Platonism is represented in Plutarch's thought.

Middle Platonism was also characterized by an attempt to integrate theology and philosophy. According to Plutarch,

¹Ibid., 147.
philosophy is to be "our Mystagogue to Theology: we must borrow Reason from Philosophy, and take her as our guide to the mysteries of Religion." Philosophy must attempt to free the old religion from its crudities and inconsistencies and thus strengthen and revive it.

The middle Platonists commonly identified Mind or God as the first principle of reality, and conceived the Platonic Forms as the thoughts of the Divine Mind. This Mind was often identified with Plato’s Good and with Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover. Plutarch tended to the concept of one god, transcendent and yet personal, the evidence for whom he finds in the beauty and harmony of the world which witnesses to an intelligent cause. His writings do not, however, reveal that he conceived the Platonic Forms as the thoughts of the Divine Mind.

There was also room in the system of Middle Platonism for other gods than one. Plutarch was willing to accept the fact of the existence of gods, but he tended in syncretistic fashion to
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1 Oakesmith, op. cit., 64–65.
2 Ibid., 85.
3 Hadas, op. cit., 275.
4 Latzarus, op. cit., 91.
5 Oakesmith, op. cit., 87, says: "His own conception of the Divine nature resembles the popular notion in being a compound of philosophy, myth, and legalized tradition."
6 Latzarus, op. cit., 88.
see the gods of other people as none other than Greek gods under other names. His office as Priest of Delphi indicates his position regarding the worship of lesser deities.

Demonology was a common feature of Middle Platonic thought. Plutarch posited the existence of mediatory demons, some of whom were good, others evil. He frequently used them to explain myths and rites of religion in a spirit of "reverent rationalism."

The heavenly bodies, according to the Middle Platonists, had a share of soul and thus possessed sensitive, rational, and intellectual faculties and were guided by reason and providence, as was man, and, according to Plutarch, also the animals.

In general, the Middle Platonists believed that the soul was divine and that it was either sent or came into the body and that life was a purification of philosophy for the return to the life of the gods and the vision of the supreme. They taught in addition that only a remote and short direct intuition of the Divine Mind was possible for man in this life, due primarily to the fact that the soul and body resulted in an obscuring of reason which linked man with the Divine. Even here
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on earth, though, man could experience a state of "enthusiasm" in which the soul shared and participated in a divine order. The condition of the soul after death Plutarch was willing to trust to a good god. He denounced the Epicurean doctrine that there was no afterlife and held that the end of the soul was, when freed finally of the body, to converse with intelligence and to behold perfect purity.

The period of Middle Platonism was also marked by the production of commentaries and doxographical writings on and about the earlier philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle. The works of Diogenes Laertius in the 3rd century A.D. and of John Stobaeus about the fifth century A.D. are the products of this tradition.

Greek philosophy and Jewish theology encountered each other in the thought of Philo Judaeus, an influential Jew who lived in Alexandria between the reign of Augustus and 40 A.D. By means of the allegorical method of interpretation familiar to the Stoics and Platonists he succeeded in harmonizing Greek philosophical ideas and Jewish theology, in fact in deriving the former from the latter. The Jewish doctrine that God is the creator and ruler of the universe which he made freely and continues to govern had much in common with the ideas of Middle Platonism, except that Middle Platonism also recognized a hierarchy of divine beings and removed the Supreme Good far from the world which is ruled by lower powers. In trying to reconcile the two positions,
Philo attempted to stress both the immanence and transcendence of the God of Judaism. He formulated a doctrine of the Logos which was "the instrument as it is purified ascends to the God again." He also identified this Logos with the Platonic world of Forms. Another point in which his doctrine was similar to that of the Stoicism and Platonism of this period was in his doctrine of the "pneuma" as the image of God in man. He regarded the whole of nature as social and united by soul.

The renewal of Platonism reached its peak in the third century A.D. with Plotinus. Plotinus studied under Ammonius Saccas in Alexandria, travelled in the East, and then established a school in Rome where he taught until his death in 270 B.C. "The philosophy of Plotinus presents us with a great ordered hierarchical structure of spiritual reality, a cosmos, which though it is static and eternal is not dead mechanical pattern, but living and organic." Though complicated by many tensions, the basic movements he posited were those of descent and ascent. His philosophy was both cosmic and religious. His transcendent First Principle was the One or Good, beyond Mind and Being, the source of the Divine Mind and the World of Forms but neither of these. From the One was derived the Divine Mind, Soul and then the material universe by a process of emanation. Each level of reality

1 Armstrong, op. cit., 163.
2 Ibid., 178.
attained its perfection by the contemplation of the level of reality above it. The soul was the link between the higher and lower worlds and was in the body not because of a fall due to sin but by the law of the universe. The \textit{koinwv\i} of soul and body he considered detrimental only when the soul allowed itself to become enmeshed in the material, which he regarded as evil. Man’s duty was to live as completely as possible on the spiritual level. The material visible universe was not evil, however, but living and ensouled and bound by a universal sympathy.

The occurrences of \textit{koinwv\i} in the Hellenistic-Roman period also reflect the social and political milieu of the age.\footnote{The survey of the social and political aspects of the Hellenistic-Roman age is based largely on W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith, \textit{Hellenistic Civilization}, 3rd ed., rev. (London: E. Arnold, 1952).} Aristotle had maintained that all associations were ultimately only a part of the \textit{polis} and existed for its sake. The Hellenistic man, however, came by necessity to regard social associations as means of establishing and regulating his relationships with other individuals. This new attitude is evidenced by the growth of nonpolitical private associations and clubs from 300 B.C. on. These were primarily religious and social in nature. Plutarch mentions the association in honor of Dionysus to which he and his wife belonged, which provided them with knowledge of the afterlife. Plutarch’s emphasis on the value of the symposium seems to be part of the same pattern of development of human
nature, and that they demanded a spirit of equality among the members. Many of the associations of which there is record from the Hellenistic period were limited in their membership. This parallels Plutarch's insistence that the success of the symposium depends on its being restricted to a manageable size. He also emphasized that the symposium should not be a place where private concerns entered, but where the conversation would be of general interest.

The status of women improved during the Hellenistic period, especially as women had the opportunity for education. The great emphasis which Plutarch put on the marriage relationship can perhaps be partially explained by this rise in the status of women. Ideally the woman was now considered the equal of the husband and worthy to be his confidant. The two shared possessions and intellectual interests. Mere sexual κοινωνία was hardly the end of marriage. In contrast to Plato and Aristotle who regarded the family as existing for the good of the state, Plutarch emphasized that the good of the family is of primary importance since the state can only be as good as the families which comprise it.

The idea of the brotherhood of all men developed and flourished during the Hellenistic period. According to Plutarch, this was initiated by Alexander the Great who wanted to establish concord, peace, and κοινωνία among all men. Cosmopolitanism was also the doctrine of the Cynic and Stoic schools of philosophy.

The idea of brotherhood also influenced the institution of
slavery by mitigating the evils to which it was susceptible.
Plutarch praised the Romans who lived at the time of Caius Marcius for their humane treatment of slaves, but criticized Cato the Elder for his cruel treatment of his slaves. He commended the Roman custom of always leaving food on the table for the slaves to eat so that they could feel a κοινωνία with their masters.

A change occurred in the political ideals and practices of Greece between the classical and the Hellenistic-Roman periods. The Panhellenic League of Corinth, under the direction of Philip and then Alexander, did not destroy the autonomy of the Greek polis on the domestic level. Each polis made a separate alliance with Alexander and remained sovereign and autonomous except in regard to its foreign policy which was dictated by Alexander. This League had the possibility of uniting the Greek world and acting effectively as a check on the power of Macedon. With the death of Alexander, however, this possibility ended.

The half century following the death of Alexander was marked by the disputes of his generals jockeying for a part of the empire. During the third century the old forms of the autonomous city-state, the Assembly, Council, and magistrates, appeared not to have changed. A definite modification took place, however, as political life gradually lost its former interest and importance, as men and whole cities were being extended citizenship in other cities, and as synoecism was encouraged by various
dynasts.

The tendency developed for the individual cities to join leagues, which had also been part of Greek political tradition especially in Northern Greece. About 275 B.C. the Aetolian League began to expand in Greece, having promised the Macedonian king, Antigonus, that it would maintain a position of neutrality. About 250 B.C. the Achaean League began to grown under the leadership of Aratus of Sicyon. Polybius, the Greek historian captured by the Romans at the Battle of Pydna and taken to Rome, wrote about the political conflicts in Greece during the period 221-146 B.C. and the period just preceding it. Being a member of the Achaean League, he was of course prejudiced against Aetolia and Macedonia and obviously was a partisan of Rome. In his description of the actions of the Roman general Flamininus after the battle of Cynocephalae in 197 B.C., he told how the Aetolians resented the fact that Flamininus would not share the victory with them. This seems a much more accurate reaction than that which Plutarch presented of the Greeks delirious with joy to think that the Romans had restored their autonomy, an action which they attributed to an ancient and distant blood relation between Greece and Rome. It is doubtful whether such sentiment was involved. Tarn believes that Rome acted as she did from purely political motives.¹

¹Ibid., 25.
Soon however Rome came to favor the dominance of the individual cities rather than the leagues because she felt the former encouraged strong central authority. Between 196 B.C. and 146 B.C. she effected the cessation of the Boeotian, Locrian, Phocian, and Euboean leagues. The Achaean league became the most powerful league in Greece after the crushing of the Aetolian league, but it incurred the suspicion of Rome. Rome tried to weaken the league by encouraging the secession of its members. The Greeks finally declared war on Rome. The war began and ended in 146 B.C., a Roman victory. Individuals, democracies, cities, leagues suspected of opposition to Rome were killed, overthrown, destroyed, or dissolved. Greece was put into the hands of the Roman representative in Macedonia. Heavy tribute continued to be exacted from the impoverished Greeks until the time of Augustus and the Empire.

Soon after 146 B.C., however, Rome changed her policy and decided to tolerate the existence of the Greek league, some of which survived under the Empire with executive powers binding on all their members. Often the leagues themselves coalesced and formed larger associations. Rome also allowed free cities to exist in Greece. During the first and second centuries A.D. the cities were permitted to retain their individual constitutions and the variations and differences which were the remnants of earlier and freer times.

In contrast to the draining demand on Greece during the
Republican period, the emperors of Rome during the first and second centuries A.D. treated Greece with a deference which they showed to no other conquered land in the Empire. They brought peace, "the peace of exhaustion" it has sometimes been called, and a benevolent administration to Greece which enabled her to enjoy a renaissance accompanied by a limited religious revival. Many Greek cities advanced in prosperity. Though lack of fertility of the soil caused a decline in population, a high level of intellectual life was maintained.

In spite of this deferential treatment which Greece received, however, "in politics there was no opportunity or at least but slight encouragement for the exercise of talent, while economic conditions offered no inducement to ambition, socially, the position of Greece was very unimportant in the world."¹ Only in the realm of philosophy was Athens the acknowledged center of the Roman Empire.

It is in this historical context that Plutarch, "a man who embodies beyond all others the Greek spirit,"² must be understood. As a member of the aristocratic class in Boeotia he became interested in theological and philosophical speculation,

¹George Depe Hadzaits, "Prolegomena to a Study of the Ethical Ideal of Plutarch and the Greeks of the First Century A.D.," (University Studies, Series II; University of Cincinnati, 1906), II, 13.

especially in the realm of ethics, which engrossed the Greek men of leisure in this period; "the ethics of this period were eclectic in character; we find the artistic and the humanistic, the national and the cosmopolitan, the social and the individualistic, the objective and the subjective all contributing to this system of ethics."¹ Plutarch emphasized the ethical in his Moralia and in his Lives of Noble Greeks and Romans. Philanthropia, one of the leading virtues proposed to the civilized and educated man by the ethical systems of the day, was the governing principle of his ethics. It consisted in a spirit of courtesy, consideration, kindness, and clemency to one's enemies.² This spirit of philanthropia applied to all areas of human relations, including politics.

Involvement in political life was traditional among the Greeks and was advocated by the philosophical schools of the period. Plutarch's own attitudes to an involvement in political life are clearly revealed in the Morals and the Lives. He advocated participation in the life of the polis as eminently suited to "the life of gentle, civil, and sociable animals, framed by

¹Hadzsits, op. cit., 65.

nature to live civilly, honestly, and for the benefit of mankind."
The welfare of the polis was not solely the concern of the
elected officials in his opinion but was the obligation of each
citizen. Plutarch himself lived according to these principles.
In his Political Praecepts he comments: "I, on the other hand,
say to those who criticize me for standing and watching tiles
being measured or concrete or stones being delivered, that I
attend these things, not for myself, but for my native place."^2
He cautioned his fellow-citizens not to attempt to model their
present behavior on the deeds, ideals, and action of their ances-
tors if these are not suitable to the present circumstances—an
attitude in sharp contrast with that of the orators of the fourth
century B.C. who strove to live according to an ideal which was
no longer possible in the historical circumstances which faced
them.

Plutarch reminded the Greeks that their officials were in
turn subject to the Roman proconsuls. He urged them not to go
beyond the liberty granted by those in authority over them,^3 but
also encouraged them to make friends among the influential Roman
administrators since they were fond of promoting the political

1 An Seni Respublica Gerenda Sit 791C.
2 Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae 811C.
3 Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae 813EF.
interests of their friends. He reminded them that such friendships would not only be personally rewarding but would also benefit the political community. He cautioned them however against further humbling their country in the process of obeying their Roman rulers, because he was not oblivious of the degradation which the Greeks had previously suffered at the hands of the Romans.

These attitudes which Plutarch advocated were reflected in his own actions. Between 75 and 90 A.D. Plutarch went quite frequently to Rome as an envoy from his native town Chaeronea. While there he acquired lasting friends among many influential Romans, including Q. Sosius Senecic, consul in 99 A.D. and 107 A.D.; Mestrius Florus; Iunius Arulenus Rusticus, praetor in 99 A.D.; C. Minucius Fundanus, consul in 107 B.C. and proconsul of Asia; Passius, and Sextius Sulla of Carthage. His Lives, comparing eminent Greeks and Romans, indicate his respect for virtue wherever he found it. They were not a testimonial to his slavish submission to the status quo of Roman rule but rather to his practical insight that the present circumstances must be accepted as it was and made the most of, without, however, the sacrifice

1 Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae 814C.
2 Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae 814C.
3 Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae 814EF.
4 Babbitt, op. cit., xi.
of principle. He seemed to want to teach the Greeks that Roman history is worth their attention, and that an outlook and purpose common to both peoples might come about if they would share their pasts. At the same time he reminds his countrymen, and the Romans too, that they had had warriors and patriots who might be compared with those of Rome.

Plutarch's attitude toward the Romans was not unique. Rostovtzeff has commented:

The activity of Dio..., the speeches of Aelius Aristides, even the diatribes of Lucian, all show that the leading classes in the Greek speaking portions of the Empire gradually acquiesced in the existing state of things, that they abandoned their dreams of liberty, and worked for the consolidation of Roman power in the East.

Among the practical benefits which the Greeks received from their inclusion in the Roman empire was the restoration and construction undertaken by the Emperor Hadrian at Delphi. This in turn helped to stimulate a religious revival in Greece in which Plutarch was intimately involved, being at the time of Hadrian's munificence, one of two priests of Apollo at Delphi elected for life.

Rose has described Plutarch's ideal man as:

one who recognizes, in theory and in practice, the rights of the rest of the world, individually and collectively, from the State, which he must be ready to serve, down to the humblest members of society, if they can be called members of society at all, slaves; indeed, even the lower animals come

---

1 Sandbach, CAH,

in for their share of kindly treatment.¹

This ideal could only have been the product of the philosophical, social, and political developments of the Hellenistic-Roman period. Aspects of it are present in the various thought of the authors studied in this chapter. But Plutarch himself, in his thought and his life was the ideal which he envisioned and advocated.

¹Rose, op. cit., 60.
CHAPTER V

KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA AND RELATED AUTHORS OF THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

Introduction

Titus Flavius Clemens, known familiarly as Clement of Alexandria, is the third major author in whose writings κοινωνία and its cognates are to be considered in detail. He was born about the middle of the second century A.D., but his birthplace is uncertain.¹ The name Flavius has evoked the speculations that his family may have been made Roman citizens by that emperor² and that he may have been descended from a freedman of T. Flavius Clemens, a nephew of Vespasian and consul in 95 A.D., who was

¹Athens is most frequently suggested as Clement's birthplace, though Albert C. Outler, "The 'Platonism' of Clement of Alexandria," The Journal of Religion, 20 (July, 1940), 213 objects that Clement's "express disavowal of interest in 'trying to be Greek' seems to indicate that he was not an Athenian. Friedrich Quatember, Die Christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandria nach seinem Pädagogus, Mit einer Kritischen Voruntersuchung über die Person des Klemens und sein Werk, den Pädagogus (Wien: Herder, 1946), 27 suggests Alexandria as his birthplace.

executed under Domitian.\(^1\) Whatever his ancestry and place of birth, it is obvious from his writings that Clement received an excellent classical education.\(^2\) His conversion to Christianity seems to have taken place during his adult years\(^3\) and was followed by travels in Greece, Italy and the East to hear the lectures of the famous Christian teachers. His journeys ended about 180 A.D. when he met in Alexandria the famous teacher Pantaenus who at that time was also one of the presbyters of the Christian church there.\(^4\)

The intellectual, cultural, and spiritual milieu of Alexandria were destined to have a significant impact on Christian life and thought. Egypt itself played a role of great importance in the "religious development of late antiquity...for this country was the crucible in which Greek, Oriental, and native elements were mixed, melted, fused and recast."\(^5\) Alexandria, the capital city of Egypt, "was a centre for a certain reconciliation

---


\(^2\) Outler, op. cit., 218.

\(^3\) H. Idris Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, Being the Forwood Lecture for 1952 (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), 96.

\(^4\) Lietzmann, op. cit., 276.

between the best thought of paganism and the nascent intellectual world of Christianity"¹ in the second and third centuries A.D. It was also the home of the largest single Jewish community in Egypt.²

The tradition that the Christian church in Alexandria was founded by Mark, the disciple of Peter, occurs late and is at best doubtful.³ Lietsmann describes it as "a deduction based on knowledge as to the historical relationship between the two churches,"⁴ of Alexandria and Rome. Satisfactory evidence for the presence of Christianity in Egypt during the first century A.D. is also lacking, but it seems a fairly certain assumption that Christianity reached Alexandria before the end of the first century.⁵ There is direct evidence that Christianity was fairly

¹H. Idris Bell, Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest: A Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism. Being the Gregynog Lectures for 1946 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 90

²Bell, Cults and Creeds, 36.

³Bell, Cults and Creeds, 79.

⁴Lietsmann, op. cit., 67.

⁵Bell, Egypt, 86 comments: "On the early diffusion of Christianity in Egypt we are singularly ill informed. The tradition that the Alexandrian Church was founded by St. Mark may probably be dismissed as a legend, but it can be assumed that the new faith would not be long in reaching the chief ports in the eastern Mediterranean, and once there it was bound to spread to other parts of Egypt. Yet it has left no trace in any of the first-century papyri so far discovered, and even in documents of the second century there is remarkably little clear evidence of its influence. That it was already well established in Middle and Upper Egypt, may, however, be inferred from the evidence of literary papyri."
widespread in Egypt by the end of the second century A.D. The scarcity of information about the early development of Christianity in Egypt, coupled with the fact that practically the only allusions made to Egyptian Christians in the first seventy-five years of the second century concerned heretics, has led to the conclusion that an heretical Christianity developed in Egypt about which the orthodox writers chose to keep silence. The earliest record of orthodoxy in Alexandria occurred during the episcopacy of Demetrius, 189-231 A.D.

Pantaenus, whose disciple Clement had become, was head of the Christian catechetical school at Alexandria. It has been suggested that he taught a gnostic Christianity different from the elementary Christianity of the simple faithful. This is difficult to prove, however, because Pantaenus himself did not write and his lectures have not survived, if they were ever

1Bell, Cults and Creeds, 81, 83 says: "Thus we have four definitely Christian papyri (one of them heretical) found in Egypt which were written in the second century, and four others which can with varying degrees of probability be classed with them...Thus we are justified in arguing that from the middle of the second century onwards, there was a not inconsiderable Christian element in Middle Egypt, whence the majority of our papyri come."

2Lietzmann, op. cit., 275.

3Ibid., 276.

recorded.\(^1\) The "school" of which he was the head was not an organized institution\(^2\) nor was it directed by ecclesiastical authority.\(^3\) Rather, it has been compared to a modern study club meeting in the teacher's home.\(^4\) Pantaenus' "school" was composed mainly of Alexandrian Greeks, both converts and inquirers, from the upper social levels. The intellectual interests of the group were broad, embracing philosophy, allegorism and its relation to both Old and New Testaments, and gnosticism.\(^5\)

Clement either joined Pantaenus in teaching\(^6\) or succeeded him as head of the school\(^7\) and remained in Alexandria until the persecution of 200-203 A.D. under Septimius Severus forced him to leave the city. It has been speculated that local interests at

\(^1\)Attempts to find traces of the teachings of Pantaenus in the writings of Clement have not been successful according to Lietzmann, \textit{op. cit.}, 277 and Johannes Munck, \textit{Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandrien Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte} (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 185.


\(^3\)In fact it is only with Origen that we can speak of a school as such. Cf. Gustave Bardy, "Pour l'histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie," \textit{Vivre et Penser} (2 series; 1942), I, 80-109.


\(^5\)Lietzmann, \textit{op. cit.}, 277 and Bigg, \textit{op. cit.}, 57.

\(^6\)Bardy, "Origines," 89-90.

\(^7\)Lietzmann, \textit{op. cit.}, 276.
Alexandria, such as the priests of Serapis or professors in the Museum, may have provoked the persecution because of their irritation at the success of Clement and his catechetical school. After departing from Alexandria, Clement went to visit the pupil Alexander in Cappadocia. Perhaps he also spent some time in Jerusalem when Alexander moved there. In 211 A.D. he moved to Antioch, bearing an episcopal communication from Caesarea. He died some few years later.

Clement's works include: Protrepticus, Paedagogus, Stromata, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae Prophetiae, Quis Dives Salutetur. Other works attributed to Clement, which exist merely in fragments or as references in other authors, are: The Hypotyposes, an exegetical work on the Old and New Testaments, On the Pasch, Ecclesiastical Canon, On Providence, Discourses on Fasting, On Slander, and On the Prophet Amos.

Considerations on the dating of the Protrepticus,


2 Ibid., I, 23.

3 Ibid., 24.

4 Lietzmann, op. cit., 277.

5 Tollinton, op. cit., 25-26 suggests his death occurred before 215 A.D. Eugene de Faye; Clément d'Alexandrie: Œtude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au IIe siècle (Paris: E. Leroux, 1891), 27 suggests that it took place in 216 A.D.
paedagogi, and Stromata have remained largely hypothetical, since, as Tollinton has observed, no theory fits all the facts and no new evidence has appeared to confirm one view or the other. The lost work, Hypotyposes, has been considered an early one by Lietzmann and as Clement's latest work, written after he

1 Robert P. Casey, "Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Platonism," Harvard Theological Review, 18 (January, 1925), 45-46 advanced the opinion that the Protrepticus appeared shortly after Clement's appointment to the catechetical school at Alexandria. Tollinton, op. cit., II, 325 regarded the Stromata as the first work which Clement wrote for publication, begun sometime after the death of Commodus in 192 A.D. with Book I dated no earlier than 195 A.D. He also maintained that the Protrepticus, Paedagogi, and Stromata were written in the order in which we possess them while Clement was in Alexandria. Ibid., 328. In his opinion the rest of Clement's writings belong to his post-Alexandrian period. Ibid., 333. Zahn dated the Stromata at 202-203 A.D. Harnack accepted this date for the earlier part of the Stromata but held that the latter part was done after his departure from Alexandria. Wendland, however, proposed that the order of these works was: Protrepticus, Stromata I-IV, Paedagogi, Stromata V-VII. This view was supported by Harnack and Heussi. Cf. John Patrick, Clement of Alexandria, The Croall Lecture for 1899-1900 (Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and sons, 1914). 10. Van Arnim and de Faye held that the Stromata was Clement's last work, interrupted by his death, while Zahn and Major believed that other works followed it. Cf. Tollinton, op. cit., I, 205. Tollinton remarked: "It is not possible to prove, but it is legitimate to suppose, that Clement wrote the Stromata in Alexandria and was cut short by the persecution under Severus in his task." He never returned to it again. Ibid., 206.

2 Lietzmann, op. cit., II, 291 says of the Hypotyposes: "It still survived at the time of Photius, who indignantly asserted that, in addition to many justifiable views, it expressed doubtful and indeed blasphemous opinions, of which he reproduces a few. Most of the heresies which he regrets, appear to be exaggerations of genuine Clementine speculation, and possibly, the book should be ascribed to the author's early period. Nevertheless, on account of its theological defects, the work was consigned to oblivion by the orthodox of a later date."
left Alexandria, by Zahn, Westcott, and Chapman.\(^1\) Again there is no conclusive evidence for either view.

Scrutiny of the developmental relationship of the various works has centered largely on the Protrepticus, Paedagogus, and Stromata. Until recently it had been assumed that these three works each dealt with one of the three topics mentioned in Paedagogus I where it is said that the Logos in dealing with men "first exhorts, then trains, and finally teaches."\(^2\) Clement, it is supposed, had addressed the Protrepticus to pagans, the Paedagogus to converts to Christianity, and the Stromata to those tending to gnostic perfection.

Observation of a lack of unified plan in the Stromata\(^3\) and its literary weakness\(^4\) led to the suggestion that the Stromata was not the work which Clement had proposed to write to those tending to gnostic perfection but merely a preparation for that

---

\(^{1}\) Patrick, op. cit., 25.


\(^{4}\) Casey, op. cit., 70.
work, which was entitled the Didascalus. Scholarly speculation expanded and elaborated the problem for decades. Finally, however, Volker seems to have concluded the argument in a common sense fashion, saying that one should not expect of Clement the precision of modern scholars in indicating the plan of his works and quoting Puech who has characterized the whole question as "une querelle de mots." 

The nature and purpose of the Stromata, the Excerpta ex Theodoto and the Eclogae Propheticas have also been under consideration. The function of the Stromata as preparatory to the

---

1 de Faye, op. cit., 78, 104. De Faye's view is reflected in Casey's statement that the Stromata are a "prolegomena to the study of systematic theology." Op. cit., 46. Gustave Bardy, Clement d'Alexandrie (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1926), 21 objected to the identification of the two works on the grounds that the Stromata falls far short of the ideal proposed for the Didascalus. Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Utrecht, Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1953), II, 12 maintained that Clement gave up his plan to write the Didascalus because it was beyond his capabilities, and wrote the Stromata instead. Lietzmann, op. cit., 287 took much the same position. Berthold Altaner, Patrology, tr. Hilda C. Graef (Freiburg: Herder, 1960), 217 suggested it was because the Stromata contained much of the material Clement had intended for the Didascalus that he gave up the projected work. Heussi, according to Tollinton, op. cit., I, 327, maintained "that the Stromata are the Master, in so far as this part of Clement's project was ever realized." Tollinton, ibid., I, 192 agreed with this point of view as did Munck, op. cit., 126, who proposed in addition that there was a double trilogy contained in Clement: the first was Prædicticus, Paedagogus, and Didascalus, and the second was Stromata I, Stromata II, and "Physiologia." If Stromata I was not itself the Didascalus, then the later trilogy constituted it. Ibid., 111.

2 Volker, op. cit., 33-34.
Didascalus has already been mentioned. De Faye has described it as an apology for the use of Greek philosophy in Christian theology.1 Tollinton, following Heussi, maintained that the "central purpose of the Stromateis was doctrinal, however imperfectly this may have been realized."2

Whatever the opinion on the nature of this work, the consensus of scholarly opinion is that the so-called Book VIII is not an integral part of the Stromata; Cross referred to it as a collection of notes4 as did Chadwick5 who suggested that it was added to the incomplete work after Clement's death.6 This was probably done by a literary executor who gave it the title;7 Despite the fact that Eusebius of Caesarea and Plotius both mentioned eight books in the Stromata,8 Clement's words at the end of the Book VII that he will "proceed with his argument from a fresh

---

1 de Faye, op. cit., 46.
2 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 192.
5 Chadwick, op. cit., 17.
6 Ibid.
8 Chadwick, op. cit., 17.
beginning" are now generally taken to indicate that Book VIII of the *Stromata* is the beginning of a new book.¹

The *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and the *Eclogae Propheticae* follow the *Stromata* in the manuscripts. De Faye has suggested that the *Excerpta* contain extracts of gnostic books which, with other extracts from the philosophers in the fragment of Book VIII of the *Stromata*, were the material upon which Clement wanted to draw for the *Didascalus*. Patrick has suggested that the *Excerpta* were extracts from an otherwise unknown gnostic author named Theodotus. The *Eclogae Propheticae* were, according to Casey, "note books containing materials gathered from other works and tentative formulations of the author's own view."² The *Hypotyposeis*, Book VIII of the *Stromata* and gnostic writings have all been suggested as the source of the *Eclogae*.

The authenticity of several of the works attributed to Clement has been questioned. Wendland's objection to the authenticity of the *Paedagogus* on the grounds that it is so saturated with Stoicism that Clement could not have written it, has not

¹Westcott, *op. cit.*, 563.
gained support.¹

An Address to the Newly Baptized has at times been included among the works of Clement following its discovery by Barnard in the Escorial Library and his conjecture as to its authenticity.² Not all accept this conjecture, however, Tollinton observed that it "may well be an extremely interesting summary of Clement's teaching, but it is difficult, on grounds of style, to regard it as actually coming from his pen."³

The final consideration concerns the general level of Clement's scholarship. Clement of Alexandria was held in high repute as a man of learning from his own time⁴ until 1879 when Hermann Diels called him "a diligent but uncritical plagiarist."⁵ because of his apparently indiscriminate, inaccurate and second-

¹Munck, op. cit., 31. It has been noted that the "Hymn to Christ the Savior" attributed to Clement and attached to the end of the Paedagogus, bears certain resemblances both in form and ideas to the "Isis Litany" discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1903. Marvin Bascom Norwood, "The Hymn of Clement and the Isis Litany" Unpublished Master's Thesis; (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1926), 17 suggests that "there must have been some interdependence of the forces which produced them, and that...they must have come out of the streams of life at the same stage of its development."


³Tollinton, op. cit., I, 201.

⁴St. Jerome praised Clement as the most learned of the Fathers. Cf. Ep. LXX.4.

⁵Outler, op. cit., 221. Cf. also Tollinton, op. cit., I, 156.
hand use of his sources. Since that time, scholars have attempted either to support or to disprove Diels' theory.

Those who criticized Clement's scholarship asserted that he could not possibly have been directly familiar with the three hundred forty-eight authors referred to in the course of his writings. 1 Undoubtedly their observation that he made use of 'florilegia' was correct. But whether this fact is sufficient to condemn Clement as "a diligent but uncritical plagiarist" is open to question.

Two points may be made in Clement's defense. First, Clement had much more than a superficial knowledge of those authors whose thought influenced him significantly. His writings reveal his obvious familiarity both with the Old Testament, which is his main and most frequently quoted source, 2 and with the New Testament, which he quotes mainly from memory. 3 It is obvious that he was also personally familiar with the heretical treatises of the Gnostics. 4 In addition, there can "be no question that he had an excellent first-hand knowledge of most of the classics of Greek literature." 5 He quotes Plato, his favorite classical author,

1 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 157.
4 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 128, 165.
5 Norris, op. cit., 21.
some one hundred sixty times, exclusive of general references to
him,\(^1\) and these citations have been shown to come directly from
Plato's works rather than from a compilation of quotations.\(^2\) A com­
parison of Clement's Protrepticus and Plato's Phaedrus made by
Butterworth indicates that the former work is filled with allu­
sions to the latter, and that none of the direct quotations from
the Phaedrus would have been obtained from a book of abstracts.\(^3\)

In further justification of Clement's critical and intelligent
use of his sources, Outler, whose study comparing twelve of Cle­
ment's longest quotations from Plato with the original indicated
that Clement was in general faithful to the text,\(^4\) has observed:

Clement's 'Platonism' is neither a direct nor a faithful re­
production of the Plato we know, whether from the later dia­
logues or from Aristotle's Metaphysics. At the same time, it
is important to observe that Clement's estimate and use of
Plato give no indication that he was aware of any distortion
or novelty in his interpretation, either of the man or of the
dialogues. This suggests inevitably that Clement understood
Plato in accordance with views long current in Alexandria and
the Hellenistic world.\(^5\)

From the results of these studies, it seems safe to conclude

\(^1\)Tollinton, op. cit., I, 7.

\(^2\)Frank Lowry Clark, "Citations of Plato in Clement of Alex­
andria" (Transaction and Proceeding of the American Philological
Association; Boston, 1902), XXXIII, xv.

\(^3\)G.W. Butterworth, "Clement of Alexandria's PROTREPTICUS
and the PHAEDRUS of Plato", Classical Quarterly, X (1916), 205.

\(^4\)Outler, op. cit., 223.

\(^5\)Ibid., 236-237.
that, though Clement undoubtedly did not have the same degree of familiarity with all of the writers whom he quoted or mentioned, nevertheless he knew well the works of the authors whose thought had a significant influence on his own writings and he used them reliably and intelligently.

Of the other classical authors, Homer, Euripides, and the Stoics were also well known to him. He quoted the writings of Philo Judaeus almost as often as he quoted Plato. He also had Plutarch's works in his library, even though "they were not very frequently unrolled."

Second, Clement was a man of his age and that age was not one of originality and creativity. "It produced no writer of the first rank. It was artificial rather than spontaneous. It was imitative more than original. It was appreciative rather than constructive." But to deny that Clement was a creative genius is not necessarily to imply that he was not a man of some intellectual stature and perception. He was the first among the Church Fathers "to see the necessity of formulating a Christian theory of the universe, a Christian philosophy of history, and a

---

1 Norris, op. cit., 21.
2 Ibid.
3 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 71.
Christian code of ethics." He also recognized the importance of reconciling philosophy and Christian theology. 

Perhaps, indeed, his chief contribution to Christianity was "his quiet yet effective work in giving to the hitherto intellectually undisciplined Christian movement a respectable standing among the educated and well to do." Whether one agrees with Tollinton, that "he did greater work than it was in his nature to do" because of the favorable political, social, spiritual, and intellectual milieu in which he lived and worked, still it seems impossible to deny that Clement made a definite contribution to the thought of his time and that, despite justifiable criticism, he is "still a scholar of deserved repute."

The impact of the Greek philosophers, especially Plato, of Philo Judaeus and Judaic tradition, and of the Old and New Testaments upon the thought of Clement is obvious both from the frequency of his quotations from or allusions to these authors and works and from the manner in which he assimilated their ideas and perspectives and literary methods. A brief examination of each

---

1Patrick, op. cit., 32.


3Patrick, op. cit., 231.

4Tollinton, op. cit., I, 65.

5Ibid., 162.
of these authors or works, both in reference to Clement's understanding and use of them and in their use of κοινωνία and its cognates,¹ as well as of the phenomenon of gnosticism, which pervaded the thought world of the patristic period, will be advantageous before beginning a detailed study of κοινωνία and its cognates in Clement of Alexandria.

Plato was the most influential of the Greek philosophers in shaping Clement's thought. His was not only philosophical thought influencing Clement however.² Aristotelian, Stoic, and Neo-Platonic elements have also been detected in certain aspects

¹Cf. Chapters III and IV for the use of κοινωνία in the philosophers however.

²Munck, op. cit., 208-209 and Johannes Meifort, Der Platonismus bei Clemens Alexandrinus (Tübingen, 1928), 2, 9, agree that Clement felt most at home in the world of Platonism, but Munck adds that he was also familiar with Stoicism and Neopythagoreanism, and Meifort, that strictly speaking he was an eclectic. Tollinton, op. cit., I, 7 observes that he drew from all the schools—Platonic, Stoic, Cynic, Pythagorean, Epicurean—and that he abandoned none of them except the Epicurean when he became a Christian. Osborn, op. cit., 78, J. Wytzes, "The Two Fold Way (I): Platonic Influences in the Work Clement of Alexandria," Vigiliae Christianae, XI (December, 1957), 241, and R.E. Witt, "The Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria," Classical Quarterly, 25(1931), 195 all recognize a strong Stoic element in Clement's thought.
of his theology, ethics, epistemology, and methodology. Only the Epicureans, it seems, did not make some contribution to his thought.

1. Despite the position of de Faye, op. cit., 256-237 that Clement's conception of God has no trace of Stoic influence in it, Tollinton, op. cit., II, 279 believes that Stoic influence can be seen in the emphasis on the immanence of God found in Clement.

2. de Faye, op. cit., 204, Mark, in Patrick, op. cit., 141, and Th. Camelot, Foi et Gnose: Introduction a L'Etude de la Connaissance Mystique chez Clement d'AleXandrie (Paris: J. Vrin, 1945), 543 hold that Clement is principally a disciple of the Stoics in his ethics. According to Osborn, op. cit., 102, Clement's concepts of providence, virtue, good will, and apatheia are derived, to a great degree from the Stoics. His ideal gnostic has affinities with the Stoic "Wise Man" especially in his practice of apatheia, according to Tollinton, op. cit., I, 169. Clement is a Platonist in his ethics according to J. Wytzes, op. cit., and Ritter, cited in Patrick, op. cit., 141. Osborn, op. cit., 100, sees Aristotelian influences in the ideas of end, purpose, function, measure, mean, and right reason with Clement uses Dahne claims Clement is a Neo-Platonist in his ethics, according to Patrick, op. cit., 141.

3. Henry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), I, 112, maintains that Clement adopted the Aristotelian term "faith" and identified it with the Stoic term "assent" both meaning "the acceptance of some doctrine as a result of having been rationally demonstrated."

4. Westcott, op. cit., 561 sees in the Word of Clement who addresses, trains and teaches a parallel to the Neo-Platonic system of purification, initiation, and vision.

5. Camelot, Foi et Gnose, 543, says that Clement criticized the Epicurean materialism and emphasis on pleasure and for all practical purposes rejected their philosophy.
The progress of determining what contributions the Greek philosophers made to Clement's thought is complicated by the fact that many of the elements which can be attributed to the influence of Greek philosophy, such as those related to the nature of God,  
man as the image of God,  
the nature of the human soul,  
etics 

1Meifort, op. cit., 86 has observed that the idea of the incarnation as the self-revelation of God is completely unplatonic. R. Newton Flew, The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology: An Historical Study of the Christian Ideal for the Present Life (London: H. Milford, 1934), 142 objects that "Clement is working with an idea of God which is essentially Hebraic and not merely or even predominantly Hellenic."

2Cuthbert Lattey, "The Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria: Some Further Notes," Journal of Theological Studies 17(1916), 257-258 objects to regarding the idea of man as the image of God in Clement as a Platonic influence. He holds that this is one of the central doctrines of St. Paul and, in addition, Clement's use of this idea could also reflect the influence of Hellenistic ruler-worship.

3Meifort, op. cit., 25 holds that Clement's tripartite soul reflects the influence of both Plato and Paul.

4Volker, op. cit., 102 maintains that Clement's ethics are derived basically from the New Testament. But Osborn, op. cit., 94 criticizes Volker for unnecessarily minimizing the influence of philosophy upon the formulation of Clement's ethics. In regard to Clement's emphasis on ἄπαθεια, generally regarded as a Stoic virtue, Theodor Ruther, Die sittliche Förderung der Apathie in den beiden ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten und bei Klemens von Alexandrien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des christlichen Volksheitsbegriffes. (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1949) has said: "Die Lehre des Klemens von der Apathie hat am Christus leben Menschenbilde der Zukunft mitgestaltet," Henri-Dominique Pire, "Sur l'emploi des termes Apatheia et Eileos dans les œuvres de Clément d'Alexandrie," Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, 27(July, 1938), 249 indicates that, while the term Apatheia retains its Stoic meaning, "exclusion de mouvements passionnels," in Clement, in addition he often couples it with the concept eileos or compassion in the Christian sense.
and mysticism,\textsuperscript{1} can also be regarded as coming from the New Testament. It is not necessary, however, or even wise, to attempt to isolate too completely these various influences on Clement's thought. It was Clement's significant contribution to have seen the necessity for the integration of Greek philosophy with Christian theology.\textsuperscript{2} Spanneut has suggested that the earlier Church Fathers had been influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by Stoicism and that Clement's thought forms the transitional link

\textsuperscript{1}According to Casey, op. cit., 45 the mystical element in Clement's thought was derived most likely from Paul and John as well as from Plato. Clement has been given the title "father of intellectual mysticism." Cf. Casey, op. cit., 96. Many have held that Clement was himself a mystic; Cf. Volker, op. cit., 45, Munck, op. cit., 82 and Le Gnostique de Saint Clément d'Alexandrie. Opuscule inédit de Fenelon (Paris, 1930). But Bigg seems to have effectively demonstrated that while Clement was the father of the mystics, he does not seem to have been one himself. Cf. Bigg, op. cit., Tollinton, op. cit., II, 237 and Molland, The Conception of the Gospel in Alexandrian Theology (Oslo, 1938), 81.

\textsuperscript{2}Claude Mondésert, Clément D'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'Étude de sa Pensée religieuse à partir de l'écriture (Aubier: Éditions Montaigne, 1944), 1-2 has commented, "Il était le premier à avoir abordé avec assez d'ampleur le problème des relations de la foi et de la philosophie; on redécouvre aujourd'hui qu'il est aussi très profondément religieux, qu'il même déjà théologien et précisément théologien parce que philosophe."
between the Stoic and the Platonic influence on Christianity.¹ Muckle speculated that Clement may have been following a tradition established by his teacher Pantaenus in attempting to integrate both Platonism and Stoicism into Christian theology.² Clement, however, seems to have been primarily concerned with the relation and equation of the New Testament and Plato³ and with

¹Michel Spanneut, Le Stoicisme des Fêtes de L’Église (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1957), 425 says: "Clément d’Alexandrie mérite également une révision des positions classiques. Son anthropologie est loin d’être toujours platonicienne. Il est souvent dichotomiste et divise l’âme à la mode stoicienne, en accordant à l’égemonikon un rôle unificateur. Dans ses théories de la génération et de l’hérédité, fusionnement des éléments de toute origine. Dans a conception de la connaissance, le système du Por­tique apparaît, par bribes, à peu près au complet: ne va-t-il pas jusqu’à proner un certain sensualisme? En morale, l’influence est manifeste, surtout dans son insistance sur l’apathie et dans sa tendance intellectualiste. En théologie, il décrit le rôle unifiant de la Providence, qui pénètre, tout, et surtout crée une atmosphère religieuse proche du néo-stoïcisme contemporain. Enfin, il devise les êtres créés selon la classification stoicienne et professe sur le monde beaucoup de thèses de même origine. On a peut-être trop vite conclu que Clément était le premier des Platoniciens chrétiens. Il n’est comme Athénagore, que le témoin de la philosophie éclectique et religieuse de son époque." Herbert Musurillo, S.J., "New Horizons in Patristic Neo­-Theology: A Survey of Recent Work," Traditio, XIV (1958), 59 evaluates Spanneut’s work as follows: One wonders if the skeins of Stoicism can be so accurately disentangled within the mesh of Hellenistic and late Roman philosophers, at a time when a vulgarization, kind of philosophic leveling process, had already set in. But in all honesty the author does not press his points excessively, and although his array of evidence still leaves one with a twinge of doubt, it is a monumental work of undoubted merit.


³Casey, op. cit., 96.
the insights which Plato might provide for a better understanding of the New Testament, since "all that was valuable in Platonism was implied in the New Testament."¹

Because of the marked influence of Plato upon Clement's thought, "there has been a constant debate as to whether Clement really is a Platonic Christian or simply an 'intellectually Christianized' Platonist."² Many writers have followed Bigg's view of regarding Clement as a Christian Platonist.³ Enslin stressed that he is "a Christian, and a convinced one. But he sees profound values in other systems and is not ashamed to recognize them."⁴ Meifort has questioned the idea of a Christian Platonism.⁵ Wytzes perhaps comes closer to the truth when, quoting Pohlenz, he describes the thought found in Clement's writings as "Greek Christianity" rather than as Christian Platonism.⁶

The influence of Plato upon Clement was primarily in the

¹Ibid.
³Molland, Conception of Gospel, 173; Outler, op. cit., 220.
⁴Enslin, op. cit., 229.
⁵Meifort's views have also been criticized however. Outler, op. cit., 220 says: "His Plato is a sort of Pauline Christian absorbed in a quest for salvation and mystical exaltation. Such an interpretation of Plato and of Clement, as well, can be called into the question."
⁶Wytzes, op. cit., 236.
Both men highlighted the transcendence of God, but with different motives. Plato tried "to keep the Deity from contact with the world. The aim of Clement is rather, in harmony with his view of a universal providence, to maintain the unconditional freedom of God and to emphasize the necessity of revelation."  

Clement's idea of man as the image of God has Platonic overtones, though it may spring "indirectly and not directly from Plato." With Plato himself it is clear that the chief connotation of the phrase is the life of reason which, for him, is the life of true virtue. Clement reverses this relation. The life of ethical perfection is discussed in terms of growth in Christian grace and love. According to Wytzes, Clement maintains that man can become like God, but only on a completely different level from him. Man's likeness to God exists only in his

---

1 de Faye, op. cit., 264; Camelot, Foi et Gnose, 15.
2 Patrick, op. cit., 72; Tollinton, op. cit., II, 279.
3 Patrick, op. cit., 72-73.
5 Osborn, op. cit., 88.
6 Outler, op. cit., 231.
7 Wytzes, op. cit., 244.
Therefore the powers of his soul should be directed to the search for the divine and the development there of the image of God. The chief means to this end is the practice of contemplation which may result in a state of ecstasy, though few attain it. The final goal of the soul for Plato is to find "its ultimate peace in the world of ideas...that of Clement in the kosmos noetos." Man is able to blur the image of God in his soul by living on a natural level, however, and so both Plato and Clement try to deter him from this by the idea of punishment after death.

Neither Plato nor Clement thought of the body as evil in itself, but both taught that the body ought to be subordinated as the proper organ of the soul...The difference between Clement and Plato at this point is one both of emphasis and of object. Plato mistrusts the body because its ἀπαθείας give only appearance and not reality. Knowledge is direct rational insight, and sensual pleasures or pains hinder this. Clement, not nearly so concerned with scientific error, is aware that the passions and feelings of the body may corrupt the

---


3 Ibid., 147.

4 Outler, op. cit., 219.

5 Wytzes, Twofold Way II, 134.

6 de Pauley, op. cit., 117.

soul's desire for perfection. Therefore, the body must be rigidly controlled. The object of the body's subordination is, for Plato, ἔστιν κύριον; for Clement γνώσις.

Osborn has made the following comparison of the starting point and the end of the good and the nature of the good life as found in Plato and in Clement:

The starting point is, for Plato, the daemon or the ruling rational part of each human soul. The starting point is, for Clement, the image of God which every soul receives at birth. The end is, for Plato, the Good. The end is, for Clement, God. The good life is, for Clement, assimilation to God and restoration to perfect sonship.

Philo Judaeus is the second of the major influences on Clement's thought to be considered here. Philo, as a man of wide learning, deep spirituality, and a naturally philosophic temperament... was peculiarly fitted to be a link between the worlds of Judaism and Hellenism; indeed, he played in the life of Alexandrian Judaism the same role as Clement was to play later for the Christian community. He frequently reflects Stoic ideas but Platonism is the main Greek influence in his writings.

It has been suggested that philosophical Judaism was probably the medium through which the Greek and Christian worlds came into contact with each other. Undoubtedly Philo as a leading exponent of philosophical Judaism, was significantly influential in effecting this contact.

1Outler, op. cit., 234-235.
2Osborn, op. cit., 84.
3Bell, Cults and Creeds, 47-48.
4Hatch, op. cit., 128.
The influence of Philo on Clement was both methodological and doctrinal. Among the Alexandrian Jews of the first century B.C. and later, there developed a method of non-literal interpretation of Scripture based on knowledge derived from Greek philosophy known as philosophical allegory.\(^1\) This form of allegory differed from that used by the Jewish rabbis of the period. Philosophical allegory was adopted by some of the Alexandrian Jews in complete disregard of the traditional approach; others, of course, recognized only the traditional method of interpretation. Philo attempted to combine both methods in his Scriptural exegesis, at times restricting the use of philosophical allegory to trained students. While he realized the values to be found in Greek philosophy, Philo never ceased to regard philosophy as the handmaid of Scripture, thus indicating his belief in the subordination of reason to faith.\(^2\) In the tradition of Philo and under his influence, Clement also employed both types of allegory to the exegesis of the Old Testament. In addition, he extended the application of allegory to the New Testament following the example of Paul's allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament in

\(^1\) H.A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), 56-57. Characteristic of the philosophical type of allegory is the change of a term from its literal meaning which need not thereby be rejected, to a meaning which is philosophical, according to Wolfson, *Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, 36.

Clement followed Philo faithfully in regarding philosophy as subordinate to and dependent upon Scripture and the revelation of God. He set a pattern for Alexandrine theology, according to Bigg, which:

regarded Allegorism as having been handed down from Christ and a few chosen Apostles, through a succession of Teachers. They employed it boldly...for the reconciliation of Greek culture with the Hebrew Scriptures. And lastly they applied it to the New Testament...with the serious object of correcting the literal mechanical, hierarchical tendencies of the day.

The influence of Philo's Logos doctrine upon that of Clement has also been observed. The Logos doctrine has been described as the heart of Clement's theology and its most distinctive feature. It was a means of bridging the gap between the immanence and the transcendence of God. "God abides unknown; and yet through the Logos, to whom nothing is incomprehensible, there lies an avenue even to the knowledge of God." The Logos is "l'Image du Père, l'Idée du Père, la Face du Père, la lumière

---

1 This consisted of predictions regarding the first and second coming of Christ, predictions dealing with the pre-existence of Christ, and legal and moral predictions, according to Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, 43.

2 Bigg, op. cit., 57.

3 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 169.

4 Patrick, op. cit., 137; Quasten, op. cit., 21.

5 Tollinton, op. cit., I, 338.

6 Ibid., 352.
du Père.\textsuperscript{1} Tollinton claims that Clement "retains all the essential features of the Philonic conception and he has robbed it of none of its surpassing dignity."\textsuperscript{2} But, according to de Faye, though the two Logos doctrines seem identical at first glance, there is a basic difference in that Philo's Logos originates from the cosmological order, while Clement's Logos is an intermediary between god and man\textsuperscript{3} and reveals its Christian character in that it does not emanate into aeons or angels.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{2}Tollinton, \textit{op. cit.}, I, 353.

\textsuperscript{3}de Faye, \textit{op. cit.}, 328.

\textsuperscript{4}Lebreton, \textit{op. cit.}, 151-152. Two theories concerning the generation of the Logos were current in Clement's time according to H.A. Wolfson, "Clement of Alexandria on the Generation of the Logos," Church History, 20 (March, 1951). The twofold stage theory in which "the Logos at first existed from eternity in God and then prior to the creation of the world, it was generated from the essence of God as a distinct personal being," and the single stage theory in which "the generation of the Logos from God was from eternity." (72) Wolfson says that most writers include Clement in the second category, but that there are passages suggesting that he held the former view. (79) He suggests that Clement may have changed his opinion under the influence of Origen to the twofold stage theory sometime after he left Alexandria. (80).
Philo uses κοινωνία and its cognates to describe certain relationships and practices in the Old Testament and Essene communities. Moses he describes as a man who enjoyed κοινωνία with the Father and Maker of all.\(^1\) The Old Testament priests who offered the consecrated offerings were honored by being allowed to have κοινωνία with God in the thank-offerings rendered to Him.\(^2\) But the laws also insisted that those who carried out the sacrifices, namely those in need, as well as the priests should be "partners of the altar whose board they share."\(^3\) The laws instructed the rich to share their goods with the poor\(^4\) and at the feast of widows, orphans and all in need were entitled to share in the goods of those who were well-endowed.\(^5\)

Philo's description of the κοινωνία practiced in the Essene community provides an interesting parallel with the early Christian Church, though there is probably little question of


\(^2\) Philo De Specialibus Legibus I. 131.

\(^3\) De Specialibus Legibus I. 221.

\(^4\) De Specialibus Legibus II. 107.

\(^5\) De Specialibus Legibus II. 108.
direct contact between the two groups, and still less of influence.\textsuperscript{1} Josephus, another Jewish writer and contemporary of Philo, also refers to the Essenes and their practice of \textit{konvui	extit{à}. Citations from his writings on this topic will be incorporated here with those of Philo. In addition, information about this sect has been gained from the recent excavations at Qumran, considered by many as an Essene community\textsuperscript{2} and will be used as a

\textsuperscript{1}Millar Burrows, \textit{More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls} (New York: Viking Press, 1958), 132, says: "There may have been some contact, or perhaps contacts, direct or indirect, between the apostolic church and the community of Qumran. Several possibilities have been shown, but, contrary to the opinion of most recent writers on the scrolls, I cannot see anything more than vague possibilities. What the Dead Sea Scrolls actually demonstrate has been well summed up by Albright: they show that the writers of the New Testament 'drew from a common reservoir of terminology and ideas which were well known to the Essenes and'--this I would emphasize--'presumably familiar also to other Jewish sects of the period'.' "Although Essenism bore in itself more than one element that one way or another fertilized the soil from which Christianity was to spring, it is nevertheless evident that the latter religion represents something completely new which can only be adequately explained by the person of Jesus himself," Cf. J.T. Milik, \textit{Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea}, tr. J. Strugnell (Naperville, Ill.; A.R. Allenson, 1959), 143.

\textsuperscript{2}Frank Moore Cross, Jr., \textit{The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies}, The Haskell Lectures, 1956-57 (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 37-38 says: "There is now sufficient evidence ... to identify the people of the scrolls definitely with the Essenes. The community at Qumran was an Essene settlement." Burrows, \textit{op. cit.}, 253, says: "Not all scholars, however, are even now convinced that the issue is closed. Some still reject entirely the identification of the sect with the Essenes; others feel that it can be accepted only with qualifications and reservations." Milik, \textit{op. cit.}, 56 feels the conclusion that the members of the Qumran community were the Essenes is inescapable.
control on the testimony of Philo and Josephus.¹

Philo classifies the Essenes as that more select portion of the Jewish nation whom Moses trained for the life of fellowship because of their holiness.² He says that their love of man is expressed by their spirit of fellowship, which defies description.⁴ Such κοινωνία as exists among them "is the clearest evidence of a perfect and supremely happy life."⁴

One of the Essene practices which was directed to the preservation of the spirit of κοινωνία was a community of goods.⁵ The excavations at Qumran witness to this practice. There is evidence of a common pottery kiln, a common scriptorium, a common irrigation system, common storage facilities, and a common dining room. They had a common treasury, common disbursements, public meals. New members were required to surrender their property to

¹Liethemann, op. cit., I, 35 states, regarding the testimonies of Philo and Josephus on the Essenes: "the critical reader will do well to set aside the Greek emendations to both sketches."

²Philo Hypothetica 11.1.

³Philo Quod Omnis Probus 84.

⁴Quod Omnis Probus 91.

the community. 1

The Essenes disdained marriage as the sole or principal danger to the maintenance of the common life. 2 A wife, especially if she becomes a mother, is bound to compel her husband, in the interests of his family, "to commit actions which are all hostile to the life of fellowship." 3 Josephus mentions that, while they do not marry, they do adopt children and train them in the Essene way of life. He also mentions that one group of them did marry but had very strict rules governing the marriage. 4 The grave finds at Qumran, which include the bones of women and

1 Helmer Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls, tr. Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), 210, basing his statement on information gained from the Qumran documents, comments: "All who were admitted to membership in the community handed over their property to the community treasury, which was then administered in common (QS 1.11f cf. 111.2; vi. 19f). On the other hand, CD xiv. 13f. implies that a member was allowed control over his own income, for it is directed that a minimum of two days' wages per month were to be set aside for the common funds. Whether these regulations date from different periods or whether they actually should be reconciled with each other is uncertain."

2 Philo Hypo. 11.14. Cross, op. cit., 71-72, says regarding the wantonness of women: "This seems a convincing enough reason for the practice of celibacy...but one suspects it originates, not in Essene theology, but in Josephus' Hellenistic imagination." To explain the female burials at Qumran, Cross does not posit two sects of Essenes, one which married and another which did not, but rather he sees that there is "an ambiguous attitude toward marriage integral to the structure of the Essene faith."

3 Hypo. 11.16.

4 Josephus Jewish Wars II, 8.2-13.
children, suggest that while celibacy may have been the ideal, marriage was allowed.¹

κοινωνία as a sharing of goods and as a spirit of brotherly love and a participation in common meals appear as common characteristics of the Essenes. The group is united by sharing the same beliefs and prayer rituals and eschatological expectations, within the context of a common life.

A third major influence upon the thought of Clement of Alexandria, and undoubtedly the single most important one, are the Old and New Testaments. Clement's general understanding, appreciation and use of the two Testaments and the occurrences of κοινωνία and its cognates in them will be considered here.

The Old Testament, through which the Spirit, Logos, Educator, or Lord spoke to the Jews,² is for Clement a final authority, "the medium or embodiment of divine truth."³ He regards it as a direct manifestation of God in all but its anthropomorphic concept of Him.⁴ In rejecting the anthropomorphic concept of God Clement does not reduce God to a philosophic concept however. "To him God is not pure Being, self-sufficient in his own blessedness: His goodness is deed; He is living and working; He is

¹Cross, op. cit., 71-72.
²Quatember, op. cit., 63.
³Tollinton, op. cit., II, 193.
⁴de Faye, op. cit., 168, 222-223.
The harmony of the Old Testament Law and the Gospel is one of Clement's main tenets. Accordingly, the Old Testament and the New Testament have equal authority for him, but at times he puts the New Testament above the Old Testament, since the one is the fulfillment of the other. "Das Neue Testament bringt das Alte Testament zum Abschluss und bildet den Grund und den Prototyp für die kommenden Geschlechter," according to Kutter.

Clement's exegesis of the Old Testament is often made in light of the New Testament. He likes "to show in the Old Testament the figure of Christ." Christ as Logos is both the revelation of the Father and the Educator of the Christian, by His example and by the laws He established.

Scripture for Clement is a source of doctrine, a guide to living, and a source of gnosis leading to spiritual perfection. He is not overly conscious of the New Testament canon being

---

1Lew, op. cit., 142.
2Molland, Conception of Gospel, 16.
3Quatember, op. cit., 63.
4Hermann Kutter, Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897), 152.
6Jules Lebreton, op. cit., 161.
7Mondesert, op. cit., 263.
formed during his time, because he finds a basic harmony between the teaching of the Lord, the doctrine of the Apostles, the tradition of the Church, and the contents of the two Scriptures,¹ which he regards as "modes of revelation, rather than fixed collections of books."²

The Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was known as the Septuagint or LXX.³ "At the time of the early Roman empire, 

¹Molland, Conception of Gospel, 16.
²Tollinton, op. cit., II, 175.
³According to the Letter of Aristeas, published either between 145-127 B.C. or c. 100 B.C. (Bell, Cults and Creeds, 44) the translation of the Hebrew Scripture, beginning with the Pentateuch, ("Introduction" to A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the apocryphal books), ed. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, assisted by other Scholars (Graz: Akademie Verlag), I, xxii. into Greek for the Jews of the diaspora was undertaken during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos (285-247) B.C. by seventy-two Palestinian Jews who worked for seventy-two days on the island of Pharos. "Septuagint," The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, ed. Paul Harvey (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959), 390. Bell, Cults and Creeds, 45, comments: "The facts are quite different and, if modern research can be trusted, rather complicated. There is no doubt that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek quite early in the Ptolemaic period, probably well before the middle of the third century B.C., for the Jews of Alexandria, most of whom could no longer understand the Hebrew text. Kahle has argued, with great cogancy, that several translations, or rather perhaps several revisions of an early, inexact translation, were made, and that the Letter of Aristeas was published as propaganda for a new and more authoritative revision, issued about 100 B.C. This standard text did not at once supersede the various current versions; a comparison of the quotations found in the New Testament, in Philo, Josephus, and other writers who used the Old Testament in Greek with the existing Septuagint suggests strongly that these writers were often using versions which differed markedly from the Septuagint we possess."
as is shown by the use made of it by Philo and Paul, the **LXX** was the universally recognized Bible of the diaspora, even for the purposes of divine worship.¹

When the Christian community adopted the **LXX** as its sacred book, the Jews abandoned it and formed their own new Greek version of the Old Testament early in the second century A.D. A little later in the century two new translations of Theodotian and Symmachus also appeared.

A study of the writings of Clement show acquaintance with all the books collected in the **LXX** except Ruth, Obadiah, the Letter of Jeremiah and Maccabees III and IV. In his use of the **LXX**, Clement made no distinction between the canonical and deuterocanonical books. In many passages, especially in the prophets, his text agrees with the revised versions of the **LXX**, especially that of Theodotion.²

CONVIVIA and its cognates appear in the **LXX** primarily as translations of the hbr-group, hbr meaning associate or comrade

¹Lietzmann, op. cit., I, 89.

²Otto Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta* (Nürnberg, 1901), 76-77.
or companion.  

"It is noticeable that haber had to do with the relationship of man to man. In the Apocrypha this appears as an intimate fellowship in respect of a spiritual benefit. But nowhere in the Old Testament does haber and its cognates (or koinwv and the derivatives representing these Hebrew words) ever connote the relationship of man to God." 

Even for the sacrificial meal which expressed the unique relationship between God and his people Israel, the use of the hbr- koinwv word-group was avoided.

---

1 Friedrich Hauck, *Koinás, Koinvías, Koinuvós, Koinwvós, Koinwvós, Koinwvós, Koinwvós, Koinwvós*, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1950), XIII, 800-801. J.Y. Campbell, "Koinonia and its Cognates in the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI (1932), 358, after having studied the LXX usages of koinonos, observes: "In none of these has it the wide, general sense of 'companion', in spite of the fact that it is used to translate or some synonymous form from the same root, and these Hebrew words can have that sense." He further indicates, however, that the occurrences of the verb form, according to Campbell, do not show any departure from classical usage. Ibid., 359. In contradiction to Campbell's former thesis, however, Hauck comments that koinonos does come to be used absolutely as 'associate' or 'comrade' in the Apocrypha, e.g. Sir. 42.3. op. cit., 801.


3 Hauck, op. cit., 802. Jourdan, op. cit., 113, n. 6 takes the same position, stating: "It is at least questionable if the ancient Hebrews regarded their sacrificial worship as establishing a relationship to God." He adds further, 123: "There is, in truth, nothing more certain than that to the Hebrews of ancient times as well as to those of the age of St. Paul, it never occurred to think that they were, or could be, haberim (= koinonoi) of God. Not even Philo had gone so far as to describe them as such, even in the passage from his De Specialibus Legibus usually cited in this connection."
Israelite piety dictated an attitude of dependence and bondage in relation to God but never one of equality.

The twenty-five citations of κοινωνία and its cognates observed in the Septuagint occur in a variety of contexts. Several citations from the apocryphal wisdom literature stress the fact that κοινωνία is impossible without mutual benefit and compatibility. "What companionship can a wolf have with a lamb?" asks Ben-Sira in Ecclesiasticus. And "what relation can an earthen pot have with a kettle? The kettle knocks against it, and it is broken in pieces," he says, warning against becoming partner with a stronger or richer man. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon says: "I will not travel with futile envy, for it cannot associate with wisdom."

In terms of the marriage relationship, the wife is the κοινωνός of the husband in the κοινωνία of life formed by marriage.

---


2 Sir. 13.2.

3 Sir.

4 Wis. 6.23.

5 Mal. 2.14.

6 II Mac. 14.25.
participation or participators in something evil. Eluk blames
Job for walking in the company of evil doers and wicked men.\(^1\)
Solomon cautions young men in Proverbs not to listen to the en-
ticements of sinners trying to persuade them to share in their
crime of ambushing just men.\(^2\) He also warns them that a man who
robs his mother or father is a *κόινωνος* of the profane men.\(^3\)
Ecclesiastes warns that men who do evil will after death become
*κόινωνοι* with the shades.\(^4\) Isaiah describes the kings of Juda
in the eighth century B.C. as rebels and comrades of thieves.\(^5\)

Ben-Sira cautions: "The man who touches pitch will get his
hands dirty,\(^6\) And the man who associates with a proud person will
become like him."\(^6\) He also warns about the friend who is a
*κόινωνος* of one's table but not of one's troubles.\(^7\) On the other
hand, the man who shares in the words of wisdom has glory.\(^8\) This
is a worthy and ennobling partnership.

As has already been stated, the *κόινων*-group words are not
used to express a relationship between God and man. There are,

\(^1\)Job 34.8.
\(^2\)Pro.1.11.
\(^3\)Pro.28.24.
\(^4\)Eccl.9.4.
\(^5\)Is.1.23.
\(^6\)Sir.13.1.
\(^7\)Sir.6.10.
\(^8\)Wis.8.18.
however, some citations which occur in passages describing matters of a religious nature. The Israelites were described as κοινωνία of the pagans when they built high places and erected "sacred pillars and sacred poles on every high hill and under every spreading tree, and offered sacrifices there on all the high places." When God became angry and forsook the Israelites, even the Temple at Jerusalem shared in the misfortune that overtook the nation by its destruction. But afterwards when God repented, the Temple too had κοινωνία in the benefits which the Lord bestowed.

The priest Eleazar was so pious and pure that his stomach never had κοινωνία with unclean meat.

When Ptolemy IV threatened to take away some of the citizen rights of the Jews at Alexandria if they would not offer sacrifice and be initiated into the mysteries, some of the Jews acquiesced, expecting, as III Maccabees says, "to gain great

1 IV Ki 7.11.  
2 II Mac.5.20.  
3 IV Mac.7.6.
glory from their association with the king."¹ Those who refused to co-operate he took to Schedia and imprisoned in the hippodrome so that they might have no κοινωνία with his army.²

Jehoshapat, the king of Judah, made an alliance with Ahaziah, king of Israel.³ They apparently had mutual advantages in mind, for they built ships to sail to Tarshish. But the Lord punished Jehoshaphat for making alliance with a wicked man by destroying the ships. Another citation in a political context contains a reference by the Persian king Artaxerxes to his queen, Esther, as "our blameless partner in the kingdom."⁴

κοινωνία and κοινωνός also occur in contexts which seem to designate some type of loose business agreement. In Leviticus the Lord had told his people through Moses that a man who cheated

¹III Mac. 2.31. "The scene of III Maccabees is placed in the reign of Ptolemy IV (Philopator) at the time of the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) It narrates an attempt made by the king to enter the Temple at Jerusalem, and his miraculous repulses." Then follows an account of his revenge upon the Jews of Alexandria. "It would seem to have been written in Alexandria at about the same time as these books, not far from 100 B.C., a date which is confirmed by indications drawn from Papyri. The writer apparently used the lost memoirs of the reign of Philopator, written by Ptolemy Megalopolitanus shortly after his death. He seems to have combined a narrative of Philopator's attempt to enter the Temple with a later story, preserved in another form by Josephus, of a persecution of Egyptian Jews by Physcon." (146-117 B.C. = reign of Physcon), Apocrypha, 155.

²III Mac. 4.11.

³II Chron. 20.35.

⁴Esther 8.13.
his neighbor in regard to some "deposit or pledge" should make restitution and one-fifth above, and in addition offer a perfect ram as a guilt-offering. Ben-Sira advised a man to be ashamed of a partner and a friend for unjust living, but not to be ashamed of settling accounts with a partner and fellow-travellers. 

κοινωνία and its cognates in the Old Testament occur primarily in contexts which warn against forming relationships not based on integrity as well as mutual benefit and compatibility. The passages are instructions on how to live pure and undefiled before God. The references to the κοινωνία of business relationships are exhortations to honesty and just dealing. The positive aspects of κοινωνία are seen in the statements that the man who has κοινωνία in words of wisdom is honored, and in the reference to the κοινωνία of husband and wife in marriage.

The New Testament existed in a somewhat fluid state during the first and second centuries of the Christian era. As has been observed above, Clement is not overly conscious of the New Testament.

1 Lev. 6.2.
2 Sir. 41.19.
3 Sir. 42.3. "The meaning apparently is—do not allow feelings of false shame and pride to deter from settling accounts involving mutual indebtedness, where friends and fellow travellers are involved." Apocrypha, 469.
Testament canon being formed during his time. He seems to have felt bound to the traditional gospel which ended with Paul but accepted apocryphal works attributed to apostolic authorship while rejecting other apocryphal works. His approach to the Scripture was more instinctive than scholarly, as a study of his use of the New Testament shows.

Forty-five instances of>koinwv, its cognates and compounds, have been noted in the New Testament. Koinwv was easily incorporated into the Christian vocabulary, according to Carr, because it was a word free from association with any system of philosophy or ethics and had no pagan overtones. In general, the grammatical use of koinwv in the New Testament remained the

---

1Tollinton, op. cit., II, 175 comments that the idea of a fixed canon of Scripture was less clear among the Alexandrian Fathers than it was in Irenaeus and Tertullian.

2Kutter, op. cit., 151-152.

3Ibid., 151.

4John M. Norris, "The Functional New Testament of Clement of Alexandria," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1942), 59 observes that Clement "quotes the New Testament for the most part from memory. He had not the aid of an exact concordance, and if any of the systems of numbering were as early as his day, they were not such as lent themselves to the easy handling needed by one who used the Scripture so copiously as Clement."

same as its use in classical and Hellenistic periods.¹

*Koinwvía* and its cognates occur most frequently in Paul.² For Paul, *koinwvía* was a religious term,³ and while he recognized and respected the fundamental meaning which the *koinwvía*-group of words had in Greek literature and the restrictions placed upon them in Jewish sacred literature, Paul succeeded in introducing...

Into the signification of each word a spiritual quality, distinctive and unique, of varying degrees of power and intensity...as enabled it to reflect the transcendence of St. Paul's

¹Heinrich Seesemann, *Der Begriff Koinwvía im Neuen Testament* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1933), 100 observes: "der Mlliche Gebrauch des Wortes *Koinwvía* sich im allgemeinen nicht von dem allgemeingässischen in klassischer wie hellenistischer Zeit unterscheidet. Eine Ausnahme bildet nur den Gebrauch des Paulus." Campbell, *op. cit.*, 363 says: Grammatically, the New Testament use of *Koinwvía* "does not differ from its use in classical writers. But when we turn to consider *koivnveí* in the New Testament we find what at first sight appears to be a very striking and surprising difference...In only one of these eleven instances do we find a genitive of the thing shared; significantly, this is in Hebrews, the Greek of which is more classical than that of most of the New Testament writings."

²Jourdan, *op. cit.*, 112-113 observes that Paul has even made it one of his familiar συν-compound forms, συγκοινωνέται Campbell, *op. cit.*, 363 comments that "the very existence of this compound suggests that the idea of association with someone else was not always felt to be expressed plainly by *koinwvía*, otherwise there would have been no point in using the compound, fond of such compound verbs as the Greeks were." This is not necessarily true, however. Paul could well have done this to give special emphasis to the idea of association in a word where this was already expressed or implied.

concepts and beliefs concerning the relationship of Christ to his faithful ones and their relationship to him."

Only two instances of κοινωνία are found in the Synoptic writers. Both have the frequently occurring context of partnership in an enterprise. In Matthew, Jesus condemns the scribes and Pharisees because they boast that they would not have been in killing the prophets\(^2\) but are at that moment plotting the death of Christ. In Luke, James and John are described as Simon's in the fishing business.\(^3\)

The Christian community\(^4\) after Pentecost is described in Acts 2:42 ff. as giving "steadfast attention to the teaching of the apostles and to union, to the breaking of bread and to the prayers. All the believers were united, and held all things in common. They would sell their possessions and goods and distribute them to everyone as need required.\(^5\) Apropos of this

\(^1\) Jourdan, op. cit., 112-113, 124.

\(^2\) Matt. 23:30.

\(^3\) Luke 5:10.

\(^4\) C. Anderson Scott, "The 'Fellowship', or κοινωνία", "The Expository Times, XXXV (September, 1924), 567 has suggested that κοινωνία "was used as a self-designation by the early Christian community, and was in fact the earliest of such self-designations to be adopted. According to his view, the disciples were known as the "habura. Seesemann, op. cit., 92 objects to this theory: "Ich glaube nicht, dass mon von hier aus folgern darf, dass sich die erste Christlich Geneinde 'Chabura' = κοινωνία gennant haben muss."

\(^5\) Acts 2:42.
A close connection... existed between the 'breaking of the Bread' and this primitive Christian 'common life'. For the author of Acts, the 'breaking of the Bread' is not a by-product, or sort of liturgical rite which one might carry out for oneself; it is much rather the powerfully influential rite in which the community character, informing the whole of the Christian life, is expressed and affirmed. That is to say, the Eucharistic liturgy provided the motivation and supernatural dynamism which effectively realized this remarkable experiment in the practice of Christian social justice. The Christian community prepared itself for the worthy reception of the Eucharist by sharing all earthly goods in common. And conversely, the communal partaking of the Eucharist, in which the risen Lord distributed His grace among His disciples, gave them the supernatural force to live as a community, 'possessing everything in common'.

Stanley also points out that the author of Acts "saw a close relationship between the apostolic teaching and the community of goods, the one describing the doctrinal, the other the social,

---

phase of early Christian life. 1

As the Christian community began to develop an attitude of exclusiveness, 2 its members were urged not to become involved with non-Christians, for "what fellowship has light with

---

1 Ibid., Carr, op. cit., 460-461 presents an interpretation of this passage similar to that of Stanley in viewing it as advocating a form of Christian socialism which "represents an effort to continue the life of discipleship and companionship with Christ which had been enjoyed by the Twelve, and by others, who had 'compounded' with them during the earthly ministry." More important than the almsgiving and sharing of goods, this κοινωνία "implied a principle of brotherhood and spiritual fellowship which lies at the root of true Christian socialism." Several scholars have taken exception to this view however. William Spicer Wood, "Fellowship", The Expositor (8th Series, 1921), 38-39 has strongly objected that nowhere is there evidence "that κοινωνία stands anywhere for a visible Fellowship of believers, although in a minor sense it signifies fellowship or association on their part in things that belong to their common peace." Hauck, op. cit., 809-810 has taken the same position: "In Ac. 2, 42 bedeutet κοινωνία nicht konkret die "Gemeinde", die Genossenschaft der Christen, die sich zwar noch nicht rechtlich und kultisch von der jüdischen Gemeinde getrennt hat, aber doch schon einen Kreis eigenster Lebensgemeinschaft darstellt, schwerlich auch die "Gutergemeinschaft"...sondern mehr abstrakt, geistig die Gemeinschaft des brüderlichen Zusammenhaltens das sich in Gemeindeleben bewahrt und auswirkt." Seesemann, op. cit., 89 has also followed this view: "Man wird daher auch in 2,42 in dem ersten zusammenfassenden Bericht über das Leben der Glaubigen unter κοινωνία die geistige Einigkeit der ersten Gemeinde verstehen müssen."

2 Kleist-Lilly, New Testament, 457 reads: This means "literally 'be unequally yoked'". The term is used by the Greek translators of the Old Testament in reference to the prohibition of yoking or teaming together beasts of different kinds such as an ox and an ass. While the reference is not primarily to mixed marriages, yet the principle here enunciated includes and is applicable to them. So Allo."
darkness?"¹ Uninvolved in the world was advocated in figurative language in the Apocalypse where Christians were urged to avoid the effects of the fall of Babylon so that they might not have κοινωνία in the resultant plagues.² Christians were to have no κοινωνία in impurity or in any deeds that seek darkness.³

They were not to participate in other men's sins,⁴ nor were they even to speak to anyone preaching false doctrine, for by so doing they would have κοινωνία in his wicked deeds.⁵

Acceptance of the gospel and the testimony of those who were witnesses to the saving acts of Christ created κοινωνία in the faith⁶ among those willing to walk with Christ in the light.⁷ James, Cephas, and John met Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem and made them their κοινωνία in the Gospel.⁸ The latter were to bring the Good News to the Gentiles. Titus, who had accompanied Barnabas and Paul to Jerusalem, was referred to by Paul as his

¹II Cor. 6:14. Apropos of this passage, Seesemann, op. cit., 99 comments: "Die einige widersprechende Stelle (where κοινωνία is not a religious term in Paul) - II Cor. 6:14 - ist wahrscheinlich nicht paulinischen Ursprungs."

³Eph. 5:11.
⁴Rom. 5:22.
⁵John 11.
⁶John 1:3.
⁷I John 1:6-7.
in traveling and preaching the Word. Paul also addressed Philemon as his \( \text{koinonos} \) in the Faith.

The Christian was called to a unique relationship with God the Father and his son Jesus in the Holy Spirit, a relationship

---

1 II Cor. 8:23. Seesemann, op. cit., 52 says that here (II Cor. 8:23) and Phlm. 17 are the two occurrences of \( \text{koinonos} \) used absolutely in the New Testament.

2 Phlm. 17. Hauck, op. cit., 808 agrees with the interpretation of \( \text{koinonos} \) as \( \text{koinoivos} \) in the Faith, but Campbell, op. cit., 362 suggests that \( \text{koinonos} \) in this passage is a "half-playful but very effective use of business terms in writing of the spiritual relationship between Philemon and himself." The latter interpretation may be reading more into the passage than is actually there, considering Paul's use of the term almost exclusively in religious contexts.

3 1 Cor. 1:9; I John 1:3. The interpretation of these passages has been the subject of controversy. Apropos of the former, Jourdan, op. cit., 118 has interpreted \( \text{koinonivia} \) as "the sublime gift of God conveyed to man through his son." Campbell, op. cit., 380 interprets \( \text{kinoivos} \) as genitive of the thing shared. Hauck, op. cit., 804-805 sees the Christian is called to communion with the Son.

4 II Cor. 13:13. Phil. 2:1. Discussion has also centered on the interpretation of these passages. The passage from Corinthians Jourdan, op. cit., 116-117 interprets as meaning that a gift "is given from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit." The sharing together cannot take place unless it is imparted by the Holy Spirit. He disagrees with Seesemann's arguments, op. cit., 62-63, that this passage should be interpreted as a fellowship or sharing in the Holy Spirit. (117). Hauck, op. cit., 807 agrees with Seesemann that the \( \text{koinonivia} \) phrase is not parallel in construction to the other two passages but rather should be interpreted as \( \text{koinonivia} \) with an objective genitive of thing. In regard to the passage from Philippians both Hauck, op. cit., 807 and Seesmann, op. cit., 58 regard \( \text{pneumatoc} \) as an objective genitive of the thing shared rather than a subjective genitive. Campbell, op. cit., 378 seems to support this view. I prefer to interpret this passage as a subjective genitive, however, which, though rare, does occur in Greek literature.
which expressed itself in sacramental participation in the body and blood of Christ.¹

Paul paralleled this sacramental participation with the practice of Israel, to which Philo alluded, where those who ate the sacrifices were considered κοινωνοι of the altar.² This was an unfortunate comparison, because "no special religious significance was attached to participation is such food. This certainly weakens the force of Paul's analogy, but it was the best he could find in Judaism."³ He next urged Christians not to eat the meat sacrificed to demons so that they would not become κοινωνοι of demons.⁴ "What is meant by κοινωνοι τῶν δαιμονίων is hard to say. Perhaps the easiest explanation is that St. Paul is transferring his interpretation of the Christian rite to them to make a· effective a contrast as possible. Even so he does not

¹ I Cor. 10:16. Again there has been question as to the interpretation of this passage. Campbell, op. cit., 375 stresses the idea of participation in the body and blood of Christ, while Jourdan, op. cit., 121, 123 emphasizes the "spiritual effects of the consumption of the bread and wine."

² I Cor. 10:18.

³ Campbell, op. cit., 377.

⁴ I Cor. 10:20.
Since Christ had become partaker in human nature, Christians in turn had the hope of becoming partakers of divine nature. As they shared in the sufferings and tribulations of Christ, so they likewise had the hope of someday sharing in the blessings of the Gospel and in the glory of Christ to be made manifest.

Paul reminded the Hebrews how they suffered for the faith or were with those who did. He told the Philippians that, because of their in the Gospel, they had been both of his troubles and of grace. To the Corinthians Paul said that they shared in his sufferings as well as in comfort from God.

1Nock, op. cit., 82. Nock comments further that there is no Hellenistic religious influence present in Paul’s use of here, in which men ate as table-companions of the gods or even ate the flesh of the god. (83-84) Rather it is the Jewish common meals that Paul finds his parallels to the Eucharist. The common meals of the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem were no doubt accompanied by table prayers of the familiar Jewish type. It is such eating together, with its preliminary offering to God of food and drink, lies the kernal of their common meal of love. Incorporated in this and only later separated was the Eucharist.

2Heb. 2:14. 3II Pet. 1:4. 4Phil. 3:10; Apoc. 1:9; I Pet. 4:13. 5Cor. 9:23. 6I Pet. 5:1. 7Heb. 10:33. 8Phil. 1:7. 9II Cor. 1:7.
When James, Cephas, and John extended the hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas as apostles to the Gentiles, they requested that the Gentile Christians give material help to the poor Jerusalem. Paul was quite willing to do so, and the theme came up often in his letters. In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul reminded them that they had had \( \kappaοιμωνία \) in the spiritual blessings of the Jews and so should be willing to share their material goods with them.\(^1\) The Gentiles should remember that they were like a branch grafted on to the root of the tree of Israel and not disparage the broken branches of the tree.\(^2\) In writing to the Corinthians and the Romans Paul commended the generosity of the impoverished churches in Macedonia and Achaia in contributing for the poor in Jerusalem.\(^3\) He urged the Romans and Corinthians to do likewise, saying that such generosity was also an expression of gratitude to God.\(^4\) He encouraged the Hebrews to do good and to share what they had.\(^5\) He advised Timothy to encourage the Ephesians to be generous in sharing.\(^6\) The man being instructed in doctrine he advised to share his goods with his teacher so that both would benefit from the association.\(^7\) Paul commented

\(^1\) Rom. 15:27.  \(^2\) Rom. 11:17.  
\(^3\) II Cor. 8:4; Rom. 15:26.  
\(^4\) Rom. 12:13; II Cor. 9:13.  
\(^7\) Gal. 6:6.
to Philemon that it was his Faith which was the cause of his generosity. ¹ Paul thanked the Philippians for their fellowship in the Gospel from the beginning² and for providing for his material needs even after he had left the ministry in their city.³

The contexts in which κοινωνία and its cognates occur in the New Testament are generally much more positive than those of the Old Testament. While the latter warned the Hebrews against any relationship which would endanger their moral integrity, the New Testament stresses the unique relationship with the Father, in Christ, through the Spirit which the Christian enjoys, his special relationship with all believers because of this, and his communion with God and other believers through sacramental participation. Importance is placed on the common life practiced by the Apostolic community at Jerusalem and on contributions made to alleviate the needs of the poor by the church of the diaspora as means of living the Christian life more fully.

Finally, consideration will be given to the phenomenon of Gnosticism which influenced the climate of thought during the first Christian centuries, and perhaps even earlier, and which also played a definite role in shaping the thought of Clement of Alexandria.

Gnosis in Greek literature, according to Bultmann, "denotes

¹ Phlm. 6. ² Phil. 1:5.
³ Phil. 4:15.
the intelligent grasp of an object or a situation, whether en-
countered for the first time or on some subsequent occasion, or
as something long known...and signifies the act of knowing rather
than the knowledge itself." It is closely connected with the
idea of seeing what really exists.

Under the influence of the mystery religions and magic of
the Hellenistic period, *gnosis* acquired, in addition to its
earlier usages: certain specialized meanings: the knowledge it-
self of God; and "illumination, something fundamentally different
from rational thought," which leads to salvation;² a vision which
"endows the Gnostic with divine nature."³

In the Old Testament, *gnosis* is a subjective experience in-
dicating primarily a recognition of the acts of Jahweh and obed-
dience to His will.⁴ The Septuagint translators used the term
*gnosis* both to designate a knowledge of sin leading to repentance
and salvation and to describe God's self-revelation.⁵ Rabbinic
usage followed that of the Old Testament, while "Philo's idea of
knowledge and use of ἔγνωσις are thoroughly Hellenistic, i.e.,
either rationalist or Gnostic."⁶

¹Rudolph Bultmann, *Gnosis*, Bible Key Words from Gerhard
Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament, tr. J.R.

²Ibid., 11. ³Ibid., 13.
⁴Ibid., 17. ⁵Ibid., 19, 22.
Common early Christian usage retains the ordinary meanings of gnosis, to feel, observe, learn, discover, but the Old Testament connotation of gnosis as God's self-revelation and man's recognition of His acts and subjection to His will also occurs. ¹ Gniosis in a Christian context indicates a knowledge which "continues to grow through obedience and meditation."² It has a practical as well as a theoretical connotation: "the conviction that faith includes knowledge of the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven...leads to the thought of Gnosis as a kind of systematic theology."³ Under this aspect, the gnosia of Christianity came into conflict with both polytheism and pagan gnosticism.

The traditional view, that which was taken by the Church Fathers and which continued up to the latter half of the 19th century, regarded gnosticism as Christianity perverted by Hellenistic philosophy to the point of heresy. The statement of this position is Harnack's famous definition of gnosticism as "the acute Hellenization of Christianity."⁴ A modification of Harnack's thesis was suggested by Wilson who regarded as gnosticism proper only such systems as were refuted by the Fathers, but distinguished between a pre-gnostic and a later phase of development. He suggested that the Judaism of the Diaspora acted as a

¹Ibid., 33. ²Ibid., 39. ³Ibid., 40.
bridge between Graeco-Roman and Jewish-Christian thought, the mingling of which resulted in the formation of gnosticism proper.  

Reitzenstein, Bousset and Bultmann challenged the traditional view and Harnack's thesis that gnosticism was "im Wesen und Ursprung" a Christian phenomenon. Reitzenstein and Bousset held that gnosticism was an independent entity, owing its origin to various oriental influences. Bultmann added that it was a "redemptive religion based on dualism." Jonas, a student of Bultmann, while admitting that no one factor in isolation can be considered the source of gnosticism, cautioned against an over-emphasis on the syncretism observable in gnosticism which would

1Ibid., 182.

2W. Bousset, "Gnosis", Real-Encyclopedia, ed. Pauly-Wissowa (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1912), VII, 2, 1507 reached the following conclusion about gnosticism: "Die Gnosis ist, wenn man auf das Ganze sicht, nicht auf dem genuinen Boden des Christentums gewachsen. Sie ist älter als dieses und als bereits fertige Erscheinung an das Christentum herangetreten...Erscheinungen wie die hermetische Literatur...und die Oracula Chaldaica beweisen dass die gnostischen Spekulationen und frömmigkeit weit über das Gebiet der spezifisch christlichen Sekten hinaus verbreitet waren."

reduce it to "a mere mosaic of these elements and so miss its autonomous essence." ¹

A third view holds that "gnosticism is an atmosphere, not a system." ² It is "not a closed system of rigidly circumscribed dogmas, but rather a movement of the spirit without definite frontiers, in many lands, among all manner of men, through century after century." ³ "In short, there was a climate of opinion, and Judaism and Hellenism alike (with such foreign ideas as had found some home in either of the two) helped to shape it." ⁴

The last view seems to be the most tenable since a study of gnostic texts indicates that the term gnos

mean a particular kind of knowledge open only to a few, and consisting in some esoteric doctrine which was carefully kept from the eyes of the uninitiated. It might be a mystic vision which conveyed it and here there was a possibility of a real religious experience; or again, gnosis might be a philosophical or scientific knowledge of the secrets of the universe, and of man's place in it. And finally, it might be nothing more than a crude magical affair of the names and


² Wilson, op. cit., 261.


⁴ Nock, op. cit., xiv.
spells which would open the doors to the scul in its ascent. ¹

Clement of Alexandria was unable to take any single stand on the gnostic doctrines current in his day. Some he commended; others he condemned. He objected in particular to the pessimistic world view popular with some of them and to their denial of the part played by free will in salvation.² He opposed both the 'rigidly ascetic' gnostics and the 'freely licentious' ones, but he had much sympathy with two of the outstanding teachers of the second century, Basilides and Valentine. "Both are men of eminence whom he always regards with respect even though he is aware of important differences."³ "As far as we can see, Clement's Gnosis is ecclesiastical Christianity mystically coloured. His Gnostic desires to follow the rule of the Church and to be in accordance with the Gospel received through the tradition of the Church."⁴

Clement recognized both the secular and the religious forms of gnosticism⁵ which held in common "that ultimate spiritual values were to be discovered in the realm of ideas, knowledge, abstract being eternal principles, and philosophic verity."⁶ For

¹Wilson, op. cit., 107. ²Camelot, Foi et Gnose, 150.
³Chadwick, op. cit., 30.
⁴Molland, Conception of Gospel, 83.
⁵W. den Boer, De Allegorase in het Werk von Clemens Alexandrinus, Résumé in French (Leiden, 1940), 146.
Clement, however, the spiritual *gnosis* was of more importance. It was the acme of the Christian life, its goal being "vision, pure uninterrupted communion with God's reality, a final phase of spiritual development." The spiritual *gnosis* leading to salvation consisted of two phases: development of the moral virtues to attain the ethical integrity necessary for the contact with God, the development of the intellectual virtues by prayer, communion with God in thought, the revelation of Christ and the Bible. The first phase Clement considered necessary for all Christians. The second phase was probably for the minority. "La foi d'après Clément, c'est le fondement; la *gnose* n'est que le couronnement." "La foi est le fondement et la condition de la vie du gnostique ou parfait chrétien."
The purpose of Clement's Protrepticus, addressed to the pagans, was to announce publicly the good news that "God is related to human life and that knowledge of him and growth in likeness to him are possible as the sumnum bonum of the Christian life."¹ "There was an innate original communion between men and heaven, obscured through ignorance, but which now at length has leapt forth instantaneously from the darkness, and shines resplendent."² Man is related to God, not in essence or nature, but in being the work of His will. And now, since the Incarnation, "human blood has become a partaker of the Word: it is a participant of grace by the Spirit."³ That which the soul sees,

¹Outler, op. cit., 228.


³Paed. III, 25.2. There has been some discussion of the place of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, in the theology of Clement. Tollinton, op. cit., I, 359-360, says: "there is no place left in Clement's system for a Third Person, because every office that has been assigned Him is so fully discharged by the Logos." Lebreton, op. cit., 60, however, holds that the Holy Spirit must inspire those who believe, along with their having a natural knowledge of God, according to Clement's view. Frangoulis, op. cit., 19, agrees with this position: "Die Ansichten des Clemens über das göttliche πνεῦμα als Inspirator, als prophetische Gabä, hangen mit der ganzen Lehre des Clemens von der Inspiration zusammen."
it is able to share with the flesh which has κοινωνία with it.\(^1\)

Every man who abandons his erroneous religious beliefs and practices and "willingly, with discipline and teaching, accepts the knowledge of the truth,"\(^2\) according to the instruction of Christ, will be called to adoption. Each and every one, not just a select few, are destined to become κοινωνοί with God through faith.\(^3\)

If only they will "become again as little children and be born again... God will become their Father and they themselves will have κοινωνία with Christ in the kingdom of the Father."\(^4\)

Our Instructor in the faith is Christ, the same instructor who made a covenant with Abraham and thus established a κοινωνία of friendship with him.\(^5\) "Being baptized, we are illuminated; illuminated, we become sons, being made sons, we are made perfect; being made perfect, we are made immortal."\(^6\)

After being born in baptism, the believer is nourished by the Word, Christ. Clement draws the analogy that just as milk and water have a natural κοινωνία which operates for the benefit of the newborn, so there is also a natural κοινωνία between the spiritual washing, baptism, and the spiritual nourishment, the

\(^1\) Exe. ex. Theod. 5.4. \(^2\) Protr. II.

\(^3\) Paed. I, VI, 30.2. \(^4\) Protr. IX, 82.5.

\(^5\) Paed. I, VII, 56.3. \(^6\) Paed. I, VI.
Word. And just as milk, mixed with sweet wine, curdles and the adulteration can be drained off, so the spiritual κοινωνία of faith separates off the lusts of the flesh and thus "commits man to eternity, along with those who are divine, immortalizing him."  

After being initiated and confirmed in faith by baptism, the Instructor then guides the believer in two areas: "the right direction of truth to the contemplation of God, and the exhibition of holy deeds in everlasting perseverance." The latter area, being fundamental to faith of every degree, is discussed first, in the work called the Paedagogus. Here the Christian receives very practical instruction on how he should think and act regarding drink, costly vessels, conduct at feasts, laughter, and speech, living together, use of ointments and luxuries, sleep,

1Paed. I, VI, 50. 3-4. It is interesting to note that the Word, rather than the Eucharist, is considered the nourishment of the Christian, at least as it is expressed in terms of κοινωνία. Κοινωνία in this context occurs several times in the NT and also in several of the Fathers. According to Bigg, op. cit., 102-105, Clement does refer to Eucharist and agape, but in a way which indicates that they were probably not yet separated at Alexandria. Marsh, op. cit., 80, points out that the word μυστηρίον was not used at Alexandria in Clement's time in any special connection with baptism or the eucharist. F.R. Montgomery Hitchcock, "Holy Communion and Creed in Clement of Alexandria." Church Quarterly Review, 129(October-December, 1939), 59 calls Clement's theory of the Eucharist "distinctly spiritual." Tollinton, op. cit., II, 54-55, says: "For just as Baptism was illumination, so are Eucharist and Agape the continued sustenance of our rational and intelligent natures."

2Paed. I, VI, 51.2.

3Paed. I, VII.
clothes, shoes, jewels and ornaments. Undoubtedly these passages present "a true picture of actual manners and morals in Alexandria" at this time.¹ In an age when asceticism was admired as a natural virtue, Clement's moderate position as a defender of the world and a preacher of withdrawal is notable.²

Food and drink are the first topic of discussion in the Paedagogus. The Christian obviously must eat to live. His meals should not only be a matter of necessity, however, but even a time of enjoyment, because a congenial supper is a "proof of mutual and reciprocal kindly feeling."³ If love governs this κοινωνία, there will be no danger that the body will take more than it needs for its well-being.⁴ So a supper guest should eat what is served⁵ but should also beware of being too enticed by expensive delicacies calculated to increase his sociability.⁶

Warning is given about the use of ointments and crowns. The crown is the symbol of untroubled tranquillity. For this reason they crown the dead, and idols, too, on the same account, by this fact giving testimony to their being dead... We must have no communion with demons. Nor must we crown the living image of God after the manner of dead idols.⁷

¹Tollinton, op. cit., I, 246.
²Wilhelm Wagner, Der Christ und die Welt noch Clemens von Alexandrien. Ein noch unveraltetes Problem in altchristlicher Beleuchtung (Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Reiprecht, 1903), 77-78.
⁷Paed. II, VIII, 73.2.
The only crown the Christian should aspire to is that which is
given for living well, once one has reached the kingdom of heaven.

There is no need for elaborate preparations and rituals for
bathing. Poor women, who share the same baths, enjoy them equally.¹ And to give someone a rubdown at the baths who has done the
same for us is an example of social justice.²

The correct use of all material goods is of special con­
cern to Clement and is discussed here in the Paedagogus as well
as in the Stromata and the Quis Dives Salvetur. Christianity and
poverty had always been closely linked: there is the emphasis on
poverty in the life of Christ himself and in the gospel message,
the primitive Church practiced some form of community of goods,
and the Church up to this point had been largely the church of
the poor.³ Yet Clement was preaching the Christian message to a
predominantly wealthy class at Alexandria and had to explain to
them the teaching of the gospel in regard to wealth.

Clement maintains that Christ's command to "sell what be­
longs to thee" is not to be taken literally.

It is not what some hastily take it to be, a command to fling
away the substance that belongs to him and to part with his
riches, but to banish from the soul its opinions about rich­
es, its attachment to them, its excessive desire, its morbid
excitement over them, its anxious cares, the thorns of our

¹Paed. III, IV, 31.3. ²Paed. III, X, 52.1.
³G.W. Butterworth, "Introduction", The Rich Man's Salvation
(Loeb Library ed.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1919), 266. Re­
ference below to this work are made to this edition.
earthly existence which chokes the seed of the true life.¹
Lack of riches is not in itself necessarily a good thing. Nei-
ther is the renunciation of wealth if it is done merely for leis-
ure or for fame.² What the Savior actually commands of the be-
liever, according to Clement, is that he should strip "the soul
itself and the will of their lurking passions and utterly to root
out and cast away all alien thoughts from the mind."³ The Christ-
ian's guide to the use of what is his own should be the remem-
brance of how "God brought our race into communion by first im-
parting what was His own, when He gave His own Word, common to
all, and made all things for all. All things therefore are com-
mon, and not for the rich to appropriate an undue share."⁴ "What
we acquire without difficulty, and use with ease, we praise, keep
easily, and communicate freely."⁵

The Christian should have what he needs⁶ but should share
with those in need what he has over and above that.⁷ This, in
fact, is for Clement one of the marks of the true Gnostic. The
attitude that "I possess, and possess in abundance; why then
should I not enjoy" is not truly human or social,⁸ for God has

¹The Rich Man's Salvation, II. ²Ibid., 293.
³Ibid., 295. ⁴Paed. II, XIII, 120.3.
⁵Paed. II, III, 38.4. ⁶Strom. VI, IX, 79.2.
⁷Paed. II, XII, 129.1; Paed. III, VII, 38.2.
⁸Paed. III, XII, 120.4.
created man naturally communicative by justice. In addition, the corporal works of mercy enjoined by the Savior are nothing else than commands to practice κοινωνία, which would be impossible without wealth, or if no one possessed anything. This sharing must also be done willingly, "without murmurings and disputations and grudging."

The law recognizes that κοινωνία is natural to man by not allowing a brother to take usury, "designating a brother not only him who is born of the same parents, but also of the same race and sentiments, and a participator in the same word." It also enjoins that part of the harvest be left unreaped, "training those who possess to sharing and to large-heartedness, by forgoing of their own to those who are in want, and thus providing means of subsistence for the poor." In these and other ways, the law promotes κοινωνία as well as piety, justice, and humanity.

Love also teaches us a natural κοινωνία. Homer advocated giving to a friend. Clement adds: "And an enemy must be aided, that he may not continue an enemy, for by help good feeling is

1Strom. I, VI, 34.4; Strom. II, XVI, 73.4.
2Quis Dives Salvetur 13.6.
5Quis Div. Salv. 31.8. 6Strom. II, XVIII, 84.4.
7Strom. II, XVIII, 85.3. 8Strom. II, XVIII, 86.4.
compacted, and enmity is dissolved."¹ The Christian should cer-
tainly have a spirit of brotherly love toward those having ἱκωνικόν with him in the same spirit.²

The effect which sharing one's goods has upon the donor is
similar to that which happens to wells which "when pumped out,
rise to their former measure, so giving away, being the benignant
spring of love, by communicating of its drink to the thirsty,
again increases and is replenished.³ Although Christian κόινωνία
has its own natural reward, and a spiritual one as well, since
its reward is the kingdom of heaven,⁴ the reward is not the moti-
vation of his κόινωνία. Rather the sole motivation of the
Gnostic is love.⁵ And the faith and love which are the reason
for his generosity cause him to respond to the need of the unwor-
thy as well as to that of the worthy.⁶ On the other hand, the fact
that "they who are consecrated to Christ are given to communi-

¹Strom. II, XIX, 102. ²Strom. II, IX, 42.1.
⁵Strom. IV, XVIII, 112.2.
⁶Ecl. Proph. 27.7. Tollinton, op. cit., I, 329, says:
"It has to be admitted that in his advice to the wealthy there
are certain things that Clement fails to see, and among these
admissions none is more obvious than his inability to perceive
the dangerous side to the unrestricted liberality. He boldly
says that alms are to be given to the worthy...Now there is no
question that, long before Clement wrote, Christian charity had
been abused."
The emphasis upon the external ethics of Christianity is directed to culmination in an inner state of apathy, which for Clement is a state of sinlessness. Only then can the believer advance to the more mature faith which consists in gnosis. What we have of Clement's discussion of this topic is contained in the Stromata.

Book I of the Stromata deals primarily with the relationship of theology and philosophy. As an introduction, Clement acknowledges the value of the written word which preserves a man's ideas for posterity. "Wisdom is a communicative and philanthropic thing," he grants. But the man who wishes either by speech or by writing to share his wisdom must be sure it is done for the right reason. His only motivation and reward must be the salvation of those who are to hear. Anyone who gives credence to opinions without intelligence, and reason, and knowledge, "believes a man who is a partner in falsehood."

One of Clement's favorite hypotheses is that the Greeks

1 Strom. I, I, 6.3. 2 Wytzes. Two-fold Way I, 239.
5 Strom. I, VIII, 42.2.
were the pupils of Moses. In Book I Clement emphasizes the contribution of Moses as a legislator who "furnished a good policy, which is the right discipline of men in social life." Moses, of course, in Clement's opinion, far surpasses his classical counterparts as a lawgiver.

The second Book of the Stromata is concerned with faith, knowledge, sin, and virtue. Agape is there defined as "consent in what pertains to reason, life, and manners, or in brief, fellowship in life." Its nature is communicative.

In Book II, Clement also distinguishes three kinds of friendship: that founded on reason; that based on mutual favor which is social, liberal and useful for life; and that founded on intimacy or pleasure. In other words, the friendship of a philosopher, that of a man, and that of an animal.

The Christian is warned against attendance at "theaters and tribunals, or rather the compliance with wicked and deadly powers, and complicity with their deeds." The Lord's statement "he that loses his life shall save it" is interpreted to mean either the actual loss of life for the Lord's sake, or else deliberate separation from participation in an unchristian way of life.

Book III of the Stromata, a treatise on marriage, is largely

\[1\] Strom. I, XXVI, 168.1. \[2\] Strom. II, IX, 163.1.
\[3\] Strom. II, XVIII, 87.3. \[4\] Strom. II, XIX, 101.3.
\[5\] Strom. II, XV, 68.1-2. \[6\] Strom. II, XX, 108.3.
a rebuttal of the false teachings on sex current in the church of Clement's time. "The gnostic estimate of the world led to two opposed attitudes to sex and marriage. Clement himself divides his opponents into two groups, the extreme ascetics and the licentious."¹ In the first group are Marcion, Tatian and Julius Cassianus. They opposed sexual intercourse and birth as something inherently evil, teaching that "the serpent took the use of intercourse from the irrational animals and persuaded Adam to agree to have sexual union with Eve."² Such union belonged to them by nature, protests Clement. He also criticizes Julius Cassianus, the originator of docetism,³ who held in his book Concerning Continence and Celibacy that God did not deliberately create man for sexual intercourse. He comments: "Could not one rightly find fault with the Savior if he was responsible for our formation and then delivered us from error and from this use of our generative organs?"⁴ He adds further, "if the flesh were hostile to the soul, he (the Savior) would not have raised an obstacle to the soul by strengthening with good health the hostile flesh... For sin being corruption cannot have fellowship with incorruption which is righteousness."⁵

¹ Chadwick, op. cit., 22. ² Strom. III, XVII, 102-3.
³ Chadwick, op. cit., 23 says that Clement's statement that Julius Cassianus was the originator of docetism cannot be accepted in view of the New Testament evidence for the prevalence of this tendency before the end of the first century.
⁴ Strom. III, XIII, 92.1. ⁵ Strom. III, XVII, 104.5.
The other group of Clement's opponents were the Carpocratians.

This sect is a peculiar phenomenon even in the curious penumbra of eccentric sects which gathered round the Church in the second century and claimed the name of Christian. The evidence concerning the sect is not a little obscure. The origin of the sect is ascribed by Clement and Irenaeus to a man named Carpocrates, but his historical existence has been doubted.

Clement discusses at some length a book attributed to Carpocrates' son Epiphanes, Concerning Righteousness. Epiphanes argues that justice in God's eyes is κοινωνία with equality. The fruits of the earth, he maintains, were originally shared by all alike and that likewise there was no written law regarding sexual union and birth. All was regulated by the natural law of justice as κοινωνία with equality. But then laws were made, which "by presupposing the existence of private property, cut up and destroyed the universal equality decreed by the divine law." The result was that with the disregard of the natural law of κοινωνία

1 Chadwick, op. cit., 24.

2 Ibid., 25-26. "This work merely consists of the scribblings of an intelligent but nasty-minded adolescent of somewhat pornographic tendencies." Clement tells of a posthumous cult of Epiphanes who died at seventeen and had a temple built in his honor at Same by his parents. Some scholars reject the existence of Epiphanes entirely, others accept the gnostic but think he had no connection with the moon-god worshipped at Same.


5 Strom. III, II, 7.2.
with equality, theft came into being.\(^1\) \(\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\iota\upsilon\delta\) with equality was also denied in sexual relations, and "those who have been born in this way have denied the universality which is the corollary of their birth and say, 'Let him who has taken one woman keep her' whereas all alike can have her, just as the other animals do."\(^2\)

Citing the Old Testament law "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," Epiphanes went through some specious logistics to prove that the law was meaningless. He says:

But for a Jew the neighbor is not a Jew, for he is a brother and has the same spirit. Therefore it remains that 'neighbor' means one of another race. But how can he not be a neighbor who is able to share in the same spirit? For Abraham is father not only of the Hebrews, but also of the Gentiles.\(^3\)

And he argues similarly that the lawgiver who said "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife" must have been speaking in jest, "since he forces what should be common property to be treated as a private possession."\(^4\)

Clement describes the feasts of the Carpocratians as beginning in a banquet and ending in a sex orgy.\(^5\) He then adds the interesting comment that Carpocrates, in advocating \(\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\iota\upsilon\delta\) \(\gamma\uomicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\) \(\omicron\nu\) \(\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma\) \(\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\), \(^6\) seems:

To have misunderstood the saying of Plato in the Republic

\(^1\text{Strom. III, II, 7.4.}\) \(^2\text{Strom. III, II, 7.4-8.2.}\) \(^3\text{Strom. III, II, 8.6.}\) \(^4\text{Strom. III, II, 9.3.}\) \(^5\text{Strom. III, II, 10.1.}\) \(^6\text{Strom. III, IV, 25.5.}\)
that the women of all are to be in common. Plato means that the unmarried are common for those who wish to ask them as also the theatre is open to the public for all who wish to see, but that when each one has chosen his wife, then the married woman is no longer common to all.

Clement acknowledges that the Lord enjoined upon believers the responsibility of sharing their goods and helping the needy but that He did not mean that there should be complete freedom of koinwvía in physical love, which some of them called a "mystical communion." This, says Clement, "is an insult to the name of communion...they have impiously called by the name of communion any common sexual intercourse." Those who advocate such doctrines are koinwvosi of lust, rather than, as they think of God. Such koinwvía will bring them only to the brothels.

Clement quotes from an apocryphal work, now lost save for this quotation, upon which, he claims, the disciples of Prodicus base their doctrine:

All things were one; but as it seemed good to its unity not to be alone, an idea came forth from it, and it had intercourse with it and made the beloved. In consequence of this there came forth from him an idea with which he had intercourse, and made powers which cannot be seen or heard.

---

2 Strom. III, IV, 27, 1-2; Strom. III, XII, 86.4.
3 Strom. III, IV, 27.1-2. 4 Strom. III, IV, 27.2.
5 Strom. III, IV, 27.4-5, 28.1.
Clement's comment is that if this passage referred to acts of spiritual κοίνωνία, as among the Valentinians, it might be acceptable. "But to suppose that the holy prophets spoke of carnal and wanton intercourse is the way of a man who has renounced salvation."¹ And he quotes John who says: "If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship with him, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from sin."²

Clement challenges Carpocrates' allegation that justice involves unbridled sexual κοίνωνία, based on the words of the Lord, 'Give to him that asks you'. The Lord, says Clement, adds immediately after that, "And do not turn away from him who wishes to borrow," thus indicating the kind of κοίνωνία to which he was referring.³ Clement refutes those who hold there is no difference between right and wrong by quoting Paul, "What is there in common between righteousness and lawlessness? Or what fellowship between light and darkness?"⁴ And when it is said in Baruch 3:10, "You were defiled in a foreign land," this did not refer to sexual defilement but "association which is bound up with a strange body and not with that which in marriage is bestowed for the

¹Strom. III, IV, 29.2-3. ²Strom. III, IV, 32.2.
purpose of procreation."\(^1\)

Paederasty\(^2\) and homosexuality\(^3\) are condemned outright by Clement. He praises:

the ancient legislators of the Romans: these detested effeminacy of conduct; and the giving of the body to feminine purposes, the contrary to the law of nature, they judged worthy of the extremest penalty, according to the righteousness of the law.

Christian marriage, on the other hand, is a common and holy life, based on conjugal union, and has heaven as its reward for both husband and wife.\(^5\) The wise wife is encouraged to "persuade her husband to be her \(κοινωνός\) in what is conducive to happiness."

If she does not succeed, she should go along with his will except when virtue and salvation are in question. And then, whether it becomes necessary for her to die or live, she should remember that:

God is her helper and \(κοινωνός\) in such a course of conduct, her true defender and Saviour both for the present and for the future; making Him the leader and guide of all her actions reckoning sobriety and righteousness her work, and making the

\(^1\)Strom. III, XII, 89.2.
\(^2\)Paed. II, X, 90.4.
\(^3\)Paed. II, X, 87.3.
\(^4\)Paed. III, III, 23.1.
\(^5\)Paed. I, IV, 10.3.
\(^6\)Strom. IV, XIX, 123.2.
Book IV of the Stromata deals with martyrdom and the true Gnostic. Death is described as the *koinwonia* of the soul, in a state of sin, with the body, while life is a separation from sin. "The severance, therefore, of the soul from the body, made a lifelong study, produces in the philosopher gnostic alacrity, so that he is easily able to bear natural death, which is

---

1Strom. IV, XX, 127.2. Tollinton, op. cit., 299, says: "The general impression which results from Clement's remarks on Marriage and Home-life is that Christianity was here exercising a high and elevating influence, and that Clement personally held well-grounded views and a noble Ideal." He does not say much about the family from the political viewpoint, "So his attitude differs widely from that of Plato and Aristotle, with whom the whole subject is approached from the standpoint of the community." Bardy, op. cit., 217 says: "Le mariage a pour but la procreation des enfants, non la debauche au la satisfaction, contraire aux lois comme à la raison, des passions." Chadwick, op. cit., 33 says: "Clement's personal attitude to marriage is curiously confused." Ibid., 34: "In short, the best Christians in Clement's view are those who are married but have no sexual relations with their wives...Despite his anxiety to vindicate marriage as created by God, he shared the idea that sex relations are to be avoided."

2Edward E. Malone, O.S.B., The Monk and the Martyr: The Monk as the Successor of the Martyr (Studies in Christian Antiquity, 12; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950), 13 concludes that Clement recognizes martyrdom as the pinnacle of Christian perfection, but since it is not an ideal toward which all must strive (witness his own life), he proposes a new ideal of "gnostic martyrdom" which consists less in "the actual forsaking of family and of worldly possessions, and on abstaining from the things of the world. For him perfection consists in the limitation of God."

3Strom. IV, III, 12.1.
the dissolution of the chains which bind the soul to the body."\(^1\)
But the witness of death alone does not constitute martyrdom, death of the body, that is. Some who share the name christian but really are not, have rushed to death out of hatred for the Creator.\(^2\) Martyrdom must be a witness to God, not a rejection of Him. The soul of the man who lives as a gnostic is drawn away from the body toward God. "It is the will of God "that we should attain the knowledge of God, which is \(\textit{koivouia}\) of immortality";\(^3\) "our true treasure is where what is allied to our mind is, since it bestows the communicative power of righteousness."\(^4\) Clement quotes I Peter 4:13: "as you are partakers in the sufferings of Christ, rejoice; that at the revelation of His glory ye may rejoice exultant."\(^5\) And he also borrows Paul's exhortation to the Philippians on the endurance of affliction: "If there is therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any communion of spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfill ye my joy, that ye may be of the same mind, having the same love, unanimous, thinking one thing."\(^6\) And later he quotes Paul's words to the Hebrews, a call to their former constancy in the faith: "Call to mind the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great flight of afflictions; partly, whilst ye

\(^1\)\textit{Strom. IV, III.} \hspace{1cm} \(^2\)\textit{Strom. IV, IV, 17.1.}
\(^3\)\textit{Strom. IV, VI, 27.2.} \hspace{1cm} \(^4\)\textit{Strom. IV, VI, 33.6.}
\(^5\)\textit{Strom. IV, VII, 47.4.} \hspace{1cm} \(^6\)\textit{Strom. IV, XIII, 90.3.}
were made a gazing stock, both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used.\(^1\)

According to Book V, Wisdom "repays the application of the elect with its crowning fellowship."\(^2\) But "it is not allowed to hand to every chance comer what has been procured with such laborious efforts."\(^3\) Both in Christianity and in the pagan philosophies those who fall away from the dogmas and the practice of the subjugation of the passions are called dead. For "what communion hath light with darkness?" as Paul said to the Corinthians.\(^4\)

Though there is only one faith, its deeper meanings are veiled and are not easily penetrated. The same phenomenon existed among the Pythagoreans who had a double κοινωνία, one made up of the vast majority, the ακουσματικοί, and the other, who have a genuine attachment to philosophy, the μαθηματικοί.\(^5\)

In Book VI the gnostic is encouraged to employ all types of human knowledge to arrive at the knowledge of the truth. Dialectic, for example, will help him to avoid error and false opinion by the ability it has to distinguish in what respect things are common, and in what respects they differ.\(^6\)

The gnostic ought not only to know the truth but he should

---

\(^1\) Strom. IV, XVI, 101.2. \(^2\) Strom. V, XIII, 83.5.

\(^3\) Strom. V, IX. \(^4\) Strom. V, IX, 57.5.

also communicate it, according to Book VII. In this way, "he mediates contact and κοινωνία with the Divinity." And even if he is rejected, "he never cherishes resentment or harbours a grudge against anyone, though deserving of hatred for his conduct. For he worships the Maker, and loves him, who shares life, pitying and praying for him on account of his ignorance." He has developed the habit of doing good and of giving a share of his own goods to his dearest friends.

According to Book VIII, those having κοινωνία in a discussion must agree on terminology before a "starting point for instruction to lead the way to the discovery of points under investigation" may be established.

κοινωνία also exists in the world of the cosmos. The stars, which have sympathy and κοινωνία with one another, also have κοινωνία with the angels set over them to govern them.

Other types of relationships involving κοινωνία also appear in Clement. The name Serapis shows κοινωνία with sepulture. Vulgar tongues are formed by the κοινωνία of two, three or more dialects. Heteronyms, according to Clement's definition, are words "which relate to the same subject under different names, as

1Strom. VII, IX, 52.1. 2Strom. VII, XI, 62.3. 3Strom. VII, XII, 80.1. 4Strom. VIII, II, 4.2. 5Strom. I, XXV, 166.1. 6Ec. Proph. 55.1. 7Protr. IV, 48.6. 8Strom. I, XXI, 142.2.
ascent or descent.¹ But words "which have a different name and definition from each other, and do not possess the same subject" are not to be called heteronyms.²

**Koinonia and its Cognates in the Related Authors of the Patristic Period**

The union with God in Christ and the Holy Spirit to which the Christian was called was both expressed and achieved, according to Acts, through belief in the teaching of the Apostles, sharing of material goods, and sacramental participation in the Eucharist. Clement of Alexandria also recognized the achievement of union with God in Christ and the Spirit as the goal of Christian life. He believed that progress toward this union could be achieved by a twofold preparation. The first phase was a moral purification involving generosity and detachment in the use of material goods and a purification of the sensual passions. The second phase was an intellectual purification which aimed at achieving knowledge and contemplation of God as a prelude to complete union with Him in eternity.

The writings of related authors of the Patristic period reveal how the Christian Church continued to develop her conception of the Christian vocation and the means by which it could be realized and manifested. The Patristic writers utilized *koinōnia* and its cognates to express various aspects of the practices and

¹ *Strom.* VIII, VIII. ² *Strom.* VIII, VIII, 244.
doctrines of Christianity which provide interesting comparisons and contrasts with the use of κοινωνία in the New Testament and in Clement of Alexandria.

The New Testament writers, especially Paul, emphasize that the spiritual union of Christians should be manifested in their willingness to share their material goods with needy fellow Christians. Clement also stressed the need for this type of expression of Christian charity but adds in addition the idea of a balanced use of material goods as an elementary form of spiritual purification. The observations of several of the Patristic authors on this topic seem to resemble the New Testament motivation more than that of purification which Clement advocates. In commenting on the impact which Christianity had on the lives of men, Justin Martyr says that those who before wanted riches now bring their goods into the common stock and have κοινωνία with the needy. He exhorts them not to look for their own glory in such action, however. The author of The Shepherd of Hermas declares that both the poor who receive and the rich who give are κοινωνοί of a just work. Origne mentions that Christians are urged to contribute to the treasury of the Church for the support of the poor.


2Justin Apologies XV, 10.

3Hermas Le Pasteur 51.2.9, ed. Robert Joly (Vol. 53; Sources Chrétiennes; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1958), 218.
according to their means. ¹ He reminds adult Christians of their
duty to provide the necessaries of life for their parents. ² Euse-
bius offers as motivation for Christian charity Christ's command
to His disciples to share their goods with the needy and to be
concerned about the common good. ³

No mention of marriage expressed in terms of koinônia oc-
curred in the New Testament. Clement presented a balanced view
of Christian marriage and sex in which he criticized extremely
licentious as well as extremely abstemious views. Many Christians
of the Patristic period however seem to have adopted Paul's posi-
tion on the superiority of celibacy. Theodoret relates that Pelagius
persuaded his bride on their wedding night to prefer chastity to sexual intercourse. ⁴ Origen grants that the married have
the opportunity for sexual koinônia and children, ⁵ but he indi-
cates that spiritual children are more noble since they are born

¹ Origenes Matthäuserklärung XI. 9.489. All the Greek texts
from Origen are taken from the Werke (12 vols. in 13 parts; Die
Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahr-

² Origenes, Matthäuserklärung, XI. 9.489.

³ Eusebius Die Demonstratio Evangelica III. 3. 1. All the cit-
ations from Eusebius are taken from Werke (9 vols.; in 12 parts;

⁴ Theodoret Kirchengeschichte IV. 13. 2. All the citations
from Theodoret are taken from his Werke (Die Griechischen Christ-
lchen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; Leipzig: J.C.
Hinrichs, 1911).

⁵ Origenes Matthäuserklärung XIV. 13.632.
without sexual \textit{koinonía}. The type of \textit{koinonía} practiced in a spiritual marriage is acceptance of the Word which results in immortality. \footnote{Prignese \textit{In Lucam Homil VII}. \textit{Matthäuserklärung} XVII21.799.} Thaleia, in Methodius' \textit{Symposium}, allows sexual intercourse\footnote{Methodius \textit{Symposium} III.13.85. All the Greek texts from Methodius are taken from \textit{Werke} (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1917).} among the married who are not strong enough to remain perfectly continent. \footnote{Symposium III. II.80.} But he phrases virginity, in which there is "no participation in the impurities of the flesh." \footnote{Symposium V. 6.126.} A virgin is not barren but has spiritual offspring through her \textit{koinonía} with the Son of God. \footnote{Symposium VII. 4.159.} She is thus considered worthy to become partaker of the kingdom of the Only-begotten, being betrothed and united to Him. \footnote{Symposium VII. 8.166.}

The New Testament indicated no special knowledge, necessary for salvation and union with God, in addition to the teaching of the Apostles. Clement taught that, in addition to the simple faith of most believers, there was a special knowledge of God reserved for the few leading to contemplation and union with God. This gnostic faith, as Clement envisioned it, was more a matter of degree than kind, however. No trace of a gnostic Christian doctrine is indicated in the statement of Justin Martyr who says that he allowed anyone who came and asked to have \textit{koinonía} in the
Christian doctrines. The Christians did have a reputation of being a secret association, thought since they avoided setting up altars and images and temples. This is one of the charges of the pagan, Celsus, who ridiculed both Christianity and Judaism and was answered by Origen in his treatise, *Contra Celsum*. In answer to the above accusation, Origen replied that Christians avoid setting up altars, images, and temples, but not for the reason Celsus suggests: "we avoid things which, though they have an appearance of piety, make impious those who have been led astray from the piety which is mediated through Jesus Christ." In answer to Celsus' objection that, if idols are nothing, the Christians should not be afraid to take part in the high festival, and if they are demons of some sort, they belong to God and we should pray that they will be kindly disposed, Origen refers to Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians in which he replying to the view that 'an idol is nothing in the world' and established that harm comes from eating meats offered to idols, proving to those able to understand his words that without doubt the man who partakes of meats offered to idols is doing something no less serious than murder. For he destroys his brethren for whom

---

¹ *Acta Martyrii Justin et Sociorum*, 564, 3.
² *Origenes Gegen Celsum* VIII.17.
³ *Gegen Celsum* VIII. 20.
⁴ *Gegen Celsum* VIII. 24.
Christ died. \(^1\) "That which is offered to idols is sacrificed to daemons, and a man of God ought to not become a partaker of the table of daemons." \(^2\)

Celsus further objects to the unwillingness of the Jews to associate with other people, "as though they had some deeper wisdom." \(^3\) Origen replies: Though Celsus will not agree, the Jews do possess some deeper wisdom, not only more than the multitude, but also than those who seem to be philosophers, because the philosophers in spite of their impressive philosophical teachings fall down to idols and demons, while even the lowest Jew looks only to the Supreme God. In this respect at least they are right to be proud and to avoid the society of others as polluted and impious. \(^4\) But Origen does not, by the same logic, envision Christianity as a religion for the elite, either intellectually or spiritually. Rather, he says that Christians, who are ambassadors of truth, should spread the Christian message widely since it is intended for the common good rather than catering only to the educated. \(^5\) In answer to Celsus' ridicule of the Christians for welcoming into their midst all kinds of wicked men and allowing them to participate in the Christian mysteries and share in its wisdom, Origen objects that these

\(^1\) Gegen Celsum VIII. 24. \(^2\) Gegen Celsum VIII. 30.
\(^3\) Gegen Celsum V. 41. \(^4\) Gegen Celsum V. 43.
\(^5\) Gegen Celsum VI. 1.
people are first invited to be healed and then gradually to share in Christian doctrine and practice. He indicates in addition that several Greek philosophers experienced a similar conversion of life and that men like Celsus who boast of their concern for the common good should thank Christianity for being able to inspire men to abandon their wicked ways and to live a life beneficial for humanity. But Celsus objects that those who are sinners by nature and custom will have a difficult time in reforming their lives. It is those who are without sin, he claims, who are οἰκονομοὶ of a better life. The Christians only make empty promises in teaching a doctrine of a blessed life and οἰκονομία with God. Origen objects that a man's deeds, particularly his philanthropy, help him achieve salvation.

Due to the Roman persecutions of the Christian Church in the early centuries, martyrdom became an important way of witnessing to the faith. The author of the Martyrdom of Polycarp would end his life in the same way that Christ did, since Polycarp professed to be a οἰκονομός of Christ. Eusebius mentions that many of the faithful wanted to take away the body of

1 Gegen Celsum VII. 61. 2 Gegen Celsum I. 64.
3 Gegen Celsum III. 65. 4 Gegen Celsum III. 80.
Polycaip "and to have a communion with his holy flesh."¹ Origen observes that the martyrs who have κοινωνία in suffering also have κοινωνία with Christ and will be κοινωνοί of His glory.² Dionysius of Alexandria, a disciple of Origen, also comments that martyrs are called κοινωνοί of the kingdom of Christ.³ Both the orthodox and the heretical sects claimed their martyrs who of course, refused to have κοινωνία with each other.⁴

Clement did not emphasize actual martyrdom as much as he did a "gnostic martyrdom," a dying of the self, without which he felt, the act of physical martyrdom was meaningless. Later, when the opportunities for martyrdom were not so numerous, some Christians adopted the practice of witnessing to their faith by renouncing the world and living as ascetics and hermits or in cenobitic communities, which were referred to by George Nazianzen in terms of κοινωνία.⁵

Clement and several other Patristic writers saw openness to the Word as a special means of union with God in Christ and the Spirit. But as members of the Church began to differ, sometimes

¹Eusebius Kirchengeschichte IV. 15. 40.
⁴Eusebius Kirchengeschichte V. XVI. 22.
radically, in their interpretation of the Word, inspiration gave way to organization. Κοινωνία in orthodox doctrine, the definition of which was often dictated by the emperor, became the absorbing concern of Christians. Orthodoxy of belief became the criterion upon which sacramental participation was allowed.

Κοινωνία and its cognates used to designate union in doctrine have been observed fourteen times in Eusebius,¹ eighty-four times in Athanasius,² and once in Theodoret.³ The criterion by which orthodoxy is to be measured, according to Athanasius, is the witness of the Apostles.⁴ To determine the correct interpretation of the doctrine of the Apostles, councils and synods were held both locally and for the whole Church.⁵ The Emperor Constantine, who tried to achieve κοινωνία at a synod,⁶ is quoted by Eusebius as saying: "the dignity of your synod may be preserved and the communion of your whole body maintained unbroken,

¹Eusebius Kirchengeschichte V. 24.17.
²Athanasius Vita S. Antonii 690.9. All Greek texts from Athanasius are taken from Opera Omnia Quae Extant (2 vols.; Patrologia Graece, ed. J.P. Migne; Paris, 1857).
³Theodoret Kirchengeschichte I. 30.1.
⁴Athanasius Epistola ad Dracontium 209, 4.
⁵Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), IV 2410 et passim uses κοινωνίω four times meaning to take part in a council or synod.
⁶Athanasius Epistola ad Epictetum 725.9.
however wide a difference may exist among you as to unimportant matters. For we are not all of us like-minded on every subject nor is such a thing as one disposition and judgment common to all alike."¹ But he pleaded with the members of the synod: "as regards the Divine Providence, let there be one faith, and one understanding among you, one united judgment in reference to God."²

There was no room for κοινωνία with the Arians because they denied that the Word was co-existent with the Father.³ Any who say they have no κοινωνία with them and yet worship with them should be told not to, according to Athanasius.⁴ In fact, the attitude on the part of those differing in doctrine was quite hostile. John Chrysostom says that those who are in communion should have no κοινωνία with their adversaries.⁵ Eusebius indicates that not even the κοινωνία of speech was practiced between heretics and Christians.⁶ Anyone, bishop, priest, or

¹ Athanasius Epistola ad Afros Episcopos 718.10.
³ Athanasius Vita S. Antonii 677.66.
⁴ Athanasius Epistola ad Monachos 771.
⁵ Jean Chrysostom Lettres A Olympias IX 1b, ed. et tr. Anne-Marie Malengrey (Sources Chrétiennes; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1947).
⁶ Eusebius Kirchengeschichte IV. 14.7.
layman, considered to hold unorthodox doctrine was excluded from
the church and worship and could also come under the sentence of
banishment or death. A council could depose a bishop for het-
erodoxy, in which case he would be deprived not only of his
office but even of κοινωνία with the faithful. The formula of
excommunication was: "οὐκέτι κοινωνοῦμεν." It became customary in the Church to send letters to the
Christian community at large which were either declarations of
orthodoxy or condemnations for heterodoxy. The former type were
known as τὰ κοινωνικά γράμματα and were of two kinds: "the one
given to the clergy and laity when they were going to travel, in
order that they might be admitted to communion by foreign bishops;
while the other kind were sent by bishops to other bishops to
declare their communion with them, and were in turn received from
other bishops...They were usually sent by new bishops soon after
their ordination." The latter type, condemnations of those cut

\begin{footnotes}
1. Athanasius Epistola encyclica 5.4.
2. Athanasius Epistola ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae 232.22.
3. Athanasius Apologia ad Constantium Imp. 248.29.
4. Athanasius Apologia Secunda 49.4.
5. Athanasius Historia Arianorum 32.2.
6. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, ed., Eusebius, Church History
\end{footnotes}
off from κοινωνία with the Church, were directed "to the injury and dishonour of those who hold communion" with them. One such letter was sent about Leontius, a eunuch, who, according to Athanasius, "ought not to remain in communion even as a layman, because he mutilated himself that he might henceforward be at liberty to sleep with one Eustolium, who is a wife as far as he is concerned, but is called a virgin."  

The Emperor often exerted his influence in securing adherence to the particular theological position he favored. Many bishops in κοινωνία with Athanasius had been deposed under the influence of the Emperor Constantius. "Orders were sent also to the more distant parts, and Notaries dispatched to every city, and Palatines, with threats to the Bishops and Magistrates, directing the Magistrates to urge on the Bishops, and informing the Bishops that either they must subscribe against Athanasius, and hold communion with the Arians, or themselves undergo the punishment of exile while the people took part with them were to understand that chains, and insults, and scourgings, and the loss of their possessions, would be their portion."  

An interesting dialogue is recorded by Theodoret between Eulogius, a presbyter of Edessa, and a perfect of the Emperor

---

1. Athanasius Apologia Secunda 56.2.
3. Historia Arianorum 30.3.
4. Historia Arianorum 31.3.
Valens. The perfect ordered Eulogius to have ἱερατεύμονα with the emperor. Eulogius responded by asking if the Emperor were not a priest as well as emperor. The perfect retorted: "I did not say so, you fool; I exhorted you to communicate with those with whom the Emperor communicates." To this the old man replied that they had a shepherd and obeyed his directions, and so eighty of them were arrested.¹

Theodoret also related that the Emperor Valens was persuaded by Eudoxius to get the Goths to accept ἱερατεύμονα with him and the Arian position.² "Partly by the fascination of his eloquence and partly by the bribes with which he nailed his proposals Eudoxius succeeded in inducing him to persuade the barbarians to embrace communion with the Emperor."³ Also, "Ulpilas in his efforts to persuade them to join in communion with Eudoxius and Valens denied that there was any difference in doctrine and that the difference had arisen from mere empty strife."⁴ So the Goths, while describing the Father as greater than the Son, still refuse to call the Son a creature, though those in ἱερατεύμονα with them do.⁵ Valens' successor Gratianus, however, adhered to true Christianity and immediately proved it "by published an edict commanding the exiled shepherds to return, and to be restored to

¹Theodoret Kirchengeschichte IV. 18.3.
²Kirchengeschichte IV. 37.1. ³Kirchengeschichte IV. 37.3.
⁴Kirchengeschichte IV. 37.5. ⁵Kirchengeschichte V. 37.4.
their flocks, and ordering the sacred buildings to be delivered to congregations adopting communion with Damasus."\(^1\)

The plight of those who repented of their heresy and wanted to return to orthodoxy varied. One bishop who left the orthodox position was received back as a layman.\(^2\) Another, Natalius, left the Church and became bishop in an heretical sect. Later he wanted to return to the Church. He dressed in sackcloth and ashes and prostrated himself before the bishop, clergy, and laity, and begged and cried to be accepted back into the of the Church.\(^3\) Others, according to Dionysius of Alexandria, who joined heretical sects and then repented were received back. Members of the Church "summoned them to assemblies, introduced them and admitted them to the prayers and feasts."\(^4\)

A problem arose about the validity of baptism in a heretical sect. Both Eusebius\(^5\) and Dionysius of Alexandria\(^6\) mention bishops who would not have with other bishops who rebaptized heretics. A certain Haracles went to his bishop protesting

\(^1\)Kirchengeschichte V. 2.1.
\(^2\)Eusebius Kirchengeschichte VI. 43.10.
\(^3\)Kirchengeschichte V. 28.12.
\(^4\)Dionysius of Alexandria Epistle I.3.
\(^5\)Eusebius Kirchengeschichte VII. 5.4.
\(^6\)Dionysius of Alexandria Epistle V. 2.1. The Greek citation here is identical with that in footnote 443.
that "the baptism he had received among the heretics was not this, nor had anything in common" with orthodox Christian baptism, but the bishop still refused to rebaptize him "saying that his so long being in communion with us was sufficient for the purpose." Participation in the Eucharist became the visible expression of unity in doctrine. Just as the Christians were not to associate with the heterodox, according to the Paschal Homilies, so the sacrifice was not to be taken outside the church so that others might not have koinōnia in it. The Christians were urged to be prepared to receive the Eucharist, the koinōnia of holiness, and to live their lives in order to become a and metochos of the holy. According to Isidore of Pelusium, the Eucharist is a koinōnia which gives us unity with Christ and makes us koinōnoin in His kingdom.

Koinōnia was also used by the Church Fathers in doctrinal formulations to describe the relationship among the persons of the Trinity and the koinōnia of men with God in Christ and the Spirit.

1Epistle V.5. 2Epistle V.5.
4Homélies Pascales III. 5Homélies Pascales III.
6Isidore of Pelusium Epistolarum Liber I; 228, ed. J.P. Migne (Patrologia Graece; Paris, 1860), 325.
Athanasius asserted that a relationship of ἀμοιβή exists between the Father and the Son. Christ himself has assured us "that He is of the Father’s nature, and He has given us to know that of the True Father He is True offspring." If this were not so, He would not have said it, "for what ἀμοιβή is there between the True and the not true?"

Basil of Cæsarea, in his treatise De Spiritu Sancto, was primarily concerned with proving the equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. He held a doctrine of one God and three hypostases or special personal properties: Fatherhood, Sonship, and Sanctification. Basil maintained that there was a natural ἀμοιβή between the three persons of the Trinity and that proof of this could be seen from the things created at the beginning. Also, the Spirit "is moreover said to be 'of God'; not indeed in the sense in which "all things are of God," but in the sense of proceeding out of God, not by generation, like the Son, but as the Breath of his mouth." The ἀμοιβή which exist naturally among Father, Son and Spirit, by the fact of naming

---

1 Athanasius De sententia Dionysii 17.1.
2 Athanasius Oratio III Contra Arianos 442.9.
5 Traité du Saint-Esprit 136a. 6 Traité du Saint Esprit 152a.
them in that order is not lessened, as the Arians think it is. 2
"Grant, they say, that He is to be glorified, but not with the
Father and the Son. But what reason is there in giving up the
place appointed by the Lord for the Spirit, and inventing some
other? What reason is there for robbing of His share of glory
Him who is everywhere associated with the Godhead; in the con-
fession of the Faith, in the baptism of redemption, in the work-
ing of miracles, in the indwelling of the Saints, in the graces
bestowed on obedience?" 3 No one who realized the unique place of
the Spirit in the Christian scheme of things could possible deny
His Κοινωνία with the Father and the Son. 4

Basil also protested that the language used to express the
reality should not mislead us as to the nature of the reality.
Quoting Paul, II Cor. 13:13: "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ
and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost," main-
tained it makes no difference if we were to use "with" instead of
"and" as the conjunctive element; 5 "the conjunction 'and' intim-
ates that there is a common element in an action, while the pre-
position 'with' declares in some sense as well the communion in
action," 6 since, "wherever the fellowship is intimate,

1Traité du Saint Esprit 153c. 2Traité du Saint Esprit 156a.
3Traité du Saint Esprit 172a. 4Traité du Saint Esprit 172b.
5Traité du Saint Esprit 59. 6Traité du Saint Esprit 177b.
congenial, and inseparable, the word with is more expressive suggesting as it does, the idea of inseparable fellowship.\(^1\) "The preposition 'in' states the truth rather relatively to ourselves; while 'with' proclaims the fellowship of the Spirit with God."\(^2\) Also the phrase "through whom" does not designate a reality inferior to that expressed by "of whom"; either can be applied to any of the person.\(^3\)

Union with God is made possible for the believer because God has created man with the desire for κοινωνία with Him.\(^4\) In addition, Christ became man and had κοινωνία in human birth that men might become κοινωνία of the divine nature\(^5\) and live forever in heaven.\(^6\) This κοινωνία with God in Christ is achieved through the Holy Spirit\(^7\) who operates in men, making them spiritual by κοινωνία with Himself,\(^8\) and in the Church, animating all the members of the body.\(^9\)

The relationship or κοινωνία existing on all levels of

\(^1\) Traité du Saint Esprit 184b. \(^2\) Traité du Saint Esprit 193b.
\(^3\) Traité du Saint Esprit 77d.
\(^4\) Basil of Caesarea Adversus Eunomium I. 18.
\(^5\) Athanasius Vita S. Antonii 680.72.
\(^6\) Athanasius Oratio III Contra Ariano, 468.40.
\(^7\) Athanasius Epistola I ad Serapion 643.30.
\(^8\) Basile de Césarée Traité du Saint-Esprit 109b.
\(^9\) Traité du Saint Esprit 181b.
realities—divine, celestial, human—has been ordered into hierarchies with great intricacy by Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite. 1 A perfect κοινωνία exists between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, 2 who, while remaining unmoving and unchanged, 3 call all being into κοινωνία with themselves 4 "by illuminations corresponding to each separate creature's powers, and thus draw upward holy minds into such contemplation, participation and resemblance" to the divine as each can attain. 5

The celestial hierarchy, the highest level of created beings, is ordered into three triads of angels: principalities, archangels, and angels. 6 They preside over the hierarchies among men "in order that the elevation, and conversion, and communion,

1 Dom Denys Rutledge, Cosmic Theology. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: An Introduction (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), 33 comments: "It would, then, I suggest, fit better into this author's scheme to regard the hierarchies as neither joined, so that one is the continuation of the other, nor as parallel, but rather as interpenetrating, the one living in the other."

2 Dionysius Areopagitica De Divine Nominibus II, I. All the Greek texts from Dionysius Areopagitica are taken from Opera Omnia Quae Extant (2 vols.; Patrologia Graeca; Paris, 1857).

3 Dionysius Areopagitica De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia III, III. III.

4 Dionysius Areopagitica De Caelesti Hierarchia IV. I.

5 De Div. Nom. I. II.

6 De Cael. Hier. IX. II.
and union with God may be in due order."\(^1\) All the angels contemplate and have κοινωνία with the divine\(^2\) as well as with each other.\(^3\) Within each rank there are three choirs, and according to this law of upward progression "the more divine are instructors and conductors of the less to the Divine access, and illumination, and participation."\(^4\)

The ecclesiastical hierarchy is also ordered into a triad: sacraments, clergy, laity. This forms "the vital link between the visible and invisible worlds, between the transient world of becoming and that of true, permanent being...The 'mysteries' or sacraments, form the direct link with the invisible world."\(^5\) The sacraments are divided into the triad of baptism, unction and eucharist; the clergy into deacons, priests and bishops; the laity into monks, lay Christians, and imperfect members.

Dionysius maintains that κοινωνία in the Eucharist, since it completes our κοινωνία with God, is for men most properly called κοινωνία or synaxis.\(^6\) Therefore, participation in the Eucharist must be carefully regulated. After the readings from the Scripture the three classes of the imperfect members leave

\(^1\) De Eccles. Hier. III.V. \(^2\) De Caec. Hier IV.2.
\(^3\) De Caec. Hier. XV.IX. \(^4\) De Caec. Hier. XV.I.
\(^6\) De Eccles. Hier. III.I.
the sacred enclosure, while only those "deemed worthy of sight and participation of the Divine Mysteries remain."¹ The Hierarch or bishop, chants, elevates the symbols and then participates in the Eucharist himself.² Then he exhorts the others, distributes Communion and terminates with a thanksgiving. Through participation in the Eucharist each person is drawn into koinwonia with the One³ according to his own character.⁴ The results of this koinwonia with regard to the soul are manifest "in pure contemplation and in the science of things being done" and with regard to the body "by sanctifying the whole man."⁵ Thus man, and all of reality which proceeded from the One, finds its ultimate fulfillment in its return to the One.

The general conclusion which results from a study of the citations of koinwonia and its cognates in the Old and New Testaments, Philo, Clement, and related Patristic authors is the same as that reached in the two preceding chapters, namely that the contexts in which koinwonia and its cognates occur are accurate reflections of the historical, intellectual, social, theological, and ecclesiastical milieu which produced them.

The fact that, in its initial stages, "Christianity seemed

¹De Eccles. Hier. III.II. ²De Eccles. Hier. III.II.
⁵De Eccles. Hier. VII.IX.
indistinguishable from its parent and was regarded by many as no more than another sect within Judaism.\(^1\) is proof of the statement that "the religion of a given race at a given time is relative to the whole mental attitude of that time."\(^2\) This is reflected in the general similarity of the contexts in which ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ occurs in the Old and New Testaments and in the literature describing the Essene sect. And yet the unique nature of Christianity also is reflected in the special orientation which ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ receives in the Christian context.

The Old Testament warned the Hebrews against any relationships which would endanger their moral integrity. The New Testament also contained similar admonitions but it minimized them and emphasized instead the positive relationship of those who were ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ in their faith in Christ and in the Gospel. The relationship which each believer enjoyed with God the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit also placed him in a special relationship with those who shared his belief. That such a close relationship should exist among believers was not a new idea to the Hebrew community. But the relationship between the believer and the Trinity was far beyond anything which the Hebrews had thought possible between man and God. In fact, when Paul tried to find

\(^1\) J.C. Davies, The Early Christian Church (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965), 30. The survey of the development of the Church which follows is based largely on this source.

\(^2\) Hatch, op. cit., 2-3.
an Old Testament parallel to the sacramental participation in
the body and blood of Christ, all he could find was the statement
reminiscent of that made by Philo, that those who shared in the
remains of the Jewish sacrifices, namely the poor and the
priests, were considered κοινωνοί of the altar, which is sometimes
considered "a circumlocution for God."

The existence of the Essene community proves that individ­
ual communities could and did exist within the Jewish community
as a whole. Thus the existence of the Apostolic community pract­
ing some form of communal living, as described in Acts fits
comfortably into the historical context. In fact, the communal
life which these early Christians practiced bears some resem­
blance to the Essene community life as described by Philo and
Josephus and as revealed by archaeological excavations at Qum­
ran. Themes in Essene literature, such as that of light and
darkness, can also be paralleled with New Testament texts. That
there was any direct influence of the one upon the other is im­
probable, however.

Paul encouraged the gentile Christians to contribute to
alleviate the material needs of the poor in Jerusalem. The var­
ious Christian communities which he founded also contributed for
Paul's needs also. This sharing of one's goods was a common
Hebrew practice too, as both the Old Testament and Philo indicate.

Both the "climate of thought and religious practice,"¹

¹Davies, op. cit., 34.
and the actual historical situation in the Roman Empire of the first century A.D. were favorable to the rapid growth of Christianity which is witnessed to in the New Testament epistles. Pagans in the diaspora, familiar with Judaism but not desiring to submit to circumcision, found the new religion attractive. Members of the philosophical schools were drawn by the emphasis on a high moral standard of behavior which, like them, Christianity fostered. Those who had been made aware of their need for a savior in the Mystery cults found fulfillment in the Christian doctrine of salvation. The Pax Romana also "facilitated the movement of men and ideas."¹ The Christian missionaries were not slow to take advantage of this opportune circumstance to travel and preach the "good news" about Christ who became man, died, and rose again, offering the hope of life forever to all believers.

In the second century, "new emphases, new interpretations and developments of ideas and movements, nascent in the preceding decades"² began to come to the fore. A pagan religious revival took place, exemplified in Plutarch, the chief characteristic of which was syncretism. There was also a renewed interest in philosophy, particularly in Platonism, though mixed with Aristotelian and Stoic elements, which was clearly reflected in Clement's

¹Ibid., 35.
²Ibid., 68.
thought.

Most people, however, still lived under the shadow of an inexorable fate, haunted by the vision of evil spirits. They sought to escape evil by means of astrology or the mystery religions. In this context also, the success of the Gnostic schools, which offered a means of "escape from the wheel of fate and the predatory activities of evil spirits" is understandable. In contrast to Christianity whose doctrines, as Justin Martyr affirmed, were open to anyone who asked, Gnosticism taught that there was a special knowledge leading to salvation reserved for the few.

Part of the whole gnostic trend in this period is reflected in the thought of a certain Marcion who caused considerable confusion in Christianity when he repudiated the Old Testament theology because of the nature of its God. He posited instead a dualism of a legalistically righteous demijure, harshly and cruelly demanding obedience to his law, and of a forgiving Father, revealing himself in loving action instead of in hate and retribution. The pressure of this and other heresies within Christianity initiated the process of formulating a Canon of Scripture, finally completed in the fourth century, based on the following criteria: authorship by an apostle or close associate;

\[1\text{Ibid., 70.} \quad 2\text{Ibid., 75.}\]
acceptance by the Church at large; general edification of subject-matter. ¹

Christians from the beginning both believed in and experienced the necessity of suffering for their faith in imitation of Christ who suffered for them. Though there was no systematic attempt to exterminate the Christian community during the second century, persecutions did arise due to local circumstances. One of the main difficulties was the fact that worship of the emperor was required of all citizens of the empire, a ritual to which Christians often refused to conform. Polycarp seems to have been a victim of a crown which, while celebrating a festival in honor of Caesar, turned against the Christians who were known opponents of the cult. Justin and his companions were the victims of one Crescens, a Cynic, who had been defeated several times in discussion by Justin, and who took revenge by reporting Justin to the authorities as a Christian.

Theologically, the patristic writers of the second century continued to interpret the person of Christ in terms of his function, namely as the bearer of illumination, as the revelation of God. Influenced by the Old Testament imagery and the terminology of Philo and the Stoics, they referred to Him as the Logos, the Wisdom, and the Word of God. Baptism and the Eucharist remained the main aspects of the cultic life of Christianity.

¹Ibid., 85.
Though some sects interpreted the freedom of the sons of God as licence to indulge in the pursuit of every type of pleasure, in general, the Christians of the second century were exhorted to a restrained manner of living. Mortification and self-denial were encouraged as means of developing spiritual vitality. Almsgiving was still considered the Christian's response of gratitude for all that he had been given.

The third century is characterized by a continued expansion of the Church and a struggle between Church and State. Official paganism was kept alive by a long line of short-reigning emperors who attempted to secure their precarious position by outlawing every type of organized club and by demanding worship from all the subjects of their empire as a proof of loyalty. Failure of the Christians to comply with these regulations resulted in organized systematic persecutions, which did not end until 261 A.D. when Gallienus tolerated Christianity as a religio licita. Patristic authors referred to those who chose martyrdom rather than worship the emperor as ἑονιστai of Christ and His kingdom. Many defenses of Christianity were also composed during this period to counteract the attacks and suspicion which Christians incurred because of the objectionable practices of some of the heretical sects, both Christian and Gnostic. A good example of this type of writing is Origen's Contra Celsum, a defense against a knowledgeable attack by a pagan both on Judaism and on Christianity.

The theological controversies of the period were concerned
with Trinitarianism and the person and nature of Christ. Tertullian, writing in Latin which now began to be used together with Greek as a language for theological discussion, was the leading Christian spokesman on these points in the West as Origen was in the East. Origen tried to preserve both the unity and trinity of persons, but his thought was complicated by a lack of exact terminology and by failure to distinguish between derivation and creation. Origen saw the role of Christ as twofold, that of Savior and that of Wisdom. Both Christ's relationship to the Trinity and His relationship to the believer were expressed by Origen in terms of ἱεραμόσυνα.

With the hope of an immanent parousia fading and with the continued expansion of Christianity the Church during this period began to develop a more structured organizational system which, though it grew out of the earlier functional offices, now subordinated function to office and privilege. The parochial system developed to cope with the numerical and geographical expansion of the Christian congregations but an attempt was made to preserve a sense of unity by means of ἱεραμόσυνα in councils and synods.

The schisms which developed during this century were the result of both personal differences and a lack of agreement on disciplinary questions. Bishops were uncertain about the reception back into the fold of those who had apostasized during the persecutions and later wanted to return to the Church. They
also differed as to whether those who had been baptized in heretical sects should be received into the Christian community without rebaptism. Stephen of Rome refused to rebaptize heretics or to have κοινωνία with those who did. Cyprian, on the other hand, maintained that baptism outside the Church was invalid and had to be repeated for each schismatic.

The cultic practices of Christianity during the third century, basically the same as in the preceding centuries, became more elaborate and enriched. The Eucharist assumed special importance as a symbol of unity in doctrine and in which those outside the fold were not to have κοινωνία. Emphasis was placed on the importance of preparation for κοινωνία with Christ in the sacrament. The agape by this period had become dissociated from the Eucharist and functioned as a "quasi-religious gathering for the faithful."¹

Christianity, which had suffered from the disfavor of many of the emperors of the third century, found herself the object of the patronage and protection of the emperor Constantine in the early fourth century. His religious policy was one of toleration, which extended to Christianity and paganism alike. Later in the century however, under the emperor Julian, paganism experienced a period of renewed vigor. The emperor technically supported a policy of religious toleration, but established a

¹Ibid., 153.
strict educational policy in which Christians were no longer allowed to teach in the schools. He provided an organized structure for paganism, modelled on that of the Church, and encouraged the practice of strict moral living, thus giving paganism a new and powerful impact in the empire.

Much of the information about this period comes from two sources, the *Chronicle* of Eusebius and the writings of Athanasius, and largely concerns the Arian controversy, which was undoubtedly the most significant of the schisms which disturbed the equilibrium of the Church during the next century and a half. Arians maintained that the Son was only a creature, while Athanasius and the Council of Nicaea, which Constantine convoked to settle the question, maintained that Christ was not like in nature to the Father but equal in nature to Him. Theoretically, the question was settled at the Council, but actually the controversy continued on for almost half a century. Eusebius' *Chronicle* records various instances of attempts to achieve κοινωνία in doctrine among the different elements in the Church, the pressures brought to bear on both heterodox and orthodox by the various emperors, and the hostility between those who differed in their theological positions.

Athanasius was supported in his theological position by the three Cappadocians, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzus. Following the lead of Athanasius who had extended the controversy regarding the nature of the Son to a further
consideration of the role of the Spirit, they solved the problem of apparent subordinationism in the Trinity by the idea of con-substantiality.

The practice of Christian asceticism was furthered by the development of monasticism, of which St. Antony was a well-known exponent. The type of monasticism practiced by Antony "was initially a protest of individuals; it was at first eremitical in character." As it developed, however, the idea of community life was also introduced. It was this form of monasticism which Basil of Caesarea observed in Syria and Egypt and then organized in his area by a rule which became the model for monasticism in the Greek Church, according to Gregory Nazianzen's eulogy of Basil.

Toward the end of the fourth century, paganism enjoyed its final revival in the empire, a revival which was brought to a conclusion by the victory of Theodosius in 394 A.D. By this time the Pax Romana was no longer a reality due to internal conflicts and external pressures. Rivalries between the emperors of the East and West weakened the strength of the empire internally and the barbarian invasion threatened it externally.

In the fifth century the Church in the West developed more independently of the political power than it did in the East. The career of John Chrysostom "illustrates the relations of

1 Ibid., 185.
Church and State in the East where the former came to be dominated by the later, and the contrast with the situation in the West, as evidenced by the exchanges between Ambrose and Theodosius, where the Church came to dominate the State. John's episcopate also reveals the rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople, which played a not unimportant part in the Church history of the early fifth century. The Fathers of this period were forced to struggle against the heretical doctrines of Pelagianism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism which again threatened the doctrinal unity of the Church.

Cultic practices became more elaborate and differed considerably from area to area. But in general "every rite continued to have two parts: the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the sacrament. This two-fold division is well illustrated by the information provided by pseudo-Dionysius in regard to the Eucharist. This author is interesting in his attempt, during this period of dissension and lack of unity both within and without Christianity, to provide an organized synthesis of the whole of reality and its interrelationships based on the philosophical doctrines of Neo-Platonism.

It is within the historical context of the patristic period, particularly that of the second century A.D., that Clement of Alexandria and his thought must be understood. Many elements

1Ibid., 220.
characteristic of the second century milieu can be easily discerned in his writing. The philosophy, which he had the vision to attempt to integrate with his Christian theology, was that which was prevalent during the period, a Platonism compounded with Aristotelian and Stoic elements. The demons who frightened so many he incorporated into his system as mediators between God and men. His encounter with gnosticism, and possibly also with Pythagoreanism, led him to the formulation of Christian gnosticism, based on authentic doctrine, in which the believer was encouraged to live a life of contemplation in response to the Logos. First, however, he had to succeed in ordering his passions following on his death to self in baptism. In opposition to the Marcionite heresy Clement stressed the compatibility of the theology of the Old and New Testaments and assigned an important role to both in his thought and writing. He stressed the necessity of inward martyrdom, in an age of martyrs, as the most significant means of Christian witness and put his theory into practice by fleeing from Alexandria during the persecution under Septimus Severus in 202-203 A.D.

Reitzenstein has stated: "In religious history it is even clearer than elsewhere that nothing can exercise influence which does not find its way prepared, and nothing is living which is not essentially new."¹ This statement can, with the proper

¹Nock, op. cit., 87.
alterations, apply equally well to figures in Church history such as Clement of Alexandria. Clement seems to have been able to respond faithfully to the Christian message and at the same time to integrate, more or less creatively, into his own thought much of his age, thus revealing depths in the Christian message which were new and vital. Bigg describes Clement as "above all things a Missionary; . . . He must graft the fruitful olive on to the wild stem, and aim at producing, not a new character, but a richer development of the old. This he succeeded in doing to a remarkable degree."¹

¹Bigg, op. cit., 47.
CHAPTER VI

KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES: GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS

The following analysis of grammatical constructions which occur with κοινωνία and its cognates is based on an examination of the more than 1400 citations collected for the whole of this study, most of which have appeared in earlier chapters. The constructions most commonly used by each of the three authors, Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria will be studied and tabulated. These results will then be compared with the results from a random sampling of citations from other authors of the same period, and finally conclusions will be drawn from this data regarding the general grammatical usage of κοινωνία and its cognates.

Plato uses noun forms of κοινωνία a total of eighty-nine times. Seven cognate noun forms also occur. The adjective κοινωνικός occurs twenty-nine times and is used substantively in every instance. Five other cognate adjectival forms also occur. Verb forms of κοινωνέω, including infinitives and participles, occur a total of eighty-eight times. Five other cognate verb forms also occur.

Examples of twenty-three different constructions of combinations of constructions occur with the forms of κοινωνία and its cognates in Plato. They are listed here with one example of each
construction:

1. Genitive of person - 310B. 
   
   "Tōs tōn ἐπιγαμίων καὶ παιδῶν κοινωνίσεων καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἑλίκια ἔκδοτες καὶ γάμους.

2. Genitive of thing - 462B. 
   
   "Οὐκόπων ὁ μὲν ἡδονῆς τε καὶ λύπης κοινωνία χαίρεται, οὔτως ἐν μιᾶσσέα πάντες οἱ πολιτεία τῶν αὐτῶν γνωσμένων τε καὶ ἐποδημάνων παραπληγιώς χαίρως καὶ λυπώνται.

3. Genitive of person, adverbial modifier - 845C. 
   
   "Τί δὲ πριν δυστυχῶς τὰν ἐπτητα τοὺς την, φαγὼν συνή καὶ ἀποφεύγων υπήκοαν, καθάτερ ὅ πνεῦς, ταύτῃ κοινωνεῖτο αὐτῶν τοῖς ἄνετων...

4. Genitive of thing, adverbial modifier - 411C. 
   
   "Επείδαι ἄλλο μηδὲν πράττει μηδὲ κοινωνίᾳ Μοῦσας μηδαμή.

5. Genitive of person, dative of person - 464A. 
   
   "Ἄρι οὖν τοὺς λείψαν πρὸς τὴν ἄλλη καταστάσει ὧν τῶν γυναικῶν τε καὶ παιδῶν κοινωνία τοῖς φωλαξί.

6. Genitive of person, dative of person, prepositional phrase - 450C. 
   
   "Τὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῖς φωλαξίν ἡμῖν παιδῶν τε περὶ καὶ 

   γυναικῶν ἕστατ καὶ τροφῆς νῦν ἃν ἄνετων...

7. Genitive of person, prepositional phrase - 209C. 
   
   "ὅποιο πολὺ μεῖζον κοινωνίαν τῆς τῶν παιδῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὥς τοιοῦτο, 

   ἰδέουσιν καὶ φιλίαν ὑβαριστέραν...

8. Genitive of thing, dative of person - 844B. 
   
   "τούτην 

   ἡμέρας ἐκατοσς κοινωνεῖος, οὕτω κοινωνεῖτο τοῖς ψεύτησιν θατοῖς.

9. Genitive of things, dative of thing - 46A. 
   
   "Ἐξ γὰρ τῆς ἐντὸς ἐκατοσ τοῦ περὶ ἐκατερού χαιράτας ἀλλήλους, ἐνοῦ τε ἅ περὶ 

   τὴν λειτουργία ἐκατοσ τοῖς χαίρεσι ἐναναίτω καὶ πολλῷ μεταρρυθμηθέντως...

10. Genitive of thing, prepositional phrase - 283D.
τὸ μὲν κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ὀλληλὰ μεγέθους καὶ σμικρότητος κοινωνιῶν,
τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν τῆς γνώσεως ἀναγκαίαν ὀδσίαν.

11. Genitive of thing, dative of person, prepositional phrase
- 730Ε ... τὸν δ' αὖ μὴ δυνάμενον, ζήλους δὲ, ἢν δεύτερον,
τὸν δὲ φθονοῦντα καὶ ἐκόπτει μονον ὑπεντὶ κοινωνῶν
ἀραθών τινῶν αὐτὸν μὲν φέρειν...

12. Genitive of thing, dative of thing, prepositional phrase
- 757Ε ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ μὴν καὶ τούτους παρωνυμίοις ποτὲ προσ-
χρόσασθαι πόλιν ἄπασαν, εἰ μὲλλει στάσεων ἐαυτῇ μὴ προσ-
κοινωνήσει κατὰ τὶ μέρος.

13. Dative of person - 369Ε ὅπως τὸν γεωργὸν ἐνα ὀντα
παρασκευάζειν συνὴ τέταρτον καὶ τετραπλάσιον χρόνον τε καὶ
πονῆν ἐκλίνειν ἐπὶ σῖτου παρασκευή, καὶ ἀλλοις κοινωνεῖν.

14. Dative of thing - 253Α Πᾶς οὖν ὅθεν ὡστά ὑποίοις
δυνατὰ κοινωνεῖν, δὴ τέχνης δὲι τῷ μελλοντι δράν ἰκανῶς
αὐτῷ;

15. Dative of person, prepositional phrase - 316Β ... πρώτον
μὲν ὡς ἑυκότως σοὶ ἔφεσυ κοινωνεῖν περὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως
πράγματα ... 

16. Dative of thing, prepositional phrase - 248Α Καὶ
ἀκόμα μὲν ἡμᾶς ἐνεβαί ἀδιδήσεως κοινωνεῖν, δὴ λογισμοῦ
δὲ φυχῆ πρὸς τὴν ὄντως ὀδσίαν ...

17. Dative of person, direct object - 540Ε Ἁρδῶς, ἔφο,
ἐπερ ἔστα ἄν πάντα τῶν ἀνδρῶν κοινωνήσουσιν, ὡς διήλθομεν.

18. Dative of thing, direct object, prepositional phrase -
20. Adverbial modifier, prepositional phrase, dative of thing - 466CD τῶνα πραττούσας ὑπὲρ πρὸς τὸ ἅρπεν, ὑπὸ περὶ κατὰ τὸ θυμόν κοινωνεῖν.

21. Direct object, prepositional phrase, adverbial modifier - 466CD ...ὑπὲρ καὶ ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲν πάντα πάντα κατὰ τὸ θυμόν κοινωνεῖν...

22. Prepositional phrase - 468 τὸς ἐν τῷ μείζων κοινωνοῦσας λέγεις.

23. Absolute usage - 449C ἄλλα τὸ ὁρβῶς τῶντο, οὕσα τῇ ἀλλη, λόγου δεῖται, τὸς δ' ὁμοίος τῆς κοινωνίας.

The two hundred and twenty-three citations of κοινωνία and its cognates occur the following number of times with each of the constructions mentioned above. In the table below, each construction is assigned the number it was given above and the number of occurrences of the construction is given, according to the form of the word with which the construction appears.

From this table it can easily be seen that the most frequently occurring constructions with κοινωνία and its cognates in Plato are: 1) genitive of thing - eighty-three; 2) absolute - for-
TABLE I
NUMBER OF CONSTRUCTIONS OCCURRING WITH KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN PLATO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction number</th>
<th>Noun Forms</th>
<th>Adjective Forms</th>
<th>Verb Forms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ty-five; 3) prepositional phrase - nineteen; 4) dative of thing - sixteen; 5) genitive of thing and dative of person - fourteen.

As a point of comparison, some three hundred thirty-five citations from Aristotle, Demosthenes, Xenophon, Isocrates, Thucydides, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Isaeus, Aeschylus, Pindar, Lysias, Euripides, Sophocles, Theophrastus, Aeschines, Fragments
of Attic Comedy, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, Supplementum Inscriptionum Graecum were studied. A variety of sixteen different constructions or combination of constructions occurred, the most frequent being: 1) genitive of thing - one hundred thirty-five; 2) absolute - one hundred six; 3) genitive of person - twenty-five; 4) genitive of thing and dative of person - twenty; 5) prepositional phrase - sixteen.

Comparing these results with those obtained from the study of the citations of κοινωνία and its cognates in Plato, it can be seen that the construction with the genitive of thing was of most frequent occurrence in both groups of citations. The absolute construction was second in both. The constructions with the prepositional phrase and with the genitive of thing and dative of person also occurred among the five most frequently occurring constructions in both groups. Plato does use several more combinations of constructions than were found in the citations of the other authors of the classical period. However, it seems safe to conclude that grammatically Plato used the forms of κοινωνία and its cognates with the constructions common in his day and that in general the most frequent constructions which occurred with κοινωνία and its cognates in the classical period were the genitive of thing, the genitive of person, the dative of thing, the genitive of thing with the dative of person, the prepositional phrase. The absolute construction also occurred frequently enough to be significant.
Plutarch used the noun forms of κοινωνία a total of one hundred six times. The cognate noun form κοινωνίας occurs eight times. The adjective κοινωνικός occurs twenty-one times with the cognate forms κοινωνικοῦ, ἀκοινωνίου, δυσκοινωνίου, κοινωνητικός occurring twenty-four times. Verb forms of κοινωνέω, including infinitives and participles, occur sixty-nine times. The verbal form occurs twice.

A total of sixteen different constructions and combinations of constructions have been observed in these citations. They are listed here with one example of each construction:

1. Genitive of person - 329F ὅδε ξύλοις οὐδὲ σχεδόνιος οὐδὲ λιμὺχοις καὶ ἀναμπαθῶς δεσμοῖς, ἀλλὰ ἐνρητὶ νομίμως καὶ γάμως σωρφοὶ καὶ κοινωνίαις παῖδων τὰ γένη συνάπτειτες

2. Genitive of thing - 886E τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲνα τούτων ἀπανών κοινωνέων, ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ περιστὰν ἐμφυχός καὶ ήμωνες.

3. Genitive of person, genitive of thing, dative of person - 49A ἐν καλῷ καταστάσει διὰρίν μὲν καὶ διαχῖναν πᾶσαν εἰργεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ γάμου, παῖδων δὲ καὶ τεκνώσως κοινωνίαν ἐνὶ γάμῳ.


5. Genitive of thing, dative of person - 204AB ὁ δ’ ἑτερὰς προγνώθη λεπτεῖς τῶν μὲν πράξεων πάσης ἐκοινώνει τοῖς Δασκαλομονήσιοις.
6. Genitive of thing, prepositional phrase - 899E

7. Genitive of thing, dative of person, prepositional phrase - 1620

8. Genitive of thing, accusative absolute - 738E

9. Dative of person - 798C

10. Genitive of thing, accusative absolute, dative of person - 279E

11. Dative of thing - 758F

12. Direct object, adverbial modifier - 634B

13. Prepositional phrase - 972B

14. Adverbial modifier - 48F
15. Dative of person, prepositional phrase - 980

16. Absolute construction - 769F

The following table indicates the number of times each of the two hundred thirty forms of κοινωνία and its cognates occur with each of the constructions illustrated above. As in the previous table on the citations and constructions occurring in Plato, each grammatical construction is assigned the number it was given above and the number of occurrences of the construction is given according to the form of the word with which the construction appears.

The results of this tabulation indicate that the most frequently used constructions and combinations of constructions with κοινωνία and its cognates in Plutarch are: 1) genitive of thing - ninety-one; 2) absolute construction - sixty-eight; 3) prepositional phrase - twenty; 4) genitive of thing and dative of person - nineteen; 5) genitive of person - eight.

The results of the tabulation of some one hundred ten citations from the Hellenistic-Roman authors and sources Polybius, Philo, Stobaeus, Themistius, Diogenes Laertius, Marcus Aurelius,
### TABLE II

**NUMBER OF CONSTRUCTIONS OCCURRING WITH KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN PLUTARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction number</th>
<th>Noun Forms</th>
<th>Adjective Forms</th>
<th>Verb Forms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plotinus, Josephus, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom, Proclus, Epicurus, Arrian, Lucian, Athenaeus, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius Halicarnassus, Doxographi Graeci, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, Supplementum Inscriptionum Graecum in thirteen different constructions and combinations of constructions indicated that the most frequently occurring constructions among these authors were: 1) absolute construction - forty-one; 2) genitive of thing - twenty-five; 3) prepositional phrase - fifteen; 4) genitive of thing and dative of person - thirteen; 5) genitive of person and prepositional phrase - six. Here again four out of five of the constructions which
occurred with most frequency in the citations of Plutarch also occurred with most frequency in a random sampling of citations from other Hellenistic-Roman authors. Several combinations of constructions occurred in Plutarch which did not occur in the selection of citations from other authors studied here; four combinations of constructions were found in the latter citations which were not found in Plutarch.

Clement of Alexandria uses the noun form of κοινωνία a total of sixty-two times. κοινωνός occurs five times and the cognate adjectival form κοινωνικός occurs twelve times. The verb forms of κοινωνέω, including the infinitives and participles and verbals occur twenty-seven times. A total of eleven different constructions and combinations of constructions have been observed in these citations. They are listed here with one example of each construction:

1. Genitive of person - Strom. III, XVII, 102-4
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλώνων λυμον τὴν ἐπιθησεσίν τῆς συνουσίας δὲ ὑφισ εἰληφὼς καὶ παραπέθανε τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς Ἐθῶς συγκαταθέσαν τὸν Ἀδριανὸν τύχη...

2. Genitive of thing - Strom. IV, IV, 17,1. εἰτε γὰρ τίνες ὁχὴ ἡμέτεροι, μόνον τοῦ ὀνόματος κοινωνοί, οὐ δὲ αὐτοῖς παραδίδοναι σπεύδουσι τῇ πρὸς εἰς ἰδιιουργοῦν ἀπέχει... 

3. Genitive of person, dative of person, prepositional phrase - Paed II, X, 90, 4. ἔχει γὰρ ὅρθως μαλλον μὴ ποτε
κοινωνίαν καθάπερ δηλεῖτιν πρὸς μίαν άφροσίαίν τοῖς νέοις.


5. ἐπεμνήσθημεν δὲ καὶ τῆς κατὰ Καρποκράτην άθεσμον γυναίκιν κοινωνίας...

5. Genitive of thing, dative of person - *Strom.* IV, XIX, 123.

2. "Ελοίς ἀν ἡ σώφρων πρῶτον μὲν πείθειν τοῦ ἄνδρα κοινονόν αὕτη γίνεται τῶν πρὸς εὐθαμονίαν...

6. Genitive of thing, prepositional phrase - *Strom.* IV, III, 12, 1. ἦθος τὸς μὲν εἶναι ἢ ἐν σώματι κοινωνία τῆς φυχῆς αμαρτητικῆς ὀόσος, ὥσπερ δὲ δὲ καὶ Χωσιμώδης τῆς αμαρτίας.

7. Dative of person - *Ecl. Proph.*, 27, 7. καὶ κινδυνεύειν ὑπὸ πολλῆς τῆς ἐφάπτομα ὧν μόνον πεῖν τῇ προσέχων ἀλλ' ἐσθοὶ δέ τε καὶ ἀναξίων λὴμπᾶς δεομένῳ κοινωνήσειν ...

8. Dative of thing - *Strom.* III, XII, 89, 2. τῆν ἑτερίαν κοινονίαν μιαρὰν ἡγούμενας τὴν ἅλλωρα σώματι συμπληκτασμοί καὶ μὴ τῇ κατὰ συμμορίαν εἶς παιδοποιική διδομένῳ.

9. Dative of thing, prepositional phrase - *Protr.* II, 25, 3. ἤν δὲ τῆς ἐμφύτου άρχαια πρὸς οδρανόν ἀνδρώτας κοινονίας, ἄφοισ μὲν ἑκοσοιμένη, ἁρμῶν δὲ ποὺ διεξωρέσσεσα τῷ σκότῳ καὶ ἀναλάμπουσα ...


The following table indicates the number of times each of the one hundred six forms of *koinonia* and its cognates occur with each of the constructions listed above.

**TABLE III**

**NUMBER OF CONSTRUCTIONS OCCURRING WITH KOINONIA AND ITS COGNATES IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction number</th>
<th>Noun Forms</th>
<th>Adjective Forms</th>
<th>Verb Forms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this tabulation indicate that the most frequently used constructions and combinations of constructions with *koinonia* and its cognates in Clement were: 1) absolute - thirty-six; 2) genitive of thing - twenty-six; 3) prepositional phrase - seventeen; and a three-way tie at 4) dative of thing - five; genitive of thing and dative of person - five; dative of person -
The tabulation of some four hundred eighty citations from the patristic writers Origen, Athanasius, Dionysius Areopagiticus, Methodius, John Chrysostom, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Hermas, Theodotus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Isodore, Gelasius, Photius, Philostorgius, Serapion, John Damascene, Justin, the Paschal Homilies, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and from the New Testament indicated that the most frequently occurring constructions and combination of constructions in this non-selective sampling of citations were: 1) genitive of thing – one hundred thirteen; 2) absolute construction – one hundred four; 3) prepositional phrase – eighty; 4) dative of person – fifty-six; 5) genitive of person – fifty.

Comparing these results it can be seen that three of the most frequently occurring constructions in Clement and the other patristic authors were identical, though occurring in a different order. The total of eleven different constructions and combination of constructions in Clement was less than the fifteen observed in the sampling from the other authors.

In general, it can be concluded that the grammatical constructions which occurred most frequently with κοινωνία and its cognates remained essentially the same from classical to Christian times. Though the absolute construction occurred often enough to be significant both in Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria and in the related authors of each period, it was by far more
common that the thought of the χόρων -root word was completed in some way. Most often this was done with the genitive of the thing or a prepositional phrase, but the thought could also be completed by the genitive of person, dative of person, dative of thing, genitive of thing and dative of person. There was a definite tendency toward the simplification of the combinations of constructions from Plato to Plutarch to Clement. Generalizations on this tendency in the related authors of the three periods must be more tentative since the number of citations studied in each period varied. However, fewer combinations of constructions were observed in some four hundred eighty citations from patristic writers than in the two hundred twenty-three citations from Plato. The general conclusion resulting from this grammatical analysis is that the relational character of χόρων and its cognates persisted strongly from classical to Christian times.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The aims of this study, as outlined in the Introduction, were threefold: to approach the thought of Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria as it is reflected in their total use of κόινωνία and its cognates; to compare the use of κόινωνία in the three main authors with that of other authors in the Classical, Hellenistic-Roman, and Patristic periods; to consider the general development of κόινωνία and its cognates from Classical to Christian times.

Plato with philosophic vision perceived a world of Ideas in which harmony and κόινωνία existed among the various Forms and between the Forms and the Good or One. He saw this harmony and capacity for relationship reflected in the world of the cosmos and realized further that the same harmony should exist in the soul of the individual and in the πόλις. This could be attained, he felt, only if both the soul of the individual and the πόλις were modeled upon or had κόινωνία in some way with the Forms in the world of Ideas.

Plato observed that the harmony in the cosmos was the product of κόινωνία between its soul, in communion with the divine and its bodily nature. Man he regarded as a microcosm of the cosmos, a being animated by soul and having κόινωνία in a bodily
nature. Soul was, of course, for Plato the most important element because it most resembled the divine and also because it was with the eyes of the soul alone that the true reality existing in the world of the Forms was able to be perceived. The passages in which Plato used κοῦννικα were primarily concerned with man's soul, drawn upward by his κοῦννικα with the virtues which exist in the world of the Ideas and at the same time drawn down by his κοῦννικα with the body to mere appearances of reality.

The most important means by which the soul could be freed for κοῦννικα with the virtues was by participation in the life of a well-ordered polis, composed of producing, material, and ruling classes, and where every aspect of life was planned in conformity with reality as the philosopher-king had perceived it in the world of the Ideas.

The tripartite polis was paralleled by the tripartite soul, in which reason was to have the dominant role. In the harmonious pursuit of temperance, courage, wisdom and justice, according to Plato, both the polis and the individual were ultimately ordered to the Good.

Since the role of the polis was to educate its citizens to the practice of the virtues, it was necessary that it provide circumstances of life most conducive to this end. Regulations were established, according to what types of κοῦννικα were and were not suitable for the citizens. And since the practice
of virtue hopefully attained ultimate union with the Good and the One, the highest possible degree of unity within the polis seemed most desirable. Thus Plato suggested that the κοινωνία of women, children, and goods he established, particularly for the two upper classes, so that all the members of the polis would share the joys and sorrows of all and come as close as possible to an imitation of the κοινωνία with the One which was the end of all being and which the soul, finally freed from the body, would enjoy forever.

Plutarch, too, observed that harmony and κοινωνία characterized all levels of reality. God, his ultimate Good, did not exist in solitary splendor, removed from the rest of reality, but enjoyed κοινωνία with the gods and other worlds. Demons effected the κοινωνία among the gods and between the gods and men. The heavenly bodies, in Plutarch’s view, had κοινωνία in soul and thus possessed sensitive, rational and intellectual faculties and were guided by reason and providence. Men and animals were also constituted by a κοινωνία of soul and body, with the soul having κοινωνία in the divine nature as well. The soul, made for κοινωνία with the divine, profited in very few ways from its κοινωνία with the body since its rational element was continually being dragged down to κοινωνία with the passions.

One of the most important ways in which Plutarch believed that the soul could succeed in achieving κοινωνία with the divine was to foster the natural impulse to κοινωνία which the deity
had implanted in the soul. This, man and, to a lesser extent, the animals, were able to do through mutual society and friendship.

The social contexts which Plutarch regarded as most conducive to the development of κοινωνία for men as individuals were marriage and family, the symposium, and friendship with like-minded persons. Most important for the successful achievement of κοινωνία in these contexts was that the partners be able to enter into a like κοινωνία, thus stressing the necessity for equality in these humanizing and also divinizing relationships.

The social nature of man was also reflected in his development of and participation in political associations. Plutarch encouraged active participation in the life of the polis which required living sociably, amicably, justly, and temperately. Though the polis by its nature required many types of κοινωνία for its success, such as κοινωνία in a favorable geographical location, yet Plutarch considered that κοινωνία among the citizens was the most essential element for a successful political κοινωνία.

It was, then, by living most perfectly in accord with his social nature in this life that Plutarch believed that man pleased the gods, benefited the state, and be prepared to have κοινωνία with the divine in the afterlife.

Clement of Alexandria's absorbing interest was κοινωνία between God and men. He maintained that there was an innate
original \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) between men and heaven which had become obscured through ignorance but which had come to light again through God's sharing His Word with man in the person of Christ. Clement taught that all men were called to this \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) with God through Christ by a twofold approach, \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) in the truth through \( \gamma \nu \sigma \iota \) and \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) in virtuous deeds. It is the latter context in which \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) is most frequently used by Clement.

The Christian was exhorted to imitate God, who brought men into \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) with Himself by sharing His Word with them, by giving one another \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) in their material possessions. Clement did not encourage the Christian to give all his possessions away and live in destitution, nor did he advocate a common life such as was practised in the Apostolic Church. But he did encourage him to be willing to share with others anything over and above that which he needed.

Clement praised the \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) of Christian marriage as a way to heaven. He condemned both those who regarded sexual \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) as inherently evil and those who advocated an unbridled use of the sexual powers under the guise of the freedom of the children of God.

The \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) in virtuous deeds which Clement advocated was aimed at the kind of death which consisted in deliberate separation from \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) in an unchristian way of life so that the soul might be freed for \( \kappa \omega \nu \nu \iota \) with the divinity through knowledge and contemplation. Not all Christians necessarily reached this
level of μανιώνια with God, but those who did were obliged to share the results of this μανιώνια with the divinity with their fellow men. After death, both the Christians who had μανιώνια with God through the moral virtues and those who in addition had this μανιώνια through the practice of the intellectual virtues and contemplation would become the κοινωνοί of God.

μανιώνια for Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria was a phenomenon found in every aspect of reality. For all three men, however, its most important aspect was that involving man, particularly the soul, which by its nature seeks μανιώνια with its ultimate goal as an end and is at the same time led to the formation of various other types of μανιώνια by reason of its μανιώνια with the body, which can be used as means to the attainment of the ultimate goal or can be deterrents to its attainment.

Plato, Plutarch, and Clement differed, however, in their view of what constituted the end and which means were most conducive to its attainment. The goal for Plato was the attainment of the Good by the soul freed for unhindered contemplation of the Ideas. Plutarch's view of the end was union with a personal and benevolent God. The goal for Clement was union with God through Christ in the kingdom of heaven. All three men posited the nature of man as dualistic, however, with the soul striving for the goal indicated but being hampered in its attainment by its μανιώνια with the body. So they each indicated the types of μανιώνια
in the human situation which they felt would be most conducive in preparing the soul for the union which was its goal after it was finally freed from its κοινωνία with the body.

Plato held that all human activity should free man from all but necessary concern with the body so that he would be able to contemplate as fully as possible the Forms in the world of the Ideas and to imitate the Forms or virtues in his life. He felt that life in a well-regulated polis which, by being ruled by a philosopher-king who had a vision of the Ideas, conformed as closely as possible to reality, would be most conducive to contemplation and virtue. He suggested a policy of κοινωνία of women, children, and goods as a means of achieving the greatest possible unity within the polis. Undoubtedly he also had in mind the strong attachment to this world of appearances which family and possessions can engender, thus distracting the soul from κοινωνία with the divine which is its true goal.

Plutarch also recognized the tension which existed in the soul striving for union with the divine through reason and yet pulled down to a lower type of existence by the passions. For him, however, living a life according to reason meant living according to the social instincts which the divinity had implanted in the soul. Therefore, rather than avoiding contact with the world to strive for unhindered contemplation of the divine, Plutarch encouraged the development of κοινωνία in the contexts of the family, the symposium, friendship, and political life. The
fostering of mutual society and friendship would thus enable him to enter more perfectly into κοινωνία with the divine, which he regarded as a personal being of a social nature.

Clement seems to have combined both the idea of freedom from the lower aspects of human nature to enable the soul to enter into a deeper κοινωνία with God through knowledge and contemplation and that of the importance of personal relationships, both with Christ and with other Christians, in his view of the best means to attain the end of union with God. Granted, however, that the former means would be the privilege of only the few. He advocated a balanced use of material goods which avoided both a position of extreme renunciation and of gross licentiousness. Marriage he praised as a means to gaining heaven. Like Plato and Plutarch who regarded the polis as providing a context most conducive to preparation for κοινωνία in the goal, Clement regarded the Church as a sort of spiritual polis in which the same conducive circumstances might be provided for the believer.

In general, then, it can be concluded that κοινωνία and its cognates as used by Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria provide an interesting insight into each author's view of the nature of man, his ultimate destiny, and the means most conducive to attaining it. While their views are similar in many respects, each also differs significantly from the other and reflects the insights and beliefs and experiences of the historical milieu in which he lived and worked and thought. Their use
of κοινωνία and its cognates likewise reflects their particular historical situation.

A comparison of the use of κοινωνία and its cognates in Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria with that of other authors in the Classical, Hellenistic-Roman, and Patristic periods results in several interesting observations.

Among the usages of κοινωνία in the pre-Platonic citations, the impact of the scientific study of medicine in the Hippocratic school at Cos, which used κοινωνία to describe certain of the interconnections within the body, can be seen in the references which Plato makes to the physical connections of the body, both as physiological observations and as analogies with the connections and interrelationships existing in the body politic. Here Plato does something similar to what Pindar did when he made the κοινωνία of lyre and voices a symbol of spiritual harmony.

Plato's statement that the earth, air, fire, and water are "variegated in their shape and combinations and formulations" echoes the sentiment of the Hippocratic writer that the hot, cold, wet, and dry cannot exist without mixture and is used as evidence by those who regard Plato's theory of Ideas and participation as derived from the scientific study current in that period.

The earlier writers, with the exception of Aristophanes, with their sympathetic view of the importance of marriage and the family, would have objected to the theory of the κοινωνία
of women, children and goods which Plato established for his ideal state. Nor would they have accepted his emphasis in the Laws on marriage as an institution for the good of the state and therefore subject to careful regulation.

Plato's use of κοινωνία as compared with that of Aristotle is also of special interest. Both authors regarded κοινωνία as natural to man, but they had different views on the nature of the basic κοινωνία which resulted ultimately in the formation of the polis. Plato viewed the mature polis as composed of classes related by a specific though unequal contribution to the common good. For Aristotle, κοινωνία involved the combination of diversity and equality for the purpose of attaining some good. The end, as Plato envisioned it, lay outside the polis in ultimate union with the One. The end for Aristotle was happiness which consisted in the possession and exercise in this life of the intellectual and moral virtues together with a possession of a sufficiency of material goods.

The uses of κοινωνία and its cognates by the related authors of the Classical period were usually concerned with specific instances of κοινωνία. The orators used κοινωνία primarily in contexts involving relationship among men and between states in a political vein. Other relationships described by these authors in terms of κοινωνία were those of military, social, marital, commercial, legal, genealogical, and nefarious kinds and occurred mainly in specific contexts also. Such citations of
**Koinwvía** in specific contexts occurred only rarely in Plato, but they were not entirely lacking.

**Koinwvía** in Plutarch and the related authors of the Hellenistic-Roman period is frequently used to designate the general relationships that exist on all levels of reality. The most frequent contexts in which it occurs, however, concern man's social nature in relation to other men. Stress was placed on the importance of developing the natural impulse to society. The Stoic Wise Man was said to set the example of a life lived in society and action. The good of all men consisted in fellowship with other men, and no one was to be excluded from this basic human right. The authors acknowledged, however, that social relationships admit of degrees and that the most perfect type of relationship is that of friendship, which is a **Koinwvía** of life.

A wide range of human relationships are described in terms of **Koinwvía** by Plutarch. They include: **Koinwvía** in political activities and alliances, administration and government; **Koinwvía** in blood relationships and intermarriage and marriage; **Koinwvía** in business partnerships, military activities, and in enterprises of various types; **Koinwvía** in religious festivals and in sacrifice; **Koinwvía** in the glory of another, in hopes regarding an enterprise, and in philosophical pursuits. **Koinwvía** in many of the same specific contexts also occurs in the other writers of the period.

Clement's use of **Koinwvía** and its cognates compared with
that of the Old and New Testaments, Philo and Josephus offers several points of similarity. The Old and New Testaments and Clement all warn against relationships which would endanger the moral integrity of the person. Sin and righteousness cannot have κοινωνία. Clement and the New Testament writers warn Christians against κοινωνία with demons. Both Clement and the New Testament writers, however, emphasized much more the positive relationship of those who were κοινωνοί with God in the Son or Word. Such a relationship was not new to the Hebrews, but the relationship as proposed in the New Testament and which Clement advocated was far beyond anything which the Hebrews had thought possible between man and God. The emphasis on contributions to alleviate the needs of the poor was common both to the New Testament, to Philo's description of Hebrew practices, and to Clement's account of the Christian's obligation in this regard.

The use of κοινωνία and its cognates in the related authors of the Patristic period was similar to that of Clement in many respects but also showed further developments in the application of the term in Christian contexts.

Clement and the Patristic authors agreed that God created man for κοινωνία with Him and that this was made possible by Christ's κοινωνία in human birth. They also encouraged Christians to share with others the good news of salvation. They exhorted them, however, to avoid any kind of activity that might seem to imply with demons.
The specific instances of *koinwnia* occurred almost exclusively in the related authors of the period and were primarily concerned with indicating union in doctrinal belief. *Koinwnia* was further extended in this context to apply to participation in synods and councils, called for the purpose of establishing orthodox doctrine. The *koinwnia* of the Eucharist assumed great significance as an external expression of the inner *koinwnia* in faith and doctrine among the believers.

Theologically, the Patristic authors affirmed belief in the equality of the *koinwnia* existing among the three persons of the Trinity. They asserted that *koinwnia* with God in Christ was achieved through the Spirit who established *koinwnia* among all the members of the body of the Church.

The following conclusions can be drawn regarding the general development of *koinwnia* and its cognates for Classical to Christian times.

Etymologically, *koinwnia* and its cognates were derived from the Greek *koinon*, meaning "public" or "common." During the long period of the evolution of the Greek language, more and more were words based on the *koin* -root developed to express refined meanings of the general concept.

*Koinwnia* is a relational word indicating in almost all cases an inner as well as an external union. The inner union, when volitional beings are involved, is based on commonality of intent or interest. When it involves non-volitional beings,
commonality of nature makes κοινωνία possible. Because of its character as a relational word, κοινωνία admits of degrees. The more intense or inclusive the relationship, the deeper the κοινωνία. Two of the principles governing κοινωνία, as established by Plato, were that κοινωνία is possible between some but not all things and that it implies some modification of those so related without, however, a loss of identity.

Κοινωνία originally may have applied to definite physical relationships, but, while it still retained the ability to be applied in such contexts, it is much more common that it refer to spiritual relationships, which may also result in a mutual concrete involvement.

Κοινωνία can also be considered from the point of view of whether the words are applied to the description of relationship in the abstract or to particular relationships. In the pre-Platonic citations κοινωνία as descriptive of particular relationships predominate. With Plato and Aristotle, however, there is a greater use of κοινωνία in contexts involving relationship in the abstract, undoubtedly because of the largely philosophical nature of their writings. In Plutarch and Clement of Alexandria and the related authors of the period, there is a more even balance between the occurrences of κοινωνία as descriptive of relationship in the abstract and of particular relationships.

Grammatically, the constructions which occurred most frequently with κοινωνία and its cognates remained essentially the
same from Classical to Christian times. Though the absolute construction occurred often enough to be significant both in Plato, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria and in the related authors of each period, it was by far more common that the thought of the $\kappa\omicron\nu\varsigma$ -root word was completed in some way. Most often this was done with the genitive of the thing or a prepositional phrase, but it could also be completed by the genitive of person, dative of person, dative of thing, genitive of thing with dative of person. There was a definite tendency toward the simplification of the combinations of constructions from Plato to Plutarch to Clement. Generalizations on this tendency in the related authors of the three periods must be more tentative since the number of citations studied in each period varied. However, fewer combinations of constructions were observed in some four hundred eighty citations from patristic writers than in the two hundred twenty-three citations from Plato.

In general the results of the grammatical analysis of the use of $\kappa\omicron\nu\varsigma\alpha$ and the cognates in the more than 1400 citations studied further strengthen the conclusion that these words retain their essentially relational character from Classical to Christian times.
APPENDIX I

GREEK TEXTS FOR CHAPTER III

Plato Epistle VII.327C. ... εἰς Συμφερόμενον δει τάχιστα ἐλθεῖν εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦτον...

Plato Epistle VII.333B. ... ὥπερ καὶ Διονύσιος, ὡς αὐτῶν ἐπεκτείνει ταξίδιον καὶ θεραμμένος ἐκεῖ εἰς ἀρχής κυρίαν, οὕτως κοινωνίαν αὐτῷ τῷ βίοι πανταχι...

Plato Epistle VII.344B. ... οὐδ' ἐρμί βασιλεῖ παῖς, διὰ δὲ ζευγάρως τοὺς κοινωνίαν...

Plato Epistle VII.350C. ... οὐ μετα τῶν άλλων βικεν τρόπον εὐσεβείς καὶ συνεστίους καὶ κοινωνίαν ἐπείγεσ...

Plato Epistle III.316B. ... τρίτων μὲν τόσος εἰκότως σοι ἐφυρὸν κοινωνίαν πέρι ὑπό τῆς πόλεως πράγματα

Plato Epistle III.316D. ... ὅτι ἂν ὁμι λόγως πολιτικῶν εἰναι κοινωνίαν προς σέ, τόν μὲν τίποτα κοινωνίαν ἐπαληλακότα...

Plato Epistle III.318D. ... καὶ τάσσα μὲν τάσσα περι σε πολιτικά κοινωνίας τῆς ἐκείς καὶ σέ...

Plato Epistle III.318E. ... ἀλλὰ τάσσα μὲν τάσσα γενόμενα τήν ἐκείς καὶ τήν τυχόν καὶ τὴν λυκοπίναν καὶ ἀκοινωμίαν διὰ σε ἀπερχόμενο.

Plato Epistle VII.323D-324A. καὶ ὅτι καὶ κοινωνίαν διεκκελεύεσθε μοι, καὶ δέν δοῦναι σε εἰς ἐργα καὶ λόγους. Ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ μὴν δοῦναν καὶ ἐπιδείκνυμι τήν τοσούτον ἐκεῖνον ἐκείνως ἐνορμή κοινωνίας εἰ, εἰ μὴ, δοξάζοντες πολάκις.

Plato Epistle VII.325A. ὅτι οὖκ ἔπειθέτω ... πῶς δὲ ... τοῖχους τοὺς παρακενήσεως παρακενήσεως παρακενήσεως εἰς κοινωνίας.

Plato Republic 476A. ... εἰ δ' ἂν τὸν πράγματα καὶ ὑμνάτας καὶ ἀληθείας κοινωνίας θαυμαζόμενα παλλα ἀνέγερθαι ἐκαστόν. Ὀρθάς, ἐφο, ἐλεύθερος.

Plato Parmenides 151E-152A. ... ὅτι τό έστι δι' τοῦ μέλλοντος οὐσίας έστι κοινωνία; Τοῖς ἀλλοις δὲ τοῦ ἔνος ὑπαίτεικα δὲ τοῦ ἔνος ἐνοικοῦν... Εἰσφορὰ τι χρὴν οὖν οὖν εἰρωνεῖ.
Plato Parmenides 166A.  "Ότι τάλα τών μη ζώνων
οδέναι οδόμαχον οδήμασιν κοινωνιάν έχει...

Plato Sophistes 264E.  ... ἔχομενοι τῆς τοῦ
ορθείον κοινωνίας...

Plato Sophistes 248A.  ἦτα δείξεις κοινωνίαν, διὰ λογισμοῦ δὲ φυσὶν ἐπὶ τὴν δύναμιν οὐδέν, ἤν
ἀρχι ὑπὲρ ταύτης ὁμοίως ἔχειν φασέ, γένοιτον δὲ ἄλλης ἄλλης...

Plato Sophistes 248B.  Τό δὲ ἡ κοινωνία... τί
τοῦ ὅμως ἐπὶ ἀμφοῖν λέγειν φαίμεν;

Plato Sophistes 250B.  Ἰμίον ὧρα τι παρὰ τὰ ὑπὸ τὸ
ἕν ἐν τῇ φυσικῇ τίθεις, διά ὅποιον καὶ τὴν κίνησιν
πεπεσμένην, συνάπτων καὶ διάφορων ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτὴν οἰκονομίαν, ὁμοίως ἔνα ἄνθρωπος
προσείπεται ἀμφότερα;

Plato Sophistes 251E.  ... μὴν ἄμειναν δύναμιν
ἔχειν κοινωνίαν ἐκ αὐτῶν.

Plato Sophistes 251B.  ήτα πέπερν ἄρθραν αὐτῶν ὁμοίως
μὴ προσκοινωνοῦν;

Plato Sophistes 252B.  "Εἰτα τούτων ἢν αὐτοὶ πάντων
καταφθάνοντα μετὰ τῶν λόγων δὲ ὁμεῖας κοινωνίαν
παράκαμφος ἔτερον ἄλλης προσαρκεύειν.

Plato Sophistes 252D.  "Τί δ', ἢν πάντα ἄλλης
ἔχειν δύναμιν ἐχειν ἐπικοινωνίας;

Plato Sophistes 253A.  "Πάς ὁδὸν ὁδὸν ὁποῖα ὁποῖας
dύναται κοινωνίας, ἢ τέχνης τοῦ ἔπειρον ἐκεῖνος ἀλλοτρίως;

Plato Sophistes 253B.  τούτο ἢ ἐπείν, ἢ τῇ κοινωνίας
ἐκάστα δύναται καὶ ὑπὸ μή, διακρίνειν καὶ γένος ἐπίστευε καθα.

Plato Sophistes 254BC.  "Ὅτι ὁδὸν ἢ ταῦτά ὁδὸν ἀλλοτρίως
gενέσθαι κοινωνίας ἐβεβαιοῦσιν ἄλλης, τὸ ὅτι καὶ τὸ
τῶν ἐβεβαιοῦσιν ἄλλης, τα ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀλλοτρίους ἀλλοτρίως κοινωνίας
τοῖς τῶν ἀλλοτρίως κοινωνίας τῷ τῷ κοινωνίας καθα.

Plato Sophistes 256B.  ... ὅτιν δὲ μηδέν τῶν, διὰ
tῆς κοινωνίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίου...

Plato Sophistes 257A.  ... ἐπείπερ ἢ τῶν ἄλλης φύσες.
Aristotle Metaphysics 991a8. ... τι δέ γ' τις θυελλή, γεγονός γ' γώρ τ' θυελλήν πού δε ταύτα μην τυχισμένης είτε κοινωνίας. Αλλ' εμείς, οι λόγοι γίνονται καὶ οὐκέναι καὶ φαντάσματα διερποντέσθαι. Ε' τι ότι τέτην ενα βαθέσιν καὶ την κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν τιμήν ὅτι εἶναι παράδοσις...

Plato Politicus 269D. ... ἕλπις ὅτι η τε κοινωνία καὶ τε οὐκέτοι...

Demosthenes Ag. Arist. II. 27. ἁλίκος ὁ οὖσεν οὖσε σεμνόν ὑπὲρ σπουδαίων τιμῶν τιμῶν διερποντάς καὶ κήρυγμα καὶ ἑορτάσμα παθομένων, τέτην καὶ τίνην αὐτῶν καὶ σα θεία...

Plato Republic 531D. Οὗτος δὲ τις, ὃς ἐκ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἑκάστη καὶ διαθέσιμη καὶ οὖσα παθήσιμα, καὶ συναφείς τάτα καὶ ἑστιν ἑλλάδος οἰκεῖα, τοιαύτη κατ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν βουλήμαθα τῆς πραγματείας καὶ ὅκ αὐτόν ἔστησαν παντεσβάι, τι δὲ καὶ τήν, ἑλλάδα.

Plato Epinomis 978A. ... καὶ πάντως ὧτε ἤλθεν κακοῦ κοινωνίαν τίνος...

Plato Timaeus 61C. ... τῷ μὲν δὲ τῶν μεταλάθηκαν καὶ ταύταν ἑλληνικάς εἰς ἑλληνικά πεποικιλώμενα εἰς ἑκάστην ἑκάστην...

Plato Timaeus 46A. Ἐκ τούτου ἡ ἑλληνική κοινωνία ἑλλήνως, εἰνὸς τοῦτον τῆς κοινωνίας τούτων καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τούτων εἰς τὸ ἐκάστην εἰς τὸν ἑκάστην καὶ τὴν ἑκάστην...

Plato Timaeus 87E. ... ὡμός στ' ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῶν πόρων πολλοὺς μὲν κάποιος...

Plato Leges 722D. ... τοῖς κενοῖς βουλαθῆται, ὅτι καὶ πάντων καὶ τούτων φθορὰ κοινωνίας προαιρεῖ εἰς ἑστιν καὶ ἔχουν ὅτι τίνες ἀνασκευᾶται...

Plato Philebus 25E. Ἀρκὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ νόσει ἁρθεὶς κοινωνία τὴν δοξάσα φρονίμησεν...

Plato Philebus 46B. ... ἐν τῇ νόσει κοινωνίας λέγεται: Πάντως γάρ τὸν...

Plato Timaeus 60D. ... τοῦτο τὸ εὐφρόσυνον καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς μείζον παρὰ τῷ παρὰ τούτου δίδυμον ἄλλον καὶ ταύτη λόγον: Ἐνθαύς ἢ ἑκάστος σύμμετρο.
Plato Timaeus 65E. 
Τὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ στρόματος 
θερμοστή ἱκονισμάτω καὶ λεμνότεμα ὅπ' αὖ τοῦ, 
ζωνετροφοῦμεν καὶ 
πάνω ἀπὸ ἀνέκθυνεν τῷ διαφθείρειν.

Plato Leges 828D. 
... κοινωνία γὰρ φυσῆ καὶ 
σώματι ἀκόλουθος οὐκ ἦσθι βρέφος...

Plato Republic 611C. 
... οἱ λεξιφθείρες οἷς αὐτοὶ 
θερμοστή ὅπ' ἐν τοῖς τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίας 
καὶ ἡλικίως κακῶς, ὡσπέρ 
νῦν ἦμεσσι δεικνύει...

Plato Phaedo 64E-65A. 
... δῆλον τετίν καὶ φιλόσοφος 
ὁπολοῦν ὦτι μαλίστα τὴν ψυχήν, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίας 
dιαφθείρεται εἰς τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων...

Plato Phaedo 65A. 
... πέτρειν ἐξορθόν τῇ σύμμα 
η οὖ ἤγε ΤΙ ἦτο ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ κοινωνίαν συμπαραλλάβαντο...

Plato Phaedo 65C. 
... ἀλλὰ οὐ μαλίστα αὐτῇ 
καὶ ἄντον. μεγάλη, ἐστὶν ἡ μακρά σύμμα, καὶ, 
καὶ ὥσπερ ὅσον ὑπάρχει, καὶ 
κοινωνία, ὡσπέρ ὥσπερ ἀκολουθεῖν ὑπάρχει τοῦ ἄντον.

Plato Phaedo 66A. 
... ὡς τρίτης νοῦν καὶ οὐκ 
ζωτικὸν τὴν ψυχὴν κοινωνία αισθάνεται ἡ νοῦν 
κοινωνία...

Plato Phaedo 67A. 
... ἐκεῖ ὦτι μαλίστα μηδὲν 
διάθεσιν τῷ σώματι μηδὲ κοινωνίαν, ἢ 
ἡ πᾶσα ἀνάγη...

Plato Phaedo 80E. 
... Ἐν μὲν γὰρ 
παραλληλεῖ, ἡ 
κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος 
συνεφύλλωσε, ὡς 
αὐτὸ τῷ ἰδίῳ 
ἐκείναι, ἀλλὰ 
φεύγειν αὐτὸ καὶ 
συνεφύλλωσεν ἀὐτὸ 
τῷ λόγῳ...

Plato Phaedrus 246DE. 
... κεκοινωνίσθη ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας 
τῶν περὶ τῇ σύμμα τῆς βίον.

Plato Leges 645D. 
... ὅλως κοινωνίαν 
τοῖς ποιοῖς τοιοῦτοι 
καὶ 
συμπάθησέ 
γίγνεσθαι.

Plato Leges 859B. 
... Πολλὰ μὲν, ὡσεὶ ἄν 
ἡ δίκαιο 
ορθῶν ὁσπέρ ἣν 
τοῦ 
κοινωνία, κατὰ 
συνεφύλλωσεν καὶ 
τῷ 
μετέχον ἔστε.

Plato Leges 860A. 
... ὡσκεῖν καὶ 
παθῶς ὡσεὶ ἄν 
δικαίον 
κοινωνία, κατὰ 
συνεφύλλωσεν 
καὶ 
μετέχον 
τῷ 
λόγῳ;

Isocrates Encomium ad Helen X.54-55. ὡσα τοῖς τῆς ἱδέας 
κεκοινωνίσθη, καὶ 
τῆς 
ἀρετῆς 
τοῦ 
καλλίστου 
τῶν 
ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἔτην.
Plato Phaedrus 249B. ... παρών τῶν εὐθυμίαστων ἄγρευ... 

Plato Phaedo 100D. ἤ ἐκπίνου τοῦ καλοῦ τῆς 

Plato Republic 369B.C. ... πολλῶν διδάσκων, πολλῶς τίς 

Plato Republic 369E. οὖν τὸν γεγονὸν ἐν ᾧ ὡκε 

Plato Republic 370A. καὶ ὁ ἄλλος κοινωνοῦντα 

Plato Republic 370D. Τέκτονες δὴ καὶ ἱδρυκες καὶ 

Plato Republic 371E. "Ετι ὅ τις τηλειάζει, ὡς ἐμβάλει, ἔστι 

Plato Leges 969B. ... ὡς τὰ λόγον ἐφηρέμαθη, 

Plato Gorgias 507E-508A. κοινωνεῖν γὰρ ἔτοιμον... τίς γε 

Plato Republic 402E. ἀλλὰ τοῦτα μοι ἐπεξερευνήσαν 

Plato Leges 730E. ... ἐν ό, τι μὴ δοξάσθην, 

Plato Leges 736DE. ... ἠθέλαντο τοῖς ἑπείκεισκα 

Plato Leges 844C. ... καὶ περὶ τῶν μὴ ἐθέλων 

Plato Leges 844B. ...πάντα δὲ δυτικήσης ἦν καὶ τῶν γείτων ταύτων ὑδραίας τιθάμενος παρὰ τοῖς ἀφρόνισι, ταύτην δὲ μέρας εἰκάσας κοινωνεῖος, οὕτω κοινωνεῖος τοῖς γείτονις ὕδασσι.

Plato Leges 844D. ..."Ὅτως δὲ ὑπὲρ τούτων, ποιήσας τούταν πάντα τοιάντας τινά.

Plato Leges 845C. ...ἐγέρσης τούτων, φαγών τινος καὶ ἀποφέρων μονακάτο χρόνος, ὥστε κοινωνεῖος τοῖς τοιούτοις ἕτερως...

Plato Leges 845B. ...τὶς δὲ ἀφρότητος ἑως ἐκεῖνος τούτων, φαγών τινος καὶ ἀποφέρων μονακάτο, χρόνος, ὥστε κοινωνεῖος τοῖς τοιούτοις ἕτερως...

Plato Republic 440B. ...τίς δὲ θεωρούσις οὕτως κοινωνήσαντα, ἀφόντες λόγον μὴ δεῖν, ἐντείνασθαι.

Plato Politicus 309DE. ἀνεδείξεις ἐνθειας ἣς ὑπέρ ὑμετέρως καὶ τῶν δικαίων μάλιστα ὑμῶν κοινωνεῖν ἕν ἐθνικήσεις, μη ἢταλαμβάνοντα, δὲ ἀποκλίνεις ηὐλιόν πρὸς θεριόδη τινὰ φύσιν;

Plato Republic 411C. Τί δὲ; ἐπειδὴ ὃλον μὴν δὲν πράττῃ μὴν κοινωνῇ Μούσῃ μηδαμῷ;

Plato Politicus 309E. ἢ τῶν δικαίων ὑμῶν συνεχεῖς συνεχεῖς ὑπὸ φρόνιμου ὑμνεῖς, μὴ κοινωνήσαντα δὲ δὲν λέγοντες ἐποιείδιστον τινὰ θυελλήσας δικάσατα λαμβάνει φύσιν;

Plato Alcibiades I 125E. ...πολιτείας κοινωνοῦσιν τίνα μικρὰς ἐπίστησιν;

Plato Republic 371B. ...ποιήσασθαι πολῖν ἡκίσκασθαι;

Plato Leges 738A. ...συμβάλλειν καὶ κοινωνήματα ...

Plato Alcibiades I 125D. ...κοινωνίας ...

Plato Republic 333A. ...κοινωνίας, ἢ τι ἄλλο; κοινωνήματα...

Plato Republic 362B. ...ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνης κοινωνίας ὑμῶν λέγοντα κοινωνοῦσιν ἄριστα ἐμβάλλειν, κοινωνεῖν ὅσ...

Plato Leges 861B. ...ἡ δὲ, ἐπειδή δὲν, ὡς ἐστείλατε, ἐννοεῖτεν τῶν πολιτῶν ἐν τῷ κοινωνίας καὶ διίδιδα πολλοί ἐπιτεινθήνται ...
Plato Republic 343D. ... δ ὅ ὅ ὅ ὅ ὅ ... τοιοῦτον κοινωνίαν, οὔτως ἐν εἴροις ἐν τῇ διάλεγμα τῆς κοινωνίας πλέον ἔχουσι σὲν δίκαιον τοῦ Δίκαιου ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν...

Plato Legea 632B. ... οὔτως ἐν γίγνεται τρόπον, καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἄλλης πάσι τοιοῦτος κοινωνίας καὶ διάλεξις ἐκοδεύει τέ καὶ ἄκουσιν...

Plato Legea 921C. ... Διὰ δὲ πολιούχων καὶ Ἁθηναίων κοινωνίας πολιτείας Ἰτιούκτερον βραχὺ κέρδος ἔργην, λύμα σειγάλας κοινωνίας...

Plato Legea 889D. ... καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν σκιρκήν, τι μέρας εἶναι φανερών φύσιν τέχνη δὲ τὸ πολύ... ...

Plato Politicus 285AB. ... θέαν δὲν μὲν τὴν τῶν πολλῶν τῆς πρὸς ἀνικητὴν κοινωνίαν, μὴ προαρχίσασθαι πρὸς ἐν ἂν αὐτῷ τὰς διαφορὰς ἀδράς πάγως ἄποσπανερ ἐν οἴδει κεῖναι...

Plato Politicus 283D. ... ἡ μὲν κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα μεγίστος καὶ ἀκριβῶς κοινωνίας, ὡς κατὰ τὴν τῶν γενέσεως ἀναγκαίων ὁδών...

Plato Hippias Minor 374E. ... Τί ὅσον ἐργάσων ποτέρην ἐν ἄλληλα ἤ γυναικών, ἢ ἐν κοινωνία... ...

Plato Politicus 381E. ... ἤτο τοῦτο δὲν τὰς μὲν περὶ τὸ ἀλφατοῦσα καὶ κερδίδας καὶ ὄψις ἄλλα ἔργα τὸν περὶ τὰς ἀνεξίωματος γενέσεως κοινωνίας, πάντας συναίτις ἐπισώπην, τὰς δὲ αὐτὰ βεβαιοῦντας καὶ θεμιστορίας ἀδύνατά;

Plato Gorgias 464C. ... ἐπικοινωνοῦσι μὲν δὴ ἄλληλοι, ἢτο περὶ τὸ ἀκόρον, ἐκάθερα τῶν ὧν, ἢ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τῇ γυναικείᾳ καὶ ἢ δικαίωσιν τῇ νομοθετική.

Plato Legea 6390-640A. ... Τί ὃ ἐπικαίρης ἢ γέγεντον κοινωνίας ἀνεξίωμα, ἢ περικά τὰ ἄρχαν εἶναι μετὰ μέρους τὰς ἀνέξιωμα ἢ τί. ὃ δὲ νῦν ἀκριβῶς εἶναι οὐκ ἦν ἄτο ποῦ ἢ καὶ κοινωνίας μετὰ ἀρχαῖος, ἢ ὃ δὲ μὴν ἤτοι ὃ καὶ κακῶν ἄρχατον ἀνεξίωμαν ἀλλ' ἐνίκητα καὶ τὰς ἀρχαῖας ἄκριτος ἤτοι, ἢ καὶ κοινωνίας μετὰ ἀρχαῖος ἢ καὶ κακῶν ἄρχατον ἀνεξίωμαν ἀλλ' ἐνίκητα καὶ κακῶν ἄρχατον ἀνεξίωμαν... ...

Plato Alcibiades I 125DE. ... κοινωνίας ἀνεξίωμα εἰς ἅρηεν τις ποιήσαι τέχνην... κοινωνίας δὲ μὴν ἐνδίκη, ὡς νῦν ἐλέγετο, τίς ἐπισώπησι ποιεῖ ἄρχειν;
Plato Republic 333AB. ... ἔτηδος καὶ χρύσιμος κοινωνὸς τίς πετεύων δένει, ἢ δ’ πετευτικός; Ἅλλ’ εἰς τίνα δὴ κοινωνίαν ἰδίαις ἰδιότητας κοινωνὸς τοῦ κιβωτικικοῦ, ἢπείρος καὶ κιβωτικικὸς τοῦ ἰδίαιτε εἰς κραυμέσσιν;

Plato Leges 640B. Νῦν δὲ γε οἱ στρατοπεδοῦ περὶ λέγομεν ἰπποκόσμον ἐν ἄνδρῶν δυνάμει ἔχοντας ἔχοντος μετὰ πόλεμου, φίλων δ’ ἐν ζηρτήν πρὸς φίλοις κοινωνοῦντες φιλορροφεύνοντες;

Plato Politicus 276B. Ἑπιμέλεια δὲ γε ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης συμπάθεις καὶ καὶ τῶν πολιτείων παρὰ τῆς ἰππόκομος ἀρχῆς εἶναι τέχνης...

Plato Politicus 303B. Οὔκ οὖν δ’ καὶ τοὺς κοινωνίας γούστων τῶν πολιτείων παρὰ τῆς ἰππόκομος ἀρχῆς ἀπέτατόν ἂς ὅπερ ὧν ἢναὶ πολιτικοὺς, ἄλλα στατιστικοὺς...

Plato Politicus 304A. Τοῦτον δ’ ἐτέλεσεν πολεμικῆς καὶ δικαστικῆς καὶ ὀπεὶ ἐκκαίρης κοινωνίας ἡ λειτουργία περίουσια τῷ δικαίῳ συνδικαστήριῳ τάς ἐν ταῖς πόλεις πράξεας.

Plato Republic 453A. ... ποτέραν δοὺς δοῦσιν δὲ ἀνθρωπίνης καὶ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἀρχέον γένους κοινωνίας εἰς ἀπαντα ὡς ἔργα...

Plato Republic 457A. Ἀποδοτέον δ’ εἰς ταῖς κυριάκοις κυρίασίν, ἐπεὶ δὴ ἀριστεύειν ἀνεί ἱματίων ἀμφισβητοῦντες, καὶ κοινωνίας πολέμου τε καὶ τῆς ἱλίου φοίλας τῆς περὶ τὴς πόλιν...

Plato Leges 804B. καὶ οὖθεν φοβηθεὶς εἰποίηρεν... ἄν τοῦτο τοῦ λόγου ὡς ἐπηκίθης ὡς ἀναμετρητικῆς, ἄν ἀνδράς μὲν πρέπειν ἃν ἐις, κυρίατι δὲ οὐκ ἃν πρέπειν.

Plato Leges 968A. Ἐπόθεν διεξελέγαν κοινωνίαν βυθόμενον...

Plato Leges 636C. ... ὥσπερ τῇ θηλείᾳ καὶ τῇ τῶν ἱλικίων φόβῳ εἰς κοινωνίαν ἑξοντα τῆς ἡμερήσιος ἐν περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν καὶ φώσιν ἀποδεξόνται δοκέτ...

Plato Leges 721A. πάλαις πόλειν ἄρ’ ὡς ἢ τῶν ἱλικίων ὁμάδες ἔστι καὶ κοινωνίας;

Plato Leges 771B. κοινωνίας καὶ ὁμορροφίας ἐστὶν τῇ ἑμείᾳ... Πρὸς ὅπερ δ’ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱλικίων...

Plato Leges 772D. κοινωνίας καὶ ἑλέσιν ἐξηνεργεῖν πιστεύει...
Plato Leges 773A. ... οἱ γὰρ παραίτησιν ἀν μὴ φεύγειν τὸν τῶν παίδων μηδὲ τὸν τῶν πλουτών διότι καὶ διηγερόντας χάμον, ἂν εἰναὶ τίλλα ἰδιώτη, τὸν ὑποδεικτέρου ἦνε τιμῶντα εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν εὐνείαν.

Plato Leges 773C. ... διότι δὲ ἦσαν πρὸς, μιανομένους µὲν δίνοντας, κοινωνίαν καὶ τῶν παίδων ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν πορεύεται.

Plato Leges 773D. ... οὐ μεῖναις μὲν δίνοντας, ἐλλογείμων δὲ ἡ τῆς πέρας διέσχεσθαι καὶ καλὴν κοινωνίαν λαβῶν ἀπεδωθεῖν πάμα καὶ μέτριον ἀπεργάζεται.

Plato Politicus 310B. ... Τούτων τῶν ἐπιγραμμικῶν καὶ παίδων κοινωνίσαντος καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἱδίας ἐκδοσέως καὶ γλώσσας. Οὔ γὰρ περί ταῦτα ἄστω ὅσα διευθυνότα πρὸς τὴν τῶν παίδων γεννήσειν.

Plato Leges 774A. ... ἢν δ’ ἀρα τις μὴ πείδηται ἐκαίν, ἐλλογείμων δὲ διέσχεσθαι καὶ ἐκδοσέως διεργάζεται τοις ὅσα συνοδεύεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν παίδων γεννήσεως.

Plato Leges 783B. ... καὶ τοιὴν μὲν ἐπιγραμμικέστην καὶ τὰς ἱδίας ἐκδοσέως καὶ γλώσσας μὲν παραίτησεις τοῖς ἄστω πρὸς τὴν τῶν παίδων γεννήσεως.

Plato Leges 783C. ... λέγοντες δ’ ἐλλογείμων καὶ τοιὴν μὲν ἐπιγραμμικέστην καὶ τὰς ἱδίας ἐκδοσέως καὶ γλώσσας μὲν παραίτησεις τοῖς ἄστω πρὸς τὴν τῶν παίδων γεννήσεως.

Plato Leges 631D. ... διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἄλλα συνεργασμένως μετὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς τῶν παίδων γεννήσεως καὶ τροποῖς ὅσοι πρὸς ἄρρενες καὶ ὅσαι δηλεῖαι...

Plato Leges 836C. ... λέγοντες δ’ ἐγραφάς εἰσέχειν τοῖς ἀρρένες καὶ τοῖς μὴ κοινωνεῖν καθαύστερος δηλεῖας πρὸς μεῖζον ἀποδίκησιν...

Plato Phaedrus 239C. ... τα μὲν δ’ ἐν τοῖς διαφοροῖς ἐπί τρόπος ἐκ καὶ κοινώνος, οὕτως λυπηλής ἄνθροπος ἠχόμενος εἰς τοῖς καθαύστεροις φρονήματος.

Plato Republic 403B. ... οὕτως ἐπιχείρησεν ἄρα αὐτὸς ἡ ἱδιώτητα, ἀλλ’ κοινωνώσαντας ἀδελφοῦ ὑποτεθήκει οὐ καὶ παιδίκοις ἐρωτεύοις...

Plato Symposium 209C. ... ὅπερ πολὺ μείζον κοινώνων τὰς τῶν παιδίων πρὸς ἐλλογείμων διώκοντοι ἰδιώται καὶ πιλιάν θεατείς, ἐκ τῆς καλλίτευμας καὶ ἀνακωτερίων τῶν παιδίων κοινωνίσκοντας...

Plato Symposium 218B. ... πάντες ὅπερ κοινωνίσκοντας εἶσιν φιλοσόφου μείζος τοῖς μαινέας...
Plato Symposium 182C.  
ος γὰρ, ἰδιαίτερα, εὐμφανεὶς στὸν ἄρχοντα φρονήσας μεγάλα ἐγγίζωντος τῶν ἐρωτομένων, οὔτε φιλίας ἤθελές καὶ κοινωνίας, ἢ ὅτι μάλλον ἡμεῖς τά τις ἄλλα πάντα καὶ ἢ ἐρωτεύεται.

Plato Republic 556B.  
οὔτε δὲ προσκυνοῦμεν ἄλλους ἢ τε ἐρωτεύεται καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἢ ἐν ᾧδεν προείρισσὶ ἢ ἐν ἄλλης τῆς κοινωνίας, ἢ κατά δειοντες ἢ κατὰ κρατεῖας ἢ εὐφρενίας ἢ ἐυπρεπείᾳς, οὐ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τοῖς κινδύνοις ἡμᾶς ἐξουσίων ἔργῳ ἄλλως ἐξουσίων πολλοῖς ἀπανθόμεθαι οὐ πεντεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν πλούσιων...

Plato Leges 783B.  
ποτὲ συνεχίζει ὑνίκα ἀρίθμηθαι—τὰς τοιαύτας κοινωνίας εἴτε ἃρμα γυναικῶν ἐϊτε ἀνδρῶν δεῖ κοινωνίας γίνεται...

Plato Leges 639D.  
τὰς πολλὰς κοινωνίων συμπότας καὶ συμπότας τείνον ἂν μιᾶς τινὰς συνοισίας εἰναι;

Plato Leges 805A.  
οδὴς ὅτι μαθητές ἀναρίθησας γυναικῶν τῶν περὶ τῶν πόλεων, ὃς ἑαυτομάτος καλοῦσιν, τῶν ὁδὸν ἀστεῖαν μιᾶν ἄλλοι καὶ τοῖς δεῖκται καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὡς τοῖς κοινωνιαῖς καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς προστομικῆς ἔρωτις ἀποκείμην...

Plato Leges 805CD.  
καὶ μὴ δὲ λέγειν ὃς καὶ παιδείας τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὃι μαλιστά κοινωνίας τοις διὸν κένοι ἐνίατι τῶν ἄρρητων ἰδέας. Τίνη ὁδὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν νόμων ἀποδεικνύειν δεῖκες ἃν τῆς κοινωνίας ταύτης ήν νῦν ἀστεῖας δηλοῖς προστομικῶς;

Plato Leges 806AB.  
καὶ παιδοφορίας ἐτές εἰς μέσον ἀρίθμηθαι, τῶν ἤ τε τῶν πόλεων καὶ κοινωνίας... οὖν ἄλλης κοινωνίας ποτὲ βολής χρήσει τεχνής δυνάμεναι, ὥστε διὰ αὐτῶν καὶ δόρυ λυθῶσι μιμητικῶς τὴν θεοῦ...

Plato Leges 833D.  
τοῖς δὲ τρικαιοδεκατοστὶ μέχρι γένους καιροῦ κοινωνίας μη μακρότεραν ἔκοιον ἐτῶν μητροτομείον ἐκτοκάλοις.

Plato Leges 834D.  
προσφέρως ἐν τοῖς τῶν νόμων μὲν καὶ ἐπιτίθεσιν ὥστε νῦν βιομείκησοι τῆς κοινωνίας. Τίνα δὲ ἐγὼ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπροσθεν παραδομάτων εἰς ἅπαν τόνων ἡ φύσις ἑνδέχεται καὶ μὴ διεχερὰν παίδες ἢ παρθένους κοινωνίας ἡν καὶ ἡ μητροτομείον.

Plato Leges 796A.  
ἐπειδή ἡ ἐμπορία ἡ Ἀμυκος, οὔσαν κράτεις ἐπί τοῖς πολεοὺς κοινωνίας ἔνεκ, ὡς ἐξωτικοῦ ὑποτελεῖ.

Plato Leges 752C.  
ποτὲ ἡ θεολόγεια παῖδες τῶν νόμων καὶ συνεργάζεται ἱκανοὺς συνῆθεσις εἰπεῖν νομολογήσεις τῶν ἀρχηγῶν τῆς πολεούς πάσης κοινωνίας...
Plato Leges 753B. Πάντες μὲν κοινωνίας τ质量和 των
αρχόντων αριστείσως οποιοι και ἂν ὅπλα ἱππεῖα ἢ ἔσπερα συνέχεια καὶ
πολέμου κοινωνικῶς οὐ γεγονόῃ τῇ οἵη ἡλικίᾳ δυνάμειν.

Plato Leges 755C. Τοιούτων δὲ στρατηγοὺς μὲν ἐκ αὐτῶν
τῆς πόλεως τεύχεσθαι οἱ νομοφόροις προβολλέως, αριστείσως δὲ ἐκ τῶν προβλή-
θευμάτων. πάντες οὐ τούτοι πολέμου κοινωνία γεγονεῖ τῇ οἵης ἡλικίας καὶ
μὴ γεγονός διάκριτον.

Plato Leges 667AB. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχύειν μιᾶν οὐδὲν τῶν ὁρῶν
καλῶν καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς κοινώ αθηναίοις, περιθυγμᾶς ἀποδέχονται τούτων ὅσοι
φιλεῖς οἴκεται μὲν αἰσχύνεισθαι, ἄτοι δὲ, ἢτοι καλότητης, ταῦτας κοινωνιῶν.

Plato Leges 967E. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχύειν τούτων
κοινωνιῶν συνθετικῶς, χρῆσται πρὸς ταῖς ἔρειν ἐπιθεωρήματα
καὶ νόμων συναρμοζόντωσι.

Plato Leges 856B. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχύειν τούτων
κοινωνιῶν συνθετικῶς, χρῆσται πρὸς ταῖς ἔρειν ἐπιθεωρήματα
καὶ νόμων συναρμοζόντωσι.

Plato Leges 950E. Το άλλο οὐ εἰς τοῦ κοινωνίας
κοινωνιῶν, οὕτως ἐν τῷ οἴκεται τοῖς πολέμως οὐδὲ ἐπιχρῆται ἀνθρώπων ἢ.

Plato Leges 967E. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχύειν τούτων
κοινωνιῶν συνθετικῶς, χρῆσται πρὸς ταῖς ἔρειν ἐπιθεωρήματα
καὶ νόμων συναρμοζόντωσι.

Plato Leges 757DE. Τοιούτων δὲ καὶ τῶν ὁρῶν δικῶν
κοινωνίας κατὰ δύναμιν ἐπαινεῖται ὅτι ἐκεῖνα τοῦ
συνδικέαν ἢ ἐπήκριτα τοῖς πολέμως οὐδὲ ἐπιχρῆται ἀνθρώπων ἢ.

Plato Leges 768A. τοιοῦτον καὶ ἐνόμων ἢ εἰς τινὰς ἐπερνὸς,
κοινωνίας ταῖς ἔρειν ἐπιθεωρήματα καὶ νόμων συναρμοζόντωσι.

Plato Leges 708C. Τοιοῦτον καὶ ἐνόμων ἢ εἰς τινὰς ἐπερνὸς,
κοινωνίας ταῖς ἔρειν ἐπιθεωρήματα καὶ νόμων συναρμοζόντωσι.

Plato Republic 470E. Ἀλλ′ ὁδή γὰρ θελελήνης οὐδὲν ὅρκιαν
τῆς Εὐθυδαίης ἡγομένως ὅτι κοινωνίας ὑπέρ οὗ τινὸς ἢ ἐπιφύλαξιν ἢ.

Plato Leges 947A. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχυείν τοῦς ἔρειν θελελήνης
κοινωνίας τριῶν καὶ διαφορμῶν καὶ ὑπό τῶν ἐπιφύλαξιν θελελήνης ἢ.

Plato Leges 950B. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχυείν, κοινωνίας
καὶ τριῶν καὶ διαφορμῶν τοῦτοι τοῦς ἢ.

Plato Republic 470E. Ἀλλ′ ὁδή γὰρ θελελήνης οὐδὲν ὅρκιαν
τῆς Εὐθυδαίης ἡγομένως ὅτι κοινωνίας ὑπέρ οὗ τινὸς ἢ ἐπιφύλαξιν ἢ.

Plato Leges 947A. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχυείν τοῦς ἔρειν θελελήνης
κοινωνίας τριῶν καὶ διαφορμῶν καὶ ὑπό τῶν ἐπιφύλαξιν θελελήνης ἢ.

Plato Leges 950B. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχυείν, κοινωνίας
καὶ τριῶν καὶ διαφορμῶν τοῦτοι τοῦς ἢ.

Plato Leges 884A. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἐκχυείν τοῦς ἔρειν θελελήνης τριῶν καὶ διαφορμῶν καὶ ὑπό τῶν ἐπιφύλαξιν θελελήνης ἢ.
Plato Symposium 188BC. Ετι τοίνυν καὶ ἢ ὑθεῖają πλαϊ καὶ ἢς μανείκη ἐκπειρατεῖ (ταῦτα δ' ἔτειν ἢ περὶ θεός τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους πρὸς ἄλλους κοινωνία) ὦ ὅπερ ἄλλο τι ἔτειν ἢ περὶ ἔκτωτος φολαίόν τε καὶ ἰδέσεν.

Plato Leges 801B. Μετὰ γάρ ἡταν ἕναι θεός καὶ ἔγχων κεκοινωομένα εὐχάρις ἀδόικ ἡν ἐρήμωτα, καὶ μετὰ θεός ἀνδρῶν περὶ δαιμονίας τε καὶ θρύμπος μετ' ἔγχων εὐχάρις γίνονται ἐν τούτοις πασί πρέσβεις.

Plato Leges 729C. Συμφέρειν δὲ καὶ ὑμοῖν θέων κοινωνίαν πάταγ αὐτοῦ φύσιν αὐτότος ἔχομεν τιμῶν τὰς καὶ σεβόμενος εὐνοοῦσίν ἡν ἑνεκλήσιος θεός ἐς παῖδων αὐτοῦ αὐτοὶ ἰδέσαν ἰδεσα μετά λόγον.

Plato Leges 909A.ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι εὐχόμα τις τῶν ποιητῶν αὐτοῖς ἅλλοι συγγράφουσιν πλην ὅτι τοῦ νυκτερινοῦ συμβολοῦ κοινωνοῦντες...

Plato Politicus 308B. καὶ τῶν μὲν μὴ δυσμένεον κοινωνεῖν ἀνδρεία καὶ συκώτον δόν τε ἄλλα ἐστὶ τείνοντες πρὸς ἀρετὴν...

Demosthenes Ag. Aristog.1.61. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπηρετοῦσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα οὐ ἐν τῷ εἰκόνιται, μὴ πυρὸς, μὴ λύχνου, μὴ ποτῶν, μὴ βρωτῶν μηδὲν μηδὲν τοῦτο τείνεν κοινωνεῖν μηδὲ λαμβάνειν, μηδ' αὐτῶν τούτων ἑτέροιν.

Plato Leges 868D. καὶ μὴ ποτὲ ἤτοι κοινὴ παιδεία ἤ παιδεία ἢ ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἀνθρώπων... καὶ τοῦτο τείνεται ποτὲ κοινωνεῖν τείνεται...

Plato Leges 868E-869A. Καταλαῦν δὲ ὅτι τοῦτον ἴδον, ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ παῖς ἢ παῖδα μὴ κοινωνεῖτο μὴ διστάσατο λέγειν ἢ παῖς ἢ παῖς ἢ παῖς ἢ παῖς... τοῦτο τοῖς συνήθεις αὐτος μὴ διστάσατο λέγειν...

Plato Leges 881D. Ἐν ὅπερ τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν ἢ ἵδεν τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς...

Aristotle Politics 1252a2-3. καὶ πάντα κοινωνίαν, ἀναθέμεν εἶναι ἢν ἐνὲκεκοινωνεῖται...

Aristotle Politics 1257a19-20. ἢ ὅτι ἢν ἢν τῇ πρώτῃ κοινωνίᾳ...

Aristotle Politics 1252b9-10. ἢν ὅτι ἢν τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἄλλο τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς πρώτῃ...
Aristotle Oeconomica 1343b8-9. κοινωνία γαρ φύσει εὖ θελεί καὶ τῷ ἄρρενι μᾶλλον ἵπτειν.

Aristotle Oeconomica 1343b12-13. Ἀδύνατον δὲ τὸ δήλον ἅνευ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἢ τῷ ἄρρεν ἁνεύ τοῦ ἄνδρος ἀποκελεῖν τούτῳ, ὡστε εἰς ἄναξίας ἀδύνηται καὶ κοινωνία συνείησθαι.

Aristotle Oeconomica 1342b26-28. οὕτως προσφευτήκει δηλα τῷ θείου ἐκτεταμένος ἡ φύσις, τοῦ τε ἄνδρος καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς, πρὸς τὴν κοινωνίαν.

Aristotle Politics 1252b8-9. ... ἀλλὰ γίνεται ἡ κοινωνία ἀδύνηται δόλιαι καὶ δοῦλοι.


Aristotle Gener. of Anim. 756b20. ... τὴν δὲ τοῖς ῥύγης, πρὸς ἀλληλα κοινωνίαν πολλάκις ὅταν πάντα ποιεῖται εἰς κορακᾶς τῶν ἄριστων.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1162a18. τοῖς μὲν ἀδικοὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἡ κοινωνία, δὲ γὰρ ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐν τῶν τεκτονικῶν χήριν συνιστοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς τῶν βίων.

Aristotle Magna Moralia 1245a15-17 ἀλλὰ μᾶς καὶ τοῦ λόγου κοινωνίαν τῶν τεκτονικῶν ἐχετον τοσοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τὸ οὔτε ἰδίον οὔτε μονόνειν τοῖς αὐτάρκεισιν ἀλλὰ πολλαίον οὖ καί τῷ ἀδίκῳ καὶ τῷ ἀγαθῷ.


Xenophon Memorabilia IV.3.12. τὸ δὲ καὶ ἑρμηνεύει δοῦναι, δι' ὅτι πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων μεγαλοδομεῖν τῇ ἀλλήλῳ διδασκόμεν τῇ κοινωνικῶς καὶ γόμον εἰδιδιδόντα καὶ πολεειδεῖα;

Aristotle Eud. Ethics. 1217a24-29. τῶν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων πάντων, ἐκ τοῦ χρὴν τῶν φύσεων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστιν, αὐθεν κοινωνεῖ τάς τὴς προσφερίας ἐμπειρίας, καί τῇ ἄνθρωπῳ ἑπτάτης ἑπτά τῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπωμοίαν ἐν τῇ ῥυθμίᾳ μετέχει θείῳ εἰσιν....

Aristotle Eud. Ethics. 1215b12-14. ἄκοςτος ἄτοσκο εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλώπως καὶ καθάρως πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον ἢ γίνοις βεβαίας κοινωνικοῦς θείας, τοῦτον ὡς ἀνθρώπου εἶπειν ἅγκριτον εἶναι.

Aristotle Eud. Ethics. 1242a32-33. γυναικὸς δὲ καὶ ἄνδρος φίλον ἐως κρήσειν καὶ κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Magna Moralia 1194b24. Ἀλλὰ ὡς τὸ μὲν ἐν γυναικὸς καὶ ἄνδρος κοινωνίας δίκαιον ἑστήν εἴποι τῷ πολιτικῷ δίκαιον.
Aristotle Magna Moralia 194b258. χειρον μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥυθή τοι ἄνδρας, ἀλλ' οἰκείοτέρου, καὶ ἐπεξεργάζετο πρὸς μάλλον, οἷοὶ ἔχουσι τῆς μεταγενεσίας κοινωνίας καὶ πρὸς οὕτως ἔπεμψε καὶ τὸ δίκαιον τὸ γονατί ἀνδρα μιλεῖτε πως ὅρος τῶν ἀλλῶν πολιτειῶν ἐστίν.

Aristotle Politics 1252b13-14. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐστιν ἡ ὑπαρακτηκή κοινωνία κατὰ φύσιν οἷος ἐστίν...

Aristotle Politics 1257a23. οὐ μὲν γὰρ τὰν ἀκόντων
κοινωνίαν πάντων...

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1242a27. καὶ κοινωνία τοισών καὶ δικαίων
καὶ ἔτι ἡ μὴ πολις εἶναι.

Aristotle Politics 1254b21-23. ἔστι γὰρ φύτευς τούδος ὁ συμμένος
ζηλοῦς εἶναι (οἷοὶ καὶ ἐλλοῦ ἐστίν) καὶ τὰς κοινωνίας λόγος τοσοῦτον ὅσον
ὑπάγουσαν ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐστὶν.

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1241b20-24. διεσποράς πρὸς δούλων, τουτέστων
μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν κοινωνία, ὅτι γὰρ ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐν τῷ δὲ τὰ
ἐνέργεια καὶ σώματα καὶ ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἐκκοινωνίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐν ἁμορφίᾳ
τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐνεκκοινωνίᾳ, τὸ τῷ χωρίῳ σωματικὶ ἀρχαὶ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ διεσποράς
καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖται τὸ δούλων ὀστερὰς μορίων καὶ ἀρχαῖων ἐνθαρρυσίων, τὰ δὲ
ἀρχαῖα ἐνθαρρυσίων διοικοῦσα.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1161b8. ὁκεῖ γὰρ εἰναι τὸ δίκαιον παρά
ζηνδρύμῳ πρὸς πάντα ὅτι δυνάμενον κοινωνεῖται νόμου καὶ συνοικίας. καὶ
φιλοτικοὶ, καὶ ὡς οὖν ἐνθαρρυσίων.

Aristotle Politics 1257a21. ... ἀλλ' ἡ κοινωνία τῆς
κοινωνίας ὡστος.

Aristotle Politics 1252b16. ἢ ὁ ἐκ πλείονος οἰκείων
κοινωνία πρώτη χρύσεως ἐνεκεν μη διαμέρους καλή.

Aristotle Politics 1252b29. ἢ ὁ ἐκ πλείονος κοινωνία
καὶ τέλειος πόλις...

Aristotle Politics 1253a30. Φόβει μὲν ὁδὸν ἡ ὁμολ. ἐν πλείον
ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιαύτας κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Politics 1253a28-29. ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος κοινωνεῖν ἢ
μηδὲν δεόμενος ὁ διαμέρους οὐδὲν μέρος πόλεως ἢ ὁδὸν ἢ βρέχω.

Aristotle Politics 1252a1-2, ἦν οὖν πολιν ὅρημεν
κοινωνίας οὐδ' ὄσον...

Aristotle Politics 1252a8-9. ... ἀλλ' ὁ ἐστίν καὶ κοινωνεῖν
πόλις καὶ ἡ κοινωνία καὶ τοιχική.
Aristotle Politics 1252b31. διὰ πάντα πόλεις φύσει ζεσίν, εἴτερ καὶ οἱ πρωτά τοι Κοινωνία.

Aristotle Politics 1253a18-19. τὸ μόνον ἄνθρωπον καὶ κάκον καὶ δικαίον καὶ ἄδικον καὶ πάντα ἄλλαν αἰσθήσεων ζεσίν, δὲ τούτων Κοινωνία ποιεῖ οἶκείαν καὶ πόλιν.

Aristotle Politics 1256b28-30. ... καθό δέ τοι ὑπάρχειν ἢ πορίζειν αὐτῶν ὡς ὑπάρχειν ἢ ἐστίν ἡ θεοπράξεις χρήσιμαν πρὸς ζωὴν ἀναγκαίων καὶ χρήσιμων εἰς Κοινωνία πόλεως ἢ οἰκίας.

Aristotle Oeconomica 1343a11-13. φανερὸν δέ, ὅταν γὰρ μὴ δοῦναι ὧδε τοῦτο εὐχάριστον, διαλύεται καὶ ἡ Κοινωνία.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1160a8. καὶ δὲ Κοινωνία πάλιν μορίοις έκφραστεῖ τῆς πολιτικῆς.


Aristotle Politics 1280b16-17. οὐδ' εἶ πρὸς ἄλλῃς εἰπτιμίας ποιησάντες, καίτοι τούτο τῶν ἰδίων τῶν πόλεις Κοινωνίαις ἔστιν.

Aristotle Politics 1280b18-20. διόπως αὖ ὅτι τὶνς οἰκεῖς χρήσι μὲν, μὴ μενοὶ τοσοῦτον ἀπεδείχθησαν ἢ σοοὶ καὶ Κοινωνία, ἀλλ' ἐξετῶν ἀυτοῖς νομίζον τὸν μή σοοὶ αὐτούς ἀπεδείκτηκεν πρὸς τὰς μεταβολὰς...

Aristotle Politics 1280b21-23. καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μορίων, μὴ μενοὶ Κοινωνίαις ἀλλά μηδὲν ἢ τῶν τοιούτων σοοὶ ἀλλὰς καὶ συμμαχίας, οὖν' οὗτος τῶν πόλεως.

Aristotle Politics 1280b25-29. εἵ γὰρ καὶ συνελθοῦν σοοῖς Κοινωνίαις ... οὖν' οὕτως ἢν εἶναι δοξεῖ πόλεις τοῖς ἀκριβῶς θεωροῦν...]

Aristotle Politics 1280b24-25. οὖ γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τὸ μὴ σύγγραμ

Aristotle Politics 1280b30-33. φανερὸν τοῖνος ὅτι ἢ πόλις ὅτι ἢ Κοινωνία τοῦτο καὶ τὸν μή άπαντες αὐτούς καὶ τῶν μεταβολῶν χρήν. ἀλλ' τοῦτο μὴν ἁναγκαίον ὑπάρχειν εἴτε τοιαύτης πόλεις, ἢ μὴν οὖν ὅτι ὑπαρχέτων τοιαύτων ἀπαντῆς ἡ ἡ Κοινωνία...

Aristotle Politics 1326b7-9. καὶ πρῶτῃ μὲν εἰς τὴν ἁναγκαίον τοῖν τοσοῦτον πλῆθος δ' ἐρχομένοις ὑπάρχεις ἢτι οὕτως ὅτι θεωρεῖ καὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς Κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Politics 1280b9-10. χίτεσιν γὰρ ἢ Κοινωνία συμμαχία, τῶν ἀλλῶν τοῦτ' ἄπαντας μὲν τῶν ἁναγκαίων συμμάχουν.
Aristotle Politics 1280a26. ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ τῶν κειμάτων χάριν ἔχωμεν καὶ συνήλθον...
Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1133a178ει γὰρ ἐκ δύο ἄρτων γίνεται κοινωνία...

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1135b4-5. ἀλλ' ἦσαν ἄλλοι ἵνα τὰ ἄνω, ὅπως τέσσαρες, καὶ κοινωνία, ὅτι ἦν ἡ ἰδιοτήτα δύναται εἰ δὲ ἄρτων δίσσως...

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1133b7. εἴ δὲ οὖσα μή ἦν διάμεση, ὑπὶ δὲ ἦν κοινωνία.

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1243b31. πῶς μὴ κοινωνίσῃ γεγονός σκοτώσας, εἴ μὴ τὰ ἄνωκα εἰσαχθήσεται καὶ ὑπὲρ;

Aristotle Magna Moralia 1194a24-5 καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην ἐκάστου ἐκάστῳ διάδοσιν τὴν ἀλλαξεῖ τῷ θάλαμῳ ποιεῖται ψυχή, καὶ τοῦτῳ τὸν πολιτικὴν κοινωνίαν συνέχειν...

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1133b167οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπὸ καὶ ὅτι ἦν κοινωνία ᾧν, ὡς ἦν ἄλλης ἐκάστου μὲν ὅπως, ὡς ἦν ἰδιότητα καὶ ὅπως συνεχεῖ.

Aristotle Politics 1259b24-5. οἱ πλεῖτον ἀπέχει φιλίας, καὶ κοινωνίας πολιτικῆς, ὡς μὴ κοινωνίας φιλικῶν, οὔτε μὴ δοῦν βολαντεῖ κοινωνικὰ τοσοῦ ἔχοντος.

Aristotle Magna Moralia 1211a45 ὑπὸ δικῆς ἂν ἦν μὲν ἰδιότητα πολιτικῆς καὶ δοῦν πρὸς πολιτικῆς καὶ δοῦν πρὸς ἀλλοις καὶ γεναική πρὸς ἄλλους, καὶ ὡς ἐπέλευ θάλαμος κοινωνικῆς καὶ φιλίας ἐνεργεῖ ἐν ἴδιος τοὺς.


Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1159b32 ἐν κοινωνία καὶ ἐν φιλίᾳ.


Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1242b102 ἐν μὲν τῷ τὸν ἄλλα τὸν ἐν καὶ ἐφ' ἄλλ' τῶν ἐν καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλ' καὶ ἐφ' ἀλλοις τῶν κοινωνικῶν οὕτω εὐχρησιμοί, δέν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα καὶ τὸν ἐναντίον υπερέχει, οὔτε δὲ μὲν ἐναντίον τὸν ἐαυτῶν μετάχειν, δεδομένον ἱκανόν

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1242b18. δοξεῖ γὰρ ἐν φιλίᾳ ἐκάστῳ δοξεῖ γὰρ ἐκάστῳ δοξεῖ καὶ ἐκάστῳ κοινωνίᾳ.


Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1171b33. κοινωνία γὰρ ἐν φιλίᾳ.
Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1245a19-23. ἀλλὰ μὲν φαίνεται ὅτι καὶ
πάντες ἢδον τῶν ἄραθρων μετὰ τῶν φιλών κοινωνοῦν, καθ' ὅσον ἐπιτελεῖ
ἐκάστῳ καὶ ὡς δύναται ἀρίστου, ἀλλὰ τῶν τε μὲν ἴδον ἰσωματικὸς τὴν
ἀναφορὰς μουσικὴς τῷ δὲ φιλοσοφίας.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 172a8-10. γίνεται ὅτι καὶ ἡ μὲν τῶν φιλῶν φιλὰ
μοχθόρα (κοινωνοῦν γὰρ φιλῶν [ἀβέβαιοι δυτεῖς], καὶ μοχθόρα) δὲ γίγνεται
διακοινούμενοι ἄλλοις, ἢ δὲ τῶν ἐπιτικῶν ἐπιτικὴς, συμπαθηματικὴ τῶν
διακοινών.

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1245b3-9. εἰ δ' αὐτὸν ἡ ἴδον καὶ δέος καὶ
tῶν φιλῶν, τὸν ὑπὸ τούτων εὐνερητικὸν καὶ κοινωνικὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ
eἰκόνῃ χρήσις, ἡ δὲ συνεπερεύουσα οὐ κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον
de τοιούτῳ γὰρ κοινωνικῶς πρὸς διαλείμματα δοκοῦσι εἰμί τὸ
καὶ ἀπολογοῦσι).

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1242a21-22. καὶ γὰρ οὖν ταύτα δίκαια ἀπὸ
ἀφίλου τὸν ἴδιον τις καὶ κοινωνίας, καὶ δὲ φίλος κοινωνίας, καὶ
καὶ γένους, καὶ δὲ βίου.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 161b11-15. Ἐν κοινωνίᾳ μὲν οὖν πάσην φιλίαν
tῆς, καθάπερ, τίτουλον, ἀφοίτητα δ' ἦν τοῖς τῆς συγγενικῆς καὶ τῆς
ἐκμικρικῆς. ὡς δὲ πολιτικὴ καὶ φιλοσοφικὴ καὶ σωματικὴ, καὶ σοὶ
tαυτῷ καὶ κοινωνικῶς ἐκκοίμησιν ἀκόμη.

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1241b25-6. Αἱ τοὶ ἄλλη κοινωνία εἰς τῶν
καί 

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1241b16. . . .καὶ δικαίῳ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ...

Aristotle Magna Moralia 194b28-9. Επει δὲ ταύτα δίκαια ἀνεφε
κοινωνίαν ἐν...

Aristotle Magna Moralia 194b10. κοινωνία γὰρ ὁ πολιτικὸς 

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1135b12. τῶν ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ...

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1134a27. τοῦτο δὲ ἦν τὰ ἔρημα [καὶ]
κοινωνίαν καὶ τῶν καὶ τὰς ἀναλογίας δὲ
καὶ κατ' ἀριθμοὶ.

Aristotle Politics 1275a8. καὶ γὰρ ὡς οἷον καὶ, ἀπολο
kοινωνοῦσι τῆς ὀικετείας...

Aristotle Politics 1275a10-14. (τοῦτο γὰρ ἔσχατον καὶ τοῖς
κακοῦσιν ἔσχατοι καὶ, τοῦτο καὶ τοῦτο εἶχοι - πολλῶν δὲ ὁμοι
οῦσι τῶν τε, τῶν τε μέσοι καὶ, τοῖς κατ' ἀνάλογον ἀνάλογα προστάτην,
διὰ ἄλλως πρὸς μετέχουσι τῆς τοιούτης κοινωνίας)
Aristotle Politics 1279a33. οἱ γὰρ οἱ πολιτείαι ματέων εἶναι
tous metákhontas, ὦ δὲι κοινωνίν εἰς συμφέροντας.

Aristotle Politics 1275b19. οἱ γὰρ εὐσεβεία κοινωνίν ἄρξον
βουλευτικῶς ὡς κρίτης.

Aristotle Politics 1276a5. ὥς γὰρ κοινωνίν εἰς τοιάδε
ἀρχῶς πολέμος ζωτίν, ὡς ἔχωμεν...

Aristotle Politics 1299a16-17. πολλῶν γὰρ ἀριστεῖτον ἢ πολιτικὴ
κοινωνία δέστα, διότερο δὲν πάντως δὲν τοὺς ἀριστεῖτον ἢς τοὺς κληρονόμους
ζητοῦσα διέσον...

Aristotle Nic.Ethics 1130a2-4. πρὸς ἐτερον γὰρ καὶ ἐν κοινωνία
ἡδέν καὶ ἀρχῶν.

Aristotle Politics 1277b35. μὲν ἀληθῶς γὰρ ποτέρον πολιτέ
ζωτίν ὡς κοινωνίν ἐξεσθεν ἄρχαι...

Aristotle Politics 1328a25-27. οὐδὲ ἄλλης κοινωνίας ὑστερίας, ἐὰν
ἐὰν τι ἐν τῷ γένοι, ἐν γὰρ τι καὶ κοινὸν ἐναι δεῖ καὶ ταῦτα τοὺς
κοινωνοῖς...

Aristotle Politics 1328a36. οὐ δὲν πολιτεία τίς ἐντὸ
tων ὁμοίων...

Aristotle Politics 1289a15-18. πολιτεία μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς
tοῦτος πολιτείας καὶ πολιτείας καὶ τό τε τέλος ἐκάστης τίς κοινωνίας ἐστίν, νόμοι δὲ
κευματικῶς τῶν ὁπλοῦσαν τῆς πολιτείας...

Aristotle Politics 1276b5-8. ὥσπερ μὲ καὶ χρῶν δέκε μὲν
κοινωνικῶν ἐτέροις ὑστερον γίναι φαμεν εἰς τοὺς παλλακίς
dιμοιρίων ὑστερον, διόμειος δὲ καὶ παλλακίς ἀλλήν κοινωνίας καὶ σβήνειν
ἐτερον τῶν ἔτολαν ἐτερον...

Aristotle Politics 1278b16-18. ὑποθέτον δὲ πρῶτον τίνος χρῶν
συνέyster τόλμη καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἀνάρχου καὶ τῆς
κοινωνίας τῆς ἀνάρχης...

Aristotle Politics 1278b25. διαφέρουσι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἂν εὐκαίρην
αὐτοῦ καὶ συνέχεις τῆς πολιτικῆς κοινωνίας...

Aristotle Oeconomics 1345b17. ἐπικοινωνεῖν μὲν τὰ πολλὰ ἀλλήλαις
ἀναγκαίον ἔστειν.

Aristotle Eth.Ethics 1242a11. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς φίλοι
κοινωνοῦσιν...
Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1241b14-15. ἢ δὲ πολιτείᾳ πάντιν δικαίον εἰ ἔλος. κοινωνίᾳ γὰρ, τὸ δὲ κοίνων πάντι διὰ τοῦ δικαίου συνήθηκεν...

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1241b35-6. καὶ ἀριθμὸν μὲν γὰρ ἡ (δημοκρατία) ἡ κοινωνία, καὶ ἡ στάρημα φίλη.


Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1241b40. ... καὶ ἐν ταῖς κοινωνίαις δὲ αὐτῶν τρόποι.

Aristotle Politics 1279b16-17. ἢ τί ὅτι ἐν τῆι πολιτικῇ κοινωνίᾳ.

Aristotle Politics 1279a36-37. ἢ ὅτι τὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου ὦριαν ἢ διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀριστον τῇ πάλατε καὶ τῶν κοινωνιῶν αὐτῶν...

Aristotle Eud. Ethics 1243b30. τῷ ἀνάλογῳ γὰρ οὐκ ἤσχεσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ πολιτικῇ μετρεῖται κοινωνίᾳ.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1130a5-6. ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ συμφέροντα πράττει, ἢ ἀρχοντες ἢ κοινωνίᾳ.

Aristotle Nic. Ethics 1132b31-32. ἀλλὰ ἐν μὲν τῆι κοινωνίᾳς ταῖς ἀλληλοκαίριαις συνάχει τῳ τοιοῦτον δίκαιον, τὸ ἀντιπποτῆς; καὶ ἀναλογίαν καὶ μὴ κατ᾽ ἱστερία.

Aristotle Politics 1276b1-2. ἢ περὶ γὰρ ὅτι κοινωνία τις ἡ πόλις, ἢ τίς ἡ κοινωνία πολιτείας...

Aristotle Politics 1276b21. ὥσπερ δὲν καὶ πλεῖστον τοις τῶν κοινωνιῶν ἐπεξε, συνερ καὶ τῶν πολιτών φανερ.

Aristotle Politics 1276b29-31. ἢ συμπληρίᾳ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐπιγέννῃ καὶ πολιτεία, καὶ τῷ ἀρκετῷ διαφανεῖον ἡ ἦτοι τοῦ πολιτοῦ πρὸς τῶν πολιτείαν.

Aristotle Politics 1279a18-22. Φανερὸν τοιοῦτον ὅτι δὲ δια μὲν πολιτείαι τῇ κοινῇ συμφέρον ὅσοισιν, αὐτὰ μὲν ὅσοι τοιούτοι συνάχονται καθά τῷ ἀληθῶς δίκαιον, δόλῳ δὲ τὰ σφαέραν ὑπὸν τῶν ἀρχώντων καὶ ἀρχοντών εἰς ὧν ἑστι καὶ παραβάσεις εἰς ὧν ὑπακούον πολιτείας. διεσπαρσικὴ γὰρ, ἡ ἀλλὰ πολιτικὴ κοινωνία τῶν ἐλευθέρων ἐστὶν.

Aristotle Politics 1292b24-25. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἢ πάντα τῷ ἐπηρεατέ μέρη τοῦ δόμου κοινωνεῖ τῆς πολιτείας, ἦ τὰ μὲν τὰ τὰ μὴ.

Aristotle Politics 1319b2. ὥσπερ δὲ τελευταίαν, διὰ τὸ πάντας κοινωνεῖν...
Aristotle Politics 1291b36. οὖσας γὰρ ἐν ἐκλίθες κοινωνοῦντες ἄτανεν μᾶλλον μετανόει τῆς πολιτείας ἐνοίας.

Aristotle Politics 1293a4-6. ἢ ἐπείτου μὲν πίνες τῆς πολιτείας διὰ τὴν ὑπερήφανον τοῦ πλῆθος, κοινωνοῦσι δὲ καὶ πολιτεύονται διὰ τὸ δύνασθαι σχολαζεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἄγορους λαμβάνοντες μισθῶν.

Aristotle Politics 1295a30-31. ἡλία βλέν τε τῶν τοῖς πλείστοις κοινωνηλα δυνατῶ καὶ πολιτεύονται ἢ τοῖς πλείστοις πάλι πέπεθαι μεταξύες;

Aristotle Politics 1295a2-4. ἤρα ἐς τοιαύτην εἰστήκει θαλητὸς ἢ ἐς τῶν ὑπαρχών καὶ πεποιθησεῖς καὶ δομηθήκης κοινωνεῖς...

Aristotle Politics 1295b55. δῆλον ἢ ἐς τὴν κοινωνία ἢ πολιτικὴ ἀριστή ἢ μὲν ἢ τῶν ἑαυτῶν...

Aristotle Politics 1297a42. οὕτω μὲν ἢς κοινωνοῦντες ἐπικείμεναι ἢ τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἰγνοῦται τῶν ἑτέρων κοινωνικῶν

Aristotle Politics 1309a29. ἢ γίνεται ἢ προσερήν χειρὶν τοῖς ἑτέρων κοινωνίσκες τῆς πολιτείας...

Aristotle Politics 1322a8. ἀναφερόμεν ἢ ἐστίν, ἢ στι ὡς καὶ χρόνος ἢ διὰ τῶν σίγατων ταῦτας δὲ μὴ λαμβάνεις ἐκεῖνος ὡς καὶ μὴ γινομένων κοινωνίαν ἤδυνατον ἀλληλοις, καὶ πράξεις καὶ γινομένων.

Aristotle Politics 1324a15-16. ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ συμπολιτεύεσθαι καὶ κοινωνεῖν πάθων ἢ μᾶλλον ὁ δεινὸς καὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς κοινωνίας ἀποτελεῖμεν...

Aristotle Politics 1324a19. ἢ εἰς πάθην ὑπερα τετελοκάτω κοινωνεῖν πάθως εἶτε καὶ τοῖς μὲν μὴ τοῖς δὲ προσερήν.

Aristotle Politics 1325a9-11. τοῦ δὲ νομοθέτου ἐποικίαν ἔτη τὸ δηλαδὴ πάντω καὶ γενός ἄνθρωπων καὶ πάθην ἄλλην κοινωνίαν, ἤς ἀριστής πάντως μετακυβεῖται καὶ τῆς ἐκδηλομένης αὐτοῦ ἀδοξασμένης.

Aristotle Politica1325b27. ... τολμῶ καὶ μὲν κοινωνική πρὸς ἁλλὰ τοῖς μέρεις τῆς πάθως εἶτεν.

Aristotle Politics 1327a11. ἢ περὶ δὲ τοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἀδίκησιν κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Politics 1327a37. ὁμορρόω δὲ καὶ μὲν ἐξαρθὲν τι συμβαίνει, ἵππευσθαι δὲ τῆς κοινωνίας ἀυτῶν, ἀπαρχη ὑπὲρ πάθει τοῦτο γὰρ ἀρχὴν...

Aristotle Politics1328b16-19. ἡ γὰρ πάθη πληθὺς ἐστίν ὡς ἐς τοὺς ἔχων, ἢλλα πρὸς λιγότερον ἄνθρωπος, διὸ φανεῖ, εἰναὶ ὡς ἐς τοὺς τούτων ἐκλείποντας, ἀδύνατον δὲ πάθος ἀντίκειται τῆς κοινωνίας εἶναι ταύτην.
Aristotle Politics 1328b25. Διαφορετικόν εἰς τούτων λοιπῶν σχέσιν ἔχειν πέτρον πάνων πάνων νομοθετείν τετελεσμένον...


Aristotle Politics 1334b34. ὥστε δὲ προβλέποντας νομοθέτειν τέτοιαν τήν κοινωνίαν πρὸς οὕτως τε καὶ τοῖς τῶν δυνάμεις...

Aristotle Politics 1336b20-23. τοῖς δὲ νυντέρως οὕτως μάλιστα οὗτοι κοινωνίας ἐπεξεργάζοντας πρὶν ἐν τῷ ἡλικίαν ἐλήφασιν ἡμῖν δὲ καταλήγοντες ὑπάρχει κοινωνίαν ἢδη καὶ μέθος καὶ τῆς ἄλλης τῶν τοιούτων τελευτής μᾶλλον ἀπαθείς ή παιδεία, ποιήσας πάντως.

Aristotle Politics 1339b40-42. ποτὲ δὲ τῶν κοινωνίων τῆς μοναρχίας οὐδὲ τῶν μόνης ὁμοίως καὶ διὰ τῆς χρήσεως εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς δυνατοὺς, ὡς τοῖς...

Aristotle Politics 1340b33-34. δεῖ μὲν οὖν παιδευτείν τὴν μοναρχίαν οὕτως νομοθέτειν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν ἐργῶν, φανερῶς ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων...

Aristotle Politics 1340b41-42. ...οὐκ ἔχει τῶν ἐργῶν κοινωνίαν τοῖς πρὸς ἑαυτὰς παιδευμένοις πολιτείας...

Aristotle Politics 1340b22-26. οὕτως ἄροιν δὲ καὶ οἱ πολλὲς ἔχει διαφόρως πρὸς τὸ ὑπερείροι ποιούν τίνας, ἐκ τῶν καὶ ἐντὸς κοινωνίας τῶν ἐργῶν, ἐν δὲ τῶν ὑπερείροι ποιούσιν καὶ ὑπερείροις εἶναι μὴ κοινωνίζοντος τῶν ἐργῶν κρίεις χαύσθεις σπουδάζουσιν.

Aristotle Politics 1340a32-33. καὶ ποίων μελῶν καὶ ποίων ἐρυθῶν κοινωνικῶν...

Aristotle Politics 1328a32-33. καὶ τοῖς ἐρυθῶν καὶ ποίων ἐρυθῶν κοινωνικῶν...

Aristotle Politics 1328b8-10. τρίτον δὲ ὅπλα τοῖς ἐρυθῶν κοινωνικῶν καὶ ἐν ὑπερείροις ἔχειν ὡς ταύτα τον ἐρυθῶν κοινωνικοῦ καὶ πρὸς τοῦς ἐρυθῶν ὑπερείροις εἰπεραίνειν...

Aristotle Politics 1268a17-20. οὐ δὲ τεχνιταὶ καὶ οἱ κεφαλαίοι καὶ οὐξ δὲ ὅπλα ἔχοντες καὶ κοινωνικοὺς τοὺς πολιτείας πάντες, οὐδὲ μὲν κεφαλαίοι δὲ ἔχουν ὡς ὡς καὶ τεχνιταὶ οὕτως ἄρα ὁ ὁδός ὡς ὁδός, ὡς οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὡς ὁδοὶ τοῖς τοῖς κεφαλαίοις...

Aristotle Politics 1266b15-16. διότι μὲν οὖν ἔχει τίνα δυνάμειν εἰς τὴν πολιτικὴν κοινωνίαν καὶ τῶν ὑπολείπεστιν χαύσθης καὶ τῶν πάλαι εἰνεῖς φαινόντες διεγερτεῖς...
Aristotle Politics 1260b28-29. Επει δὲ προσπόρισμα δειμένοι περὶ τὴν κοινωνίας τῆς πολιτικῆς ἡ κράτεσι τῶν τοῖς δυναμένοις ἢν ἔτι 

Aristotle Politics 1260b38-39. Ἐρῶ τῷ πάνες πάνες κοινωνεῖν τοὺς πολίτες, ὡς ἔθετο, καὶ εἴναι μὲν τίνων δὲ μὴ. τὸ μὲν 

Aristotle Politics 1260b40-42. Εἰ μὲν πολιτεία κοινωνία τῆς ἄνδρων ἀνέκδοκον τοῦ συνομονοῦντος, δὲ μὲν τὸ πόλεος ἢ τῆς μιᾶς πόλεως, 

Aristotle Politics 1261a1-3. Ἄλλο πότερον όσον ἐνδέχεται κοινωνεῖν ἀνέκδοκον θέλειν κοινωνεῖν τινὲς κοινωνεῖν τοὺς πολίτες ἄλλης ἡ οὐκ ἑκτεῖναι τὰ ἄλλα, ἢ τινῶν δὲ ὁδόν 

Aristotle Politics 1261a4-6. Ἐνδέχεται ὁ πολιτικὸς καὶ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ κεφαλῶν κοινωνεῖν τοὺς πολίτες ἄλλης, ἢτοι ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τῆς Μᾶλτους. 

Plato Republic 449CD. Ἅλλα τοιοῦτο οὕτω, ὅπερ τάλλια, λαέει 

Plato Republic 450C. ὥστε περὶ ὅν φωτισμένων ἀποκάλεσις ὑποκάλεσις καὶ δοκεῖ διεξεῖν, τῆς ἡ κοινωνία τοῖς φύλακις ἡμῖν πάλαι τε 

Plato Republic 461E. ἢ μὲν ὁ κοινωνίας, ὡς Ἑλλάδος, αὕτη 

Plato Republic 464B. Τοῦ μετέτροπον ἔργο ἡμᾶς τῇ πόλει αὕτη 

Plato Republic 462B. Οὐκοῦν ἢ μὲν ἡδονῆς τε καὶ λύπης κοινωνίας ζυγίζει, οὐδὲ μεγαλότερα πόντες οἱ πολιτείας τῶν ἁπάντων γυναικῶν τε καὶ ἀπολλυόμενων παραπλησίως χαίροντος καὶ λυπώντος; Ποτάπτομαι μὲν οὖν; 

Plato Republic 462C. Καὶ θέρει ο.MaximizeBox ἃ ἐξήγητο ένος ἀνθρώπου, 

Plato Republic 464A. Οὐκοῦν μάλιστα τοῦ ἄστωδος κοινωνήσεως τοῖς ἡμῖν οἱ πολιτείαι δὲ ἐν χορήσιμον τοῖς δυναμένοις ἢτοι ὑπὸ 

Plato Republic 464B. Ἡ μόνη τῶν τούτων αἰεί πρὸς τὴν ἄλλη καταστάσει ἢ τῶν γυναικῶν τε καὶ παῖδων κοινωνίας τοῖς φύλαξιν.
Plato Republic 466CD.

Συγγράφεις ήμεν εἰν αὐτὸν, ἐν τοῖς γυναικῶν κοινωνίας τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ἀν ἡ συνεχίζωσιν, παιδείας τε περί καὶ παιδών καὶ φιλάρχης τῶν ἄλλων πολιτέων, κατὰ τε πόλιν μειοδές εἰς πολέμων τε γοβασι Κύκλων καὶ ἐξερχόμενον δὲν καὶ εὐφώρθωσιν μίσους καὶ πάντα πάντως κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν κοινωνικώς, καὶ τάτα προσκόποις τα τῇ βιλίτσας πράξεις καὶ όποια παρὰ φύσιν τῆς τοῦ βάλεσ τροφὴ πρὸς τὸ ἄρρητον, τὰ περιμένεϊν πρὸς ἀλλὰ ἐκατεχόντος κοινωνικάν, Συμφωνώ, ἔφη.

Plato Republic 540C.

Ὅρθως, εἶπε, εἴπερ ἔμεν ἐν πάντα τοῖς ἀνδράσι κοινωνητός, ὡς διδάσκομεν.

Plato Republic 466D.

ὁ μὲν γὰρ χαράκης ἦν μέρος τῶν ἐκδεσμῶν, ἐξ ὅν τῶν παίδων οἱ κοινωνεῖς γίνονται τῆς πολιτικῆς.

Aristotle Politics 12b0b20. Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ χαράκης ἦν μέρος τῶν ἐκδεσμῶν, ἐξ ὅν τῶν παίδων οἱ κοινωνεῖς γίνονται τῆς πολιτικῆς.

Aristotle Politics 1263b24-27. Ἔτι καὶ τοὺς κακὰ κεκινήμενος καὶ κοινωνοῦσας πολλῷ διαφορεμένους μᾶλλον δρᾶσει ὁ τῶν λαρίς ἔτις ὡσεὶς ἔχοντας ἀλλὰ διαφορομένους τῆς τῶν κοινωνιών διαφερομένων πρὸς πολλούς συμβάλλουσας τῶν κεκινήμενοι τοῖς κακέστεροι.

Aristotle Politics 1263b23. ἦν οὖν ἂν γίνεται δι' τὴν ἄρνησιν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν μεθορίαν . . .

Aristotle Politics 1263b29. ἦταν δὲ σίκατον μὴ μόνον λέγων ὅσον στερήσατο κακῶς κοινωνοῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσον ἴκαθόν . φαίνεται δ' εἶναι πάμποι αὐτοὺς διὸ μίσος.

Aristotle Politics 1264a11-12. Οὐ μὴν ἂν οὖν ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀληθινῆς πολιτείας τίς ἦταν τοῖς κοινοποιοῦσιν οὐκ ἔτηκεν ὁ Σωκράτης οὗτος βίδον εἰτείν.

Aristotle Politics 1264a24-25. τῷ δὲ καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀλλην πολέμου, καὶ πρὶς τίνας ἦταν τα τοίχῳ, τὸ εἰτское ὅτε τῆς κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Politics 1264a39-41. ἦτοι δ' οὔθε εὑρέθη βίδον, ὡστε το διαφέρον μικρόν, τῆς ποιοῦς εἰναὶ διούσα πρὸς τῷ ἐφικτεῖται τῆς τῶν φιλάκων κοινωνίας.

Aristotle Politics 1264b29-31. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ περὶ ἀληθείας πάντων διώρισεν ὁ Σωκράτης, περὶ τῶν ὅμως καὶ τῶν κοινωνίων πάλιν ἔχειν ὀκοῖς, καὶ πρὶς τοῖς, καὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῇ ταξίν . . .

Aristotle Politics 1265a5-6. ἦσι γὰρ τῆς τῶν ὅμως κοινωνίας καὶ τῆς τοίχῳ, τῷ ἅρμα τετασκίνησαν ἐνθέωρεσις τ stringWith τοιχείασ . . .

Aristotle Politics 1271a4-5. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἀνταποδοτούμενοι καὶ κακατριχίομενοι πολλὰ τῶν κοινών οἱ κοινωνικαὶ τοῖς ἔργων ταξία.

Aristotle Politics 1272b14-15. καὶ τοῖς τὴν διαφέρειν ἐν τοῖς διδυμοῖς ἐνδιώκονται κακοῖς τῶν τῶν τοῖς πάλιν ὅμως κοινωνικάς ἐκκοινωνίας.

Isocrates Team of Hors. XVI.37. ὅσων σφόδρα ὡς τῶν πάλιν τῶν παράδον κακῶν ἀπλαύσεις κατέχεισαν τῶν τῆς τοίχων ἐκκοινωνίαν.

Isocrates Panegyricus IV.2. . . . ἦν τοῦ ἄνδρος εἰς φρονήσεις ἐπαναλαμβάνεις τῶν ἀποδημοσίων οἱ βουλευόμενοι κοινωνεῖ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας.

Isocrates Panegyricus IV.167. Ἀδικίας ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν δικής σεβασμός τῆς προσωρινῶν, ἢν ὡς τῶν τούτων κοινωνίων, τῶν ἱκανῶς ἐπολοῦσι καὶ μὴ πάντα τῶν ἱκανῶν δοσθεῖσαν συμπόλεμκοι.

Isocrates Panegyricus IV.110. . . . τοιχίας κατοιχητὰ τῶν δημοσίων κοινωνικάς καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν παράδον διδυμοφανέων . . .

Isocrates Platoicus XIV.8. . . . τοῦ ἐν τοῖς παράδον οἱ κοινωνεῖ τῆς τοίχων ἐκκοινωνίας.
Isocrates Plataicus XIV.57. ... εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ μόνῳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κοινωνίας ἐκεῖνος τῶν κινδύνων γενομένως εὐναυσάσθαι εἰς πόλιν αὐτοῖς.

Isocrates Plataicus XIV.46. τῇ τῷ ἀπευθυνθέντες μεταλαμβανέν ἀληθείαν. ἀναζωολογεῖν πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους κακοῖς καὶ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείαν κοινωνίαν.

Xenophon Hellenica VI.3.1. κοινωνίας γε μὴν αὐτοῖς Ῥώμην ἐπέρασεν οὐκέτι Ὑθέλον, ἐπεὶ ἔφυγεν στρατεύοντας τοῖς οἰκείοις ἑπὶ φίλους ἀργοῖς τῆς πολεοῦ Φωκής, καὶ πόλεις πιστὰς ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὸν Ἀρβαρων τοὺς πολέμους καὶ φίλος ἐναυσάσθαι ἀφεθέντες.

Xenophon Hellenica VI.5.2. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δόγμα ἐποίησαντε ἐν τοῖς κοινωνίας ὑπολογίων ἐξελέγη τόσον τῶν ὅρκων.

Isocrates Archidamus VI.43. ἐκλίποντες δὲ τῇ χώρᾳ, καὶ παρὰ μὴν τῆς ἐλευθερίας κοινωνίας, κοινωνήσαντες δὲ τῶν κινδύνων ἡ μὲν, τοσοῦτος μεταβολῆς ἔσχεν...

Isocrates To Archidamus Ep. IX.8... οὔ μόνον τοῖς Ἀρβαροῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήνων τοῖς τῆς μὴν φωνής τῆς ἡμετέρας κοινωνίας, τῷ δὲ τρόπῳ τῶν Ἀρκαντῶν χρήσις...

Isocrates Areopagiticus VIII.31... ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱδιῶν βίων τοσοῦτον ἐποίησαντε προνόμων ἀλλήλων, ὅπην περὶ χρῆ τοῖς εὐδαιμονέας καὶ παρῖδος κοινωνίας...

Demosthenes Ag. Leptines 20.25. οὐ γὰρ κοινωνεῖ τὰς οἰκονομίας προσόχοι καὶ περιουσίας ταύτα ταναλώσας ὀδεύ.

Demosthenes On Navy Boards 14.16. ἐὰν γὰρ τοῦτο ἀποδείξετε τῷ πλῆθος, ἡρῴμαι, τῶν ἐπικίνδυνων καὶ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ τῶν κρατουμένων καὶ τῶν κοινωνικῶν καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων ἔχουσαν ἀπορίας ἀφαιρέσεων, ἑξεσθειν χίλια καὶ διάκοσια ταύτ' ὅμοι σώματα.

Isocrates Add. to Philip V.131. τῶν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήμενον ὁδεῖς κακοίσσης, τῶν δ' ὁφελίμων τῶν κατηργοῦσανοίς ὕποκ ἄτιν ὅσεις οὐκ ἀνθληταί μεθέξεν.

Demosthenes On the Peace 5.19. ... Φίλιππος δ', ὅτι κωλομένοις αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖν τῆς ἄμφιστοιον...

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat.19.33.355,6 δὲ ὁμοιά ἀνυπολογίζειται πανομοστήρει, ἐπὶ ὅσιων καὶ πιστῶν ὁμοίων, ὅτι κοινώνω τῷ οἰκεῖῳ.

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat.19.45.355,6, ὅτι τἀυτὲ ὅτι δ' ὅτι κοινωνω, προσέθηκα δ' ὅτι ὅσιοι προσδοκῶ.

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat.19,119, ... καίτοι εἰς καὶ κοινωνία, εἰς ἅπαξ ὑπερ Φιλοκρατοῦς αὐτή...
Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.132.381 ότε τῶν ἐν Ἀμφικτύοις κοινωνιῶν ζήτεις, διούσιος ἐρέες καὶ ὑποτέκις ἀπὸ τῶν Φιλιπποῦν...


Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.190.400 επονοεῖ, ἦρων ἐκκοιμήσαν ἀφ' ἑρατηγοῦ, εχθρὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν ἢ ἥραται πάλαι.

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.202.404 ἀκούω γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰρεῖν ὡς δ' ἐμπάντων ἢν κατηγορῶν κοινωνίας γέγονα...

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.205.405 εἴκοσι ὡς οὐκ εἰς κεκοιμήσασα τούτων οὐδένας, λοιπὰν μοι δῆλα...

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.209.406; ἤνδρες Ἄθναιοι, τοὺς τοῦ πρᾶγμα πανδείκτων ἐστίν· αὐτοὶ κατηγορεῖ ταῦτα ἐμοὶ δὲν αὐτὸς κοινωνίας γέγονε...

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.222.410... καὶ φίλοι κακεῖνον ἐξείν καὶ τούτους (ὅσον γὰρ ἦν, ἦνόν μοι φίλοι τῶν αὐτῶν κεκοιμημένης).

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.280.431... ᾗ ὑπόρχεσθαι τοῖς βασιλῆσιν, εἶ ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς ἰδρυσὶν ἐπὶ ταῖς δυσίκοις ἐπονοεῖ καὶ χρησίμων κοινωνιῶν τελεσθε...

Demosthenes De Fals. Legat. 19.334.448... στρατηγὸς δ' εἰς τις ὀδύρησεν βασιλῆς, οὐχὶ κοινωνεῖ ταῖς τῶν τουδοῦναι.

Aeschines On the Embassy II.54... ἢν ἐδεστε, ὃ ἤνδρες δικαστεὶ, καὶ τὴν ἀκολομαίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν φόρουν, καὶ εἰς τῶν πραγμάτων μετὰ Φιλοκράτους κοινωνίαν, καὶ τὸ ἢθος, ἢς ἐπίρουσι καὶ ἀπίστου...

Aeschines On the Embassy II.56... Τὴν μὲν τοῖνον κοινωνίαν τῶν περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης πράξεων ὀδὴς ἦλθη καὶ Φιλοκράτους, ἀλλ' Δημοκρίτους καὶ Φιλοκράτους εὐρίσκετε.

Demosthenes On Halonessus 7.30.31... Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἑτέρου ἐπαινορθώμενος, Θ ὡμοίως εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην ἐπανορθώσατε, τοὺς ἀλλοὺς Ἐλλήνας, ὅσοι μὲν κοινωνοῦσιν τῆς εἰρήνης ἐλευθερούς καὶ ἀνώνυμους εἶναι, καὶ εἰς ταῖς ἠθους στρατεύματι βοηθεῖν τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας τῆς εἰρήνης, ἤγονες, καὶ δίκαιον εὐστῶτι καὶ φιλάνθρωπον...

Isocrates Ep. to Philip I.10... ἦν καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἀρατεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐπείνας δὲν οδηγεῖν τὴν πονηρὰς κοινωνίας...

Demosthenes Third Philippic IX.28... ὀδὴ κοινωνίαν βοηθεῖας καὶ φιλίας οδηγιὰν ποιήσασθαι...
Demosthenes Third Phil. IX.71. ... tōa ta ἐν τῇ πάντ' αὐτοὶ παρε-
κουσάμενοι καὶ ποιήσαντες φανερὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἡδικὰ παρακαλέων, καὶ
toûs ταῦτα διδάσκοντες ἐξέπεμπον πρὸς τοὺς ... τοις ἐν πάν τιν 
κοινωνῶς ἔχεις καὶ τῶν κινδύνων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡν τι ἔδρα, καὶ 
θεὶ μὴ, ἥρων ὑποστῆντε τοῖς πράγμασιν.

Demosthenes Fourth Philippic IX.45. δέ τι θείρ, ὡς ἄδει 
διδάσκοντες τῆς πολιτείας κοινωνεῖν τοὺς μὲν εὐφράστους τίς μὲν 
tοῦ βίου τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄρχον τῆς κοινωνίας ἔχειν νομίζοντες καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦτων λεγόντας ...

Isocrates Panathenaios XII.71. ... ὀδ μόνον τὴς τοιαύτης 
ἀν πολλῷ καὶ τῶν φιλῶν κοινωνοῦντιν, ἀλλὰ κατείνας ὑπὸ ὁδοῖς ἤν 
παρευρέσθαι αὐτὸς ὑπερείη καταχειίν ...

Isocrates Panathenaios XII.178. τοῦ μὲν ἄλλους συνοίκους 
τῆς πόλει τοὺς στασιάσαντας καὶ κοινωνοῦντας ἀπαντῶν τινὰ 
ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν τιμῶν.

Isocrates Panathenaios XII.184. ... ἀποκρείεται δ' ἂν τοιαύτης 
τῶν ἀδελφῶν τοὺς ἐνειμένα καὶ τοὺς ἐξαίρετους καὶ τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας 
καὶ ταξινομών λαβεῖν.

Demosthenes Against Neera 59.98. ... καὶ ἰγαμαίναν αὐτοὺς, 
ἐκκολάφρασεν τῇ ἐλεημον ἐπιγράφα τῆς πόλεως τῶν κοινωνότας τοῦ ἔργου.

Demosthenes On Treaty Alex.17.6. καὶ ὅπερ ἐτοι προσερέπτεται ἐν 
ταῖς συννόμισις πολεμοῦντας τῆς ἐκείνης ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρου τοιούτου ἀπαγο 
τοῖς τῆς ἐπιμέλειας κοινωνοῦσι, καὶ τῆς χώραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ στρατεύσθησθαι 
ἐν αὐτῶν ἐπαναλάβειν.

Demosthenes On Treaty Alex.17.15. ἦτοι ὅτι ἐν ταῖς συναγόμ καὶ 
τοὺς συνεχίζοντας καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς κοινῆ, φυληκὴ τεκμηρίων 
ἐπιμέλειας καὶ ταῖς κοινωνοῦσις πολέμος τῆς ἐπιμέλειας μὴ ὑπερείην 
καὶ φυγὰ παρὰ τοὺς κειμένους τοῖς πολέμοι νομοῖς, μηδὲ χρημάτων 
θημερίων, μηδὲ ἡμερῶν ἀποκοπαῖ, μηδὲ δακῶν 
ἀπελευθέρωσες ἐν νεωτερίσμῳ.

Demosthenes On Treaty Alex.17.16. ἦτοι ὅτι ἐπον ἐδύτο τὸ λεγόμ 
ταῖς συννόμισις. ἦτοι ὅτι ἐρμαμένοι, ἐκ τῶν πολεμῶν τῶν κοινωνοῦσιν 
τῆς ἐπιμέλειας μὴ ἐκείνα φυληκὴ διδάχεται ἔπειτ' ἐπιφέρειν ἐπὶ 
ὑπὲρ τοῦτοις καὶ τῶν τῆς ἐπιμέλειας τῆς ἐπιμέλειας κοινωνοῦσιν.

Aeschines Ag. Ctesiphon III.96. ... ἦτοι ὅτι πολλὰς καὶ ἄλλουs 
τῶν Ἐλλήνων ὡς ὑποστῆντε κοινωνεῖν τῆς συντάξεως ἔποιη καὶ τραπεζῶν 
οὕτω στρατιωτῶν ἐπιστολάς ἔτησαβαι.

Aeschines Ag. Ctesiphon III.145. ... καὶ μετανύξειν εἰς Θῆβαν 
ἐν τῇ καμήλα, τῶν κοινωνιῶν τῶν πράξεων τοῖς θεωρημάσιοι συνεχείσαι...
Aeschines Ag. Ctesiphon III. 257. "Οταν δ' εὗρε τιλευτήριο ήδη του λόγου συνήγορος των κοινωνιών των σωφρονιστών αὐτῶν παρακαλῆσον, εἰπολαμάδισσε δράν ὦ τοις δήμασισ...

Demosthenes De Corona 18.21.232. "Φιλόκράτης ὁ Ἀρνούιος, ὁ σός, Ἀζίνης, κοινωνικὸς οὐχ ἐκνόσ...

Demosthenes De Corona 18.23. "καὶ μὴν εἰς τὸ κατάλογο τῶν Ἐλλήνων κοινωνιῶν ἐπεράκειν ἄρας Φιλίππως ὁ θὰ τῇ μὴ σηκούσι λοιπὸν ἔγγει, ἀλλὰ βοῶν καὶ δισμαρτύρεσθαι καὶ ἱδροῦν τούτων...

Demosthenes De Corona 18.58.244. "καὶ ἀνεηφίην ἐν τῷ δέκατῳ οὔτε κελευοῖς, κοινωνίαν μὲν ἑγομένην καὶ τότε τοῖς πεπολεμημένοις...

Plato Leges 686A. "αὐτοῖς δὲ κεκοινωνικοῖς μὲν πολλῶν πόσων καὶ κινδύνων ἀλλήλοισ...

Xenophon Cyropaedia VII. 5.71. "ἐνυπέλεγε τὸς τε ἐμφύτην ἀνὴρ τοῖς ἀναπαράστατοι ἀυτῷ ἐδόκουν κοινωνικὸν εἶναι καὶ πόσων καὶ ἄρτασιν...

Plato Leges 694B. "καὶ πάντα δὴ τὸ στρατεύεται ἀνατιθέντος διὰ ἐλευθερίαν τε καὶ φιλιῶν καὶ νοὸν κοινωνίαν.

Plato Leges 695D. "δὴ ἐπεξεργαζόμενος Πέρσας, ὅς τὸν νόμον τείνει, φιλιῶν ποριζόντος καὶ κοινωνίας πάσης Πέρσας, χρήσαι καὶ ἐργασίας τῶν Πέρσων δημοσίων προσφέρειν...

Plato Critias 119C. "ἡ δὲ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἄρχη καὶ κοινωνία κατὰ ἐπίστευσιν ἢ τὰς τοῦ Πολειτῶν...

Plato Epistle VII 332A-B. "Τότε τοις κοινωνίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὑποθέσεν υἱὸν καὶ ἠνεφέδρος καὶ ἐφεξῆς καὶ παραστάτης ἀπεργάσθης πολλοίσιν, Δαρέω δὲ ἐπιτάσσετο παλαιός Χέρινα, διὸ ὅτι ἐπεξεργαζόμενος ὑπὸ διὸ ἀνέδωσεν τραφείσιν καὶ διόμοις εἰς οὖν τῷ ἱέρω τε καὶ ἡμοῖοι ήρευμένοι διένειμε τῇ μέρῃ ἑσῆς ἐκάστα Σίκελια πάσης ὥστε καὶ πιστοὶ ἔρχεται τοῖς κοινωνίας καὶ ἀκόμα ἐπιστευέσθως ὡς ἀνὰς ὀστραγγεῖς, ἐδείξε τοῖς παράδειγμα διὸν χρῆ τὸν νομοθέτην καὶ διέσαλε τὸν άχθον διίσθενοι...

Xenophon Hiero III.1. "Φιλίας δ' ἐπὶ καταθέσασι τοῖς κοινωνοῦσιν διὰ τύχηνον...

Xenophon Memorabilia II.1.32. "ἀδελφῇ δὲ συλλήπτερα τῶν ἐν τῷ τὸν πόλεμον βοήθησε δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ πολεμῷ σύμμαχος ἐργαίς, κατέστη δὲ φιλίας κοινωνίας.

Xenophon Memorabilia II.6.26. "πῶς ὡς λειτουργήσως πλήθος φιλιῶν κοινωνίων πολιτεύσαται, τούτοις κοινωνίοις καὶ συνεργείοις τῶν πράξεως μαλλον ἡ συνεργιστατε ἡ κρίσειν αὐτῶν;
Demosthenes Ag. Aristog. I XXV. 33. οὐκ ἀπονοώντας, ἡ ἄνθρωπος ἀθηναίοι, τὸς ὑπὲρ παθήρους λευκοσμοινοὺς δητὶς ἐντὸς κοινωνίας, ἀλλὰ νοῦ καὶ φρενῶν ἤρμαν καὶ προνοοῖς πολλῆς.

Plato Epistle VI 323BC. Ἐπιστήμης ἡ ποιήσασθαι πάλιν ὡς τὴν προπάρχουσαν γιατίτης εἰς καὶ κοινωνίαν...

Isocrates Ep. V. to Alex. 2. ἐκλήθη διὸς συνδιπτρίβων τοι οὐκ ἄν λυπηθεῖς, ἐμβάλλων τε καὶ κοινωνίων προμάχων οὕτως ἐννοεῖσθαι...

Plato Laches 179E. καὶ δρᾶσι συμπαραλαβεῖν ἦν... ἐν καὶ κοινωνίας. 

Plato Laches 180A. καὶ πρῶτος τῆς κοινωνίας λέγων ὅτι ποιήσετε... ἐμὲ μὲν Ἰ. Δυσίμαχο τε Ἀλεξάνδρου, εἰπώντω τοῖς τῆς ἱλαρόσι καὶ κοινωνεῖν ἔροις, οὕτω δὲ καὶ Δράκητα τοῦτο...

Plato Timaeus 20D. Ταῦτα χρῆ οὖν, καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ κοινωνίᾳ. Τιμαῖῳ δεδοκεί... 

Xenophon Oeconomicus VI. 3. ὡστε καὶ λόγως κοινωνοῦσαν περὶ ἃν ἰκανόν ἐν συνομολογοῦνται διεξεῖναι. 

Plato Gorgias 487C. ὁτέρως ὑπάρχων κοινώσας χρυσόντω σοφίας...

Plato Cleitophon 410C. ἐθέλειν ἄν ἐμοὶ κοινωνεῖν...

Plato Laches 197E. σὲ τῆς κοινωνίας τὸν λόγον...

Plato Legea 891B. κλεινώ, καὶ πόπην κοινωνεῖς καὶ συνδοκεῖ σοι...

Plato Cratylus 434BC. τοῦ λόγου ὁσπὶ ἔρημον Ἐρμοχένης.

Plato Crito 49D. Σκοτει ὅτι ὅπως καὶ οὐ ἐν... 

Plato Republic 335E. ἐμει κοινωνεῖν τούς άλλους...

Plato Republic 450A. καὶ ἔμετοιν, τριήμερον έτη...

Plato Politicus 260B. Τούτου τούτων μετρητέρον ἂν αὐτοῖς κοινωνοῦμεν, ζητοῦν πάντα καὶ τοὺς άλλους συνάπτομε καὶ συνίσταμεν...
Plato Alcibiades II 147E. ταύτης δὲ καὶ σύμων δοκεῖς κεκοινωνήσαι...

Plato Crito 49D. ἦ διαφέραται καὶ οὐ κοινωνεῖς τοῖς ἁρχαῖς;

Plato Leges 810C. Ὡρᾶσθαι δηλαδή, ἡ Κλίνικα, πρὸς ἄνδρας καὶ μη κατὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν εἰπώρον καὶ τῇ μη φύλαξιν.

Plato Leges 753A. Τί δέκει ὧς καὶ σὺ τε καὶ ὃς Ἀγίλλος, ῦτε γείνει, ἐκκοινωνήσετε ὅτιν τῆς πολιτείας;

Plato Leges 969C. ἄλλα δέχεσθαι καὶ μηκαιάς πάσας κοινωνίας ποιήσεις; εἰπ ἐτὸς πολλὰς κατακλίσεις.

Isaeus On Estate of Astyp. IX. 30. καὶ ἐς τοὺς διάτους τοὺς Ἰρακλέους ἐκεῖνον λαύονεν, ἐμπέτεχοι τῆς κοινωνίας.

Isocrates Aeginiticus XIX. 10. ἄλλα καὶ τῶν ἴδιων ἐκκοινωνών καὶ ἔμελλες περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐνοίκους ἐκείνης καί φίλοις καὶ ζέναις τοῖς αὐτὸν ἕχομεθα.

Isocrates Antidosis XV. 105. εἰκοί δὲ δικαίων ὃ καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν κοινωνεῖν ἢ μηδὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπαλαύειν.

Demosthenes Ag. Meidias 21. 118. ὡπετέρον γὰρ ἄλλο παρὰ τῶν φίλοις ζῇν, τοῖς τις δοκοῦσιν πεποικέκειαι ἰδιοῖς, ὡρᾶτε τρίς λοιπὰς διήλεος κοινωνεῖν, τοῖς δὲ τιμωρεῖσθαι καὶ ἐπεζηνέα τοῖς πεποιθοῦσι καί τοῖς ἔχθροις ταραλείζει...

Isocrates Addr. to Demonicus I. 25. δοκοῦσι λοιπὰς διήλεος πέρι τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις κοινωνίας...

Plato Epistle VII 337D. μὴ γὰρ μὴ μὴ ἐλλον κοινωνεῖν παρακαλεῖν τοῖς μὴ πειθόμενον τοῖς νῦν ἐπεσταλμένοις.

Demosthenes Ag. Pantaenetus 37. 10. ἡ γὰρ κοινωνεῖν ἐξει τῆς ἐργασίας καὶ τῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῷ Ἐδέμφρῳ...

Demosthenes Ag. Zenothemis 32. 7. οὕτως ὃ καὶ κοινωνός ἀυεῖ ποτὲ συναρρός...

Demosthenes Ag. Zenothemis 32. 15. δὲ ὡς κοινωνοῖς καὶ πολιτείς...

Demosthenes Ag. Zenothemis 32. 17. ἐξηγεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ Πρῶτος καὶ κοινωνὸς τοῦ Ἱπποτοῦ, Φερεατος...

Demosthenes Ag. Zenothemis 32. 21. οὕτως ὃς τοῦτό ὡς ἄδεις ἡμῶν τῶν κοινωνῶν ὑπαλαύεσθαι, δὲ δεις ἐνεργεῖτε τοὺς εἰμι τοῦτον τοῦ σίτον...
Demosthenes Ag. Phormio 34.8. Ἐφαύξαν τοὺς εἰς τὸν Βώρτιον, ἔχων ἐπίτευχος παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἀς ἐξελθεῖν ἀδελφὸν ἠπενεγκείν τῷ παιδὶ τῷ ἐμῷ παραχθεῖν· ἄρα ἔτη ἦν καὶ κοινωνίᾳ τινὶ...

Demosthenes Ag. Phormio 34.36. καὶ δεῖθος δὲ κοινωνίᾳ τούτῃ ἀπὸ τῶν γιατρῶν.

Demosthenes Ag. Phormio 34.38. Φορμίων τοῖς τούτων κράτης κοινωνίᾳ καὶ μάρτυρι δεῖχε ότι δὲν ἠποτελήσας τὰ κράτη διὸ...

Demosthenes Ag. Lacritus 35.16. ...καὶ ἕξελθες ἔρχεται εἰς καὶ κοινωνίᾳ τῶν Ἀρετίνων, καὶ λόγος ὁμολογίας διὰ πιθανότως Εὐγεν... 

Demosthenes Ag. Timotheus 49.31. ἐπιτίθεσις δὲ τῶν Φορμίων καὶ κοινωνίας καὶ τοῦτος...

Demosthenes Ag. Callipus 52.3. ...λέγων δὲ τοις κοινωνίᾳ τῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ κηριάδες ὁδοὶ...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.1. Κοινωνίας τινὶ τοῦ δανείσματος αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ.

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.5. Διονυσίδωρος ἔκρυς ὁδοῦ, ἢ ἄνδρες Ἀδριανοῦ, καὶ ὁ κοινωνίας αὐτοῦ Παρμενίδος...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.7. Διονυσίδωρος θ' ὁδοῦ καὶ ὁ κοινωνίας αὐτοῦ Παρμενίδος...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.9. ...ἐκλύων ὁδοῖς ἀποστέλλει τινὶ εἰς τὴν Ὀδον ἀπαγγέλλει τῷ Παρμενίδῳ τῷ κοινωνίᾳ ταύτην...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.10. ἐρας δ' εἰς τῶν κοινωνίας τοις τοῖς διάματα τῷ παρὰ τούτῳ ἀποστελέσθεναι...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.11. ...εἰς τῇ κακοκινώνθησαν τῇ σιενῇ τῆς εἰς τὴν Ὀδον...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.24. ἢ τῶν ἀδριανίων ἡμῶν ὁδοὶ ὁδοῖς τὴν κύριος ὁδοὶ δὲ κοινωνίων αὕτην...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.42. ἢ δὲ τούτων καὶ τῶν κοινωνίων αὕτη...

Demosthenes Ag. Dionysiodorus 56.45. πανείσασθε Διονυσίδωρῷ συνεργῇ καὶ τῷ κοινωνίᾳ αὐτοῦ τρισχίλια εἴρησις...

Demosthenes Ag. Ophonus III.29.20. προσκαλοῦμαι καὶ Δημόνως εἰς μάρτυρίαν, ὅτε ἔπειτ' ἦν καὶ κοινωνίᾳ τῶν δικαίωματος, καὶ συγγραφῇ τῶν ἐκείεσθε ἐκείεσθε μάρτυρεῖν...
Demosthenes Ag. Meidias 21.120. ... ἐὰν δ' ἐπεξῆν, λέοντα τὴν φίλον, φόνον καίνων, δεῖ μοι ἀνηρπασθῆναι.

Demosthenes Ag. Timocrates 24.159. ἦσας δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἑκείνων πεπληρωμένων ἐμὰς μικρὰς ἀλήθειας ἔσειν ἄκουσκε, καὶ τοὺς ταύτα, ὡς κεκοιμηθήκεν ὡς καὶ δ’ ὅ τούτον ὀδηγήν ἑτοῖν ἑκείνου δικαίως ἄν μισήσῃ.

Demosthenes Ag. Timocrates 24.177. ἔρισθεν δ’ ἐπὶ ταῦτα προοίμιον τούτον τοῖς πάνενω τοῖς μακροων κοινωνοῖς.

Demosthenes Ag. Conon 54.33. ἐμποταὶ δ’ ὄνεις τούτου καὶ πολλῶν τοιούτων ἔρων κοινωνοῦν, εἰκόνας τῷ φεύγον μεμαρτυρῶσθαι.

Demosthenes Ag. Conon 54.37. ... οἱ κεκοιμηθήκοτες τοσοῦτος καὶ τοιαύτης φιλανθηματίας καὶ πονηρίας καὶ ἄνδρεύσας καὶ ὀφρος;

Demosthenes Ag. Macartatus 43.30. ... συμφωνολογοῦσαν, δ’ ἔστω ἕξουν τοὺς κοινωνοῦν, δὴ ἄλλας συμφωνισται καὶ ἐπιτείνα ἐπιρέουσον κο hust...

Demosthenes Ag. Olympiodorus 48.28. καὶ τὰ μὲν προανελάβετα ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀποδιώκτῃ τῷ Ολυμπιοδόρῳ, καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς πρὸς τούτον ταῦτα ἕκαστῳ ἀπελθοῦσα.

Plato Leges 699D. Ἐστ’ ταῦτα, ὑπὸ Δεδυκύα: πρὸς τὸ σὲ ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς ἡγομένοις, κοινωνοῦν τῇ τῶν πατέρων γενεὰς φύσει, δίκαιον λέγειν.

Demosthenes Ag. Theocrines 58.40. ... μικρῶν ἐναλλάσσεται τοὺς αὐτών τούτοις συνδεκατικάνεις καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἑρων κοινωνοβοῖς.

Demosthenes Ag. Eubulides 57.28. ... ἔχομεν τούτους τότε τὰ πατρίδα μνήματα, τὸν πόλεμον εἰς τὸν ἔτος κοινωνοῦσιν...

Demosthenes Ag. Macartatus 43.79. ... ἄπαθεν· δʼ ἐπτούσιν, κοινωνοῦσι, τοῦ μνήμακα τοῦτον. δ’ ἔπειτ’ ἐπτούσι πατὴρ Μακαρτάτου καὶ δ’ ὅπἀτον ὀπὸ κεκοιμηθήκατο τοῦτον...

Xenophon Oeconomicus III.15. ... νομίζειν ἂν χωνείκα κοινωνῶν ἐχθρῶν δίκου ὀφειν πάνω ἄντιχροσον ἐκεῖ πο’ ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ ἔργον.

Xenophon Oeconomicus VI.3. ... Ἡδονάς ὑπὸ ὁδόν πολύτιμην, ἔργα δ’ ἐκ βουλήσεως, ὀπὸ καὶ προστασίας κοινωνήσεως ἀκαμπτὸς ἄνθρωποι...

Xenophon Oeconomicus VII.11. ... ὀπὸ τούτων ὄπορον ἔκμολευμα τοῦτον ἐκ μὲν καὶ σοὶ γονέας διπλῆς σοὶ τοῖς διπλαίς κοινωνοῖ βελετεσσεν ὀικύο τε καὶ ταῖς λάβωμεν, ἔλεγεν τῇ ἐκ της ἐκπροσεβείματι καὶ σοὶ γονεῖς, δι’ ἀγωγάς, ἐκ τῶν δεινῶν ἔκτις.
Xenophon Oeconomicus VII.13. δολό έχεινο δεί τι θέλεις, οτι διπότερος άν άν δημος ξελεγίνως ή, ούτος τι πλείονος έχει συμβαλλεται.

Xenophon Oeconomicus VII.18. ...οπως ότι άφελμώτατον έ αυτω τις την κοινωνιαν.

Xenophon Oeconomicus VII.30. οπταινεί δε, έρη μανι, καλ δ νόμος αυτά συγκεκριμένα άνθρα και χυναίκα και κοινωνός διότερ των τέκνων ή διάδος έποίησεν, ούτω και δ νόμος του οίκου κοινωνίους καθοδεύει.

Xenophon Oeconomicus VII.42. ...οτι προσβηραν λημνομενη δεμ
ζην και έμοι κοινωνος και παιδιν οίκου φύλαξ αμείνων γινη, τοσότερο
και τιμιωτερα χερ κι ηκ ταυρη.

Xenophon Oeconomicus IX.3. Επιτε μοι έρην, ά ριναι ποτέρως
ζην με κρινις αξιοφιλησε μπαλλον ειμαι ξηματων κοινωνον, ή οι
αυτα χερ ήταν αποδεικνυομε.

Xenophon Oeconomicus X.5. Ποτέρως ζην οδη έρην έμω, το
επώματος αυτ δοκοιν είναι αξιοφιλης μπαλλον κοινωνος...

Isocrates To Nicocles III.40. ίτι δε καί των τοιοτων πολλης
κακων κατηγοροκειν, οτι χυναίκας λαβοντες και κοινωνον ποιησαμενοι
πανες τω βίω μη στεροουσην οτι επιραξαν, άλλα ταυτων δεινων
λαμβανει τοτας δη αυτοι ευδηνα εξευθενει και περι μεν
καλλα, τινας κοινωνας έπιλεγοντες σφας ουτως παρέχουσιν, έν δε ταύς
προς τας χυναίκας έξαρατανωσιν...

Consi. of Lacedaemonians I.9. ....οι των μεν γενος και
tης συναλως κοινωνιαν, εων οδη ξηματων έχον ἀντιποθεταται.

Isocrates Ag. Stephanus II.46.17. ....τοσες ενι χυναίκα δοξαι
την αύτου και εων παιδων ειςα αυτως κοινωνον αυτω γνωριμαι.
APPENDIX II

GREEK TEXTS FOR CHAPTER IV

Plutarch De Def. Orac. 423D. εἰσὶν δὲν ἐκεῖ ἔτεροι θεοὶ καὶ κόσμοι, πρὸς οὓς χρήται ταῖς κοινωνικαῖς ἀρειαῖς...

Plutarch De Def. Orac. 415A. εἴμοι δὲ δοκεῖσθαι πλεῖονας λυσι ἀνάμενες ἁπαρίδα νῦν εἴναι τῶν δαιμόνων γένος ἐν μέσῳ θεῶν καὶ ἄνθρωπων τρόπον τινα τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῶν συμάχον εἰς ταῦτο καὶ συνάπτον ἐξευραίες...

Plutarch De Ser. Num. V. 566C. καὶ μὴ καλῶς διαμεμοιδάσαντα λόγον εἰς ἄνθρωποις κίμωλιν ἐξευραίες, διὸ κοινῶν εἰς ἀντέτον ἐν θεοῖς Ἀπόλλωνας καὶ Νυκτών. οὐκέτοι γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα Νύκτω κοινωνίαν.

Plutarch De Def. Orac. 416E. ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ τὸν άδέρ τις ἀνέλοι καὶ ὑποπασίες τον μεταξύ γῆς καὶ σελήνης, τὴν ἐνότητα διαλύει τῇ τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ παντὸς ἐν μέσῳ κατ' ἀναπεσίων χώρας γενομένης...

Plutarch De Prim. Frig. 946F... ἀλλὰ τὴν τῆς θερμότητος καὶ πυρότητος ἐν κόσμῳ κοινωνίαν καὶ διαφωράν, ὡς ὑποβάθμις ταὶς ὑποβάθμις καὶ διαφωράς πάλιν...

Plutarch De Prim. Frig. 951D... χρῆται μὲν γὰρ ἐναρτύος εἰς τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πράγματα. χρῆται δὲ οὕς ἀκράτεος οὐδ' αὐτοτοπίς ἀλλ' ἐναρτύος εἰς τὰς ταῖς καὶ τὸν ὑποβάθμιον ἀποκεφαλήθη τῆς κοινωνίας, ὡς ἐπάνω καὶ συνεργῶν ἐν μέσω παρεμπελεκομένην ἔχουσι.

Plutarch De Pro An. Intim. 1036A. δὲ πᾶσιν ὡς ἔκ διαφοράς καὶ ἀνοικοστότητος ἐγγίζοντος κοινωνίας ταῖς πρὸς ἄλλα καὶ πυρότητος, τούτης αὐτῆς εἶναι μεταφοράς καὶ τὰς, ἀριθμοὺς καὶ ἀρμονίας μετασχοῦσιν...

Plutarch De Prim. Frig. 951D... ὅτε οὖν τὴν φύσιν έχει λόγον ἡθησις, τῷ θεῷ προφέροντο τάξις, τῷ θεῷ προφέροντο, ὡς ὑποβάθμιος καὶ τὰς ἀρμονίας ἀλλα παλέαν καὶ μάχης ἐνμισθοῦσι.
Plutarch DeFac.inOrb.L.926E... ἀλλ' ἐκρατεῖ καὶ ἀστορροὶ καὶ μανάδες αὐ̃ τῶν ὅλων ἄρχαι, μὴ προσέλθειν σύγκρισιν ἐκείνου πρὸς ἑπεκεῖν μινδὲ κοινωνίαν...

Plutarch DeFac.inOrb.L.927A... ἐξ' οὗ πέρικεν, ἐνδούναι καὶ μεταστήναι... ἀρμονίαν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἀπεραστήσαται σοῦ παντὸς.

Plutarch DeFrat.Amor.478F, μᾶλλον δ' ἐσπερ ἐν ταύτῃ σώματι μίας κοινωνίας φύσεως καὶ τρόφις τὰ δύό̂ρα καὶ ἔρημα καὶ ψυχρὰ καὶ θερμὰ τῆς ὅμονοιας καὶ συμφωνίας τῆς ἄρσεντι καὶ ἡδύσην κράτειν ἐμποιεῖ καὶ ἀρμονίαν...

Plutarch DePrim.Frig.946E... θερμὰ δ' ἐξείν ἄγρες ἀδ' κεραυνόμενα ψυχρὰ ὑπομενεῖ, καὶ ἐπερ ἑλάμα λευκός καὶ, ἐφέ ζέε καὶ χλακίζειν ἀνατηρεῖ, παρέχοντα τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ ἀρμονίᾳ ὑματεῖν τας καὶ ὀβέρων καὶ συμφωνίας καὶ ὄρθων προσφιλεῖς πολλὰς καὶ φιλανθρώπους γενεῖσαι.

Plutarch DePrim.Frig.951DE... καὶ ταύτην ἐξείνειν καὶ ἅγια ὑπὸ κεραυνός εἰς πυρὶ πρὸς τού ὁδότος καὶ διαδίδους ἐν ἀμφότερα καὶ συνάγων, ὡς ἁθρόος ὅν τῶν ὁδότις ἄγκες ψυχρὰ ἄλλα ψυχρὰ καὶ βουμανωμέτακαρσιαι καὶ κοινωνήματα μννεμένων ἐν αὐτοὶ μείζων ἀνὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ καλάκως ἀνείσαν καὶ διεμείην τὰς ἐναντίως ἀκροτήτας.

Plutarch DePrim.Frig.946DE... καὶ ἁγία ἔξεις μὲν ὅπε ἔστι μείζον πρὸς στρέψων ὁδὴ ἀναδέχεται δύνασις οὔτεμα τῆς ἀναζημευμένης αὐτής στρέψιν ἐπιστάν ὁδὴ ποιεῖ καὶ κοινωνίαν ἄλλη ἀνεικευτάτα.

Plutarch Ag.anIgn.Util.956E... πῦρ ὑπὸ ῥοῖ όν ὅπε ἐπιστάν τοῦ ἑρόως κοινωνίας χρήσιμον, ὅπωρ ὅ ἔστι μετὰ πυρὸς ὁφέλιμον.

Plutarch DeFac.inOrb.L.924D... ἕσταν τῶν ἑτερων οὐ τῆς ὑγίου τῆς μεσότητος πρὸς τῶν κόσμων, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν θρύσκον τῆς κοινωνίας τίνος καὶ συμφώνιας τὸς ἀπωσμενόνας αὐτής εἰς τὰ πάνιν καταφερομένοις.

Plutarch DePlac.Philos.386E... ὅτα μὲν ἄγρες συμφωνίας ταύτῃς οὐδ' ἐπεί τὸν ὅρων ἀπολακτεῖ φύσις ἀλλ' ἐπιστρέφουσα ὑπὸ μὲν ἀφοθεῖ τῇ ταύτῃ περίοδῳ καταφέρειν ἐκεῖνης καὶ ἀνακύκλῳ τῶν κόσμων.

Plutarch De An.Proc.inTim.1026Ε... ὅτα διηθῆς κοινωνίας ταύτῃς οὕτ' ἐπεί τὸν ὅρων ἀπολακτεῖ φύσις, ἀλλ' ἐπιστρέφουσα ὑπὸ μὲν ἀφοθεῖ τῇ ταύτῃ περίοδῳ κράτος ἐχόση καὶ ἀνακύκλῳ τῶν κόσμων.
Plutarch Plat. Quaest. 1004D. Ὁ διαλογιστικὴ καὶ διανοητικὴ μαλίστα τοῦ θείου κεκοιμηθηκεν, ἐν τῶν θείων καὶ οὐρανίων ἐφέσειν;

Plutarch Plat. Quaest. 1004C. Ἔνως ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Φάιδρῳ λέγεται τὸ τῆς του πτεροῦ φύσιν, ὅτε ἦν κοινωνία ἡ οὐκ ἔγινεν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς καταλήψεως, κεκοιμηθηκεν μαλίστα τῶν περὶ τὸ θεῖον τοῦ θείου;

Plutarch Amatorius 763F. Ἔνως ἄρα διὰ τύπουν καὶ ὄργυν καὶ ἀμφοτῆς ὑπὸ Ἰασόνδου καὶ Πλάτωνας καὶ Σέλενος ἀπὸ τοῦ Εἰκείων τινῶν Ἀκαδημίαι ἔστεραν καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῷ συναντῆται πολλοῖς συνωρίσει φιλίας καὶ κοινωνίας;

Plutarch Amatorius 758Ε. Ἐνῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύμου πλημμένων ἄθορον δὲ τὸ φρονήματι, ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου φύσις ἐνυποκοιμηθηκεν ἀλλ᾿ ὑπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας θειοτέρας συνώρισε.

Plutarch De Plac. Phil. 899Ε. Πλάτων τὴν ἁίσθησιν ἀπομίνετα φύσις καὶ συμματικός κοινωνίαν πρὸς τὰ ἔκτος.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 626Δ. οὗ ὄργυν ἀναπρόσθεν ἀρτέρων ὑπὸ ἄρτερος κρατηθέν, ἀλλ᾿ ἐν τῷ ἐμφόρων ἐν τῇ ἐμφόρων, καὶ κοινωνία, συνάφεις τῶν μίαν δύναμιν ἀποτελεῖται.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 626ΔΕ. πρὸς τὸ ἀναπρόσθεν καὶ λεπτὸν ὑπὸ ἄρτερος φύσις ἀναπρόσθεν συμματική καὶ συμματικὸν ἀφίσθην, καὶ με κοινωνία καὶ συνωρίσεις διὰ τὴν ἁίσθησιν.

Plutarch De Anim. Proc. 1024Δ. ὅτι καὶ ὅσαν ὄργυνν η κοινωνία κατέρχεται αὐτῶν, τῷ ἐμφόρῳ καὶ τῇ ἑμφόρῳ καταβολὴ καὶ συμματικὸν ἀρτέρων ἐν τῷ τῶν συνωρίσεων,

Plutarch De Virt. Moral. 450Ε. ὧν καὶ συνωρίσεις διά τὴν τῶν καταβολής τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀκρότατον καὶ καταβολής τῆς τῶν καταβολῆς τῶν κοινωνίας ἐν τῷ τῶν κοινωνίας.

Plutarch Cons. ad Apol. 104C. ἐν θεῷ τῷ σπέρματι ἐκὸν ὅταν ἀνεύς καὶ ἐνυποκοιμηθηκεν ἡς ψυχή, ὃς ὁ ὅμοιος καὶ κόρη ἅλλης ῥητῶν ἐκεῖθεν ἡμῶν ἐρήμει.
Plutarch Con. ad Apol. 108C. καὶ ἐν ἐν τὰν ἔμεθα
ὡς ἐοικεῖς, ἐρματῶν ἐξομήθη τοῦ εἶδος, ἐπὶ δὲ
λαβεῖται μὴν διήλθη τῷ τόμῳ μηδὲ κοινωνόμεν, δεὶ
μὴ σαῦτα ἄναγκη, μηδὲ ἀναπρολώμεθα τὸς τούτων φύσεως...

Plutarch Con. ad Uxor. 611D. ὥσπερ δὲ καθότι σε
περί τιν ματίας ἀλόγως καὶ τὰ μετακάπι τοῦ
περὶ τῶν ψυχήσων ἄρκεσιν, ὥσπερ ἀλλὰ τοῦ
κοινωνοῦντος.

Plutarch De AnimProc. in Tim. 1027Aἔγειτος ἦν
κοινωνίαν πρὸς ἀλλήν καὶ φίλων ἐρματῶν ὦτὰρ ἀρίθμους καὶ
ἀρμονίας.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 746A. ἐπιδίωσοι δὴ λόγου καὶ
ψυχῆς, πειθῶν πολιτικῆς καὶ κοινωνικῆς συνεργὰς ἐπάγουσα
παραρμουμενήν καὶ κηλοῦσαν ἥπειρον τῷ ταραχῆς καὶ τῷ
πλανώμενον ὑπὲρ ἐς ἀνοίγῆς ἀνακαλομενήν ἐπιτείκως
καὶ καθιστῶσαν.

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 962D. ἐπεὶ δεικνύσα τι
πολλὰ κοινωνίας καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ τοῦ παιδοῦρον περὶ τοὺς
πολισμούς καὶ τὰς ἀκονίων.

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 966Β. καθὼς δὲ ἐπεὶ ὅποιον
ὁι φιλόταρτοι δεικνύσα τῷ ἑαυτῷ μετέχειν λόγον τῇ ἀκοινωνίᾳ,
προβλέπεσιν τοῖς καὶ παρισκέωμα καὶ μνημεία καὶ τὰθή καὶ
τεχνῶν ἑπιμέλειαι καὶ χάριται εἰς παθώμαν καὶ λυπησικKeySpec
πρὸς τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ἐπεὶ δὲ καθιστῶσα τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἐθέρασις
ἀρετῆς, ἰδίως ἀνδρείας κοινωνίας ἑκπαιδείας μεταλλοφροσύνης...

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 967D. ἐνθὰ ἐν ῥήματι τῶν
κοινωνίων...

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 972Β. τὸ ᾿Ενθὰ ἐν Ῥήματι
κοινωνίων μετὰ τοῦ συντετούς τοὺς ἱερατευματοκυκλώματος...

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 972C. οὐχ ἦττον δὲ κοινωνίαν
tὰ τῶν λεύτρων...

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 975Ε. ἐπὶ ἀκολούθως, κατειστῶν καὶ
ὑπογείης διήλθος τῶν δὲ πλείστων κατακαλύπτει
χρυσάις καὶ τροφῶν ἐπιθέσεις τε καὶ φυλακάς ἀλλήλων,
ἐν δὲ ὑπὸ ἅλυσα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐγγίνα καὶ μνῆμας καὶ
κοινωνίας ἐνοπλοῦσα βιοτείται τῶν λόγων.
Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 977C. Εἶπεν δὲ ἐπείρασεν μετὰ τοῦ δινέων τοῖς κοινωνικοῖς καὶ τοῖς φιλάληλον, μέτα πασί καὶ σκάροι.

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 977E. ἔλθει δὲ ὁδαὶ πολλὰ δείκνυσι τῶν ξύλων μηνὶν ἀποδειπώνει τοῖς κοινωνικοῖς καὶ συνεώς τοῦ σοφωτάτου εὑν χειράινιν. ἄλλα περὶ κοινωνίας ἄστων θίους ἐσται τὰ Ἰσόν ἐκουσι τοῖς μαθήματος...

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 980A. Τῶν δὲ ξύλων χειρῶν δομάς ἔνωσι καὶ ἡ κοινωνίας μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων ἀλληλοκατοικίας ὅπως ἀπειρίτως τῶν ἄθροιμων, ἄλλα μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς καὶ τὰς ἰδιὰν κοινωνίας αὐτῶν καὶ συμβιβάζεις ἱζεν.

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 980DΚ. οἱ τις τοῦτοι τῶν κοινωνίας διαμοίρασιν, ὅπου τὸ πάντων ἀμωματάτον καὶ [τὸ] ἀριθμόστατον ἐν τρεφούν, τοσούτοις καὶ πλασαμίνης καὶ ἀλλάζοντας τὺμον, δὲ κρατικὸν τὸ θαυματωτὸν εὐαντὸν ἐπιμείνοντα πρὸς κοινωνίαν καὶ χαρὶν ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὸν τροχίλον του ὁμολαίοις;

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 981Β. ὅπος οὖν άξιον ἔστιν τάνων τῶν κοινωνίας καὶ συμπεριφορᾶς παράδειγμα εἴστε ὅπος Ἀριστοτέλης ἡσυχείς ἀληθικῶς καὶ ἀρείως διὰ τὸ κοινὸν αὐτοῖς πολέμιον εἶναι τοῦ ἔτος, ἵνα ἐν τοῖς στιγμαῖς πρὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς, ἐν τῷ χαρίσων προσπελάτουσι καὶ διασκάλουσι τοῖς καὶ τόν ὄνομαν. τῶν οὖν ἐν διαμοίρασι καὶ μελέτοις ὁποίος τοσοῦτον ἀλλήλων ἐπιμείνεις ὁδὲ δεν μυρμήνης οὐκ ἔχοντος καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ αὖθισιν πασί καὶ πάντως ἑρων, ἐστεροὶ δὲ καὶ εὐθὺς ἑσθερι ἑστεροὶ στοιχεῖοι ὁδὲ ἐστεροὶ στοιχεῖοι ἑστεριν.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 704F. ὅπος δὲ μοι μὴν Ἀριστοτέλης ὠρῶν δικαίως τόσα περὶ θεῶν, καὶ ἀκροσίαν εὐπαθείας ἀπολείπει ἀκρασίας, ἡς ἄνως ἁνδρωτικῆς ὁδοῖς τοῖς δὲ ζώλας καὶ τὸ δηρία φύσιν ἔστω Χρήσια καὶ κοινωνίαν.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 728Α. οὗ δὲ θείας εὐπάθειας ἄστι, μόνα τῶν συνοίκων μείζων καὶ ξυλίδων, ὥς ἡ καταχθαὶ πρὸς ἀνδρωτον ὄδυς ἀνεχόμεναι φύσιν οὐδὲ διμίλιαν ὁδὸν κοινωνίαν ἑρμον, τοὺς ἐν παιδίαις...

Plutarch An Sen. SitGer. 783EF. οἷς καὶ τὸ τοῦ θουκυδίδου παράγει ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον, ὥς τὸ πιθανόν ἀγνώρω μόνον ἁγουμένως, ἄλλα μᾶλλον τοῖς κοινωνικοῖς καὶ πολιτικοῖς, τοῖς καὶ μηθηκοῖς ἐν ἴδιοις τελοὺς παραμένει καὶ μελετεῖται.
Plutarch Life of Pompey 633E. καὶ θηρία διαιές
κοινωνία πριαστέας ἐκδύσατο εἰς ἄχριν καὶ χαλέπταν...

Plutarch De Soller, Anim. 963A. Ἀλλ' ἄθανατόν ἔσον
νεμέως ἐνανθεῖται καὶ ἄγνωστος καὶ τῶν περὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ
κοινωνίαν διαφέρει τῶν ἥρων.

Plutarch AnVirt, Doc. Pos. 439E. ὃικοὶ δὲ καὶ πόλεως καὶ
γάμου καὶ βίου ἀρχῶν κοινωνίαν ἐνέχεισαν ἡνεῦσαν μὴ
mαθόντων ζωῆς ἀρετή τρόπον ἀλλήλοις συμφέρεσθαι;

Plutarch AnVirt, Doc. Pos. 439E. ἐτικ παραφύσος μὲν ἡ
κύλικος δικ ἐστι κοινωνίαν ἐπίδειξις ἐὰν μὴ ἐμβῇ τις
σελίδας ἐκ παῖδων ἀρχάμενος...

Plutarch Comp. Aris. & M. Cat. 354A. Ὅτα ἡ τῆς πολιτικῆς
ἀνθρώπος ἄρετης οὐ καταὶ τελειότερων ἀλογομοίματον ἔσται
μάθης δὲ ποὺ μάθημα ὁ πλεῖστός ἐν τῇ ὅρισμοιν ὕψω
μικρών τιθέναι καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόλεων δικόν τι σύστημα
καὶ κεφαλήν τοῦ μιᾶς ἐννυστείς πρὸς ὅλους τοῖς ἰδίοις
κλαῖος τῶν πολιτῶν συμβοῦσθαι...

Plutarch Sept. Sap. Conv. 155C. ... ὀς καὶ ἐν γυναικὶ
εἰς ὅν νυόται νοῦν ξεχώσας καὶ συμφρονοῦσας κοινωνίᾳ
tῶν ὁπέντε, ἅρτον ὅποιαν οἴκης καὶ μακάριον.

Plutarch Life of Brutus 98F. Ἄγαθε, Βρούτε, Κάρνος
οὕτω δυνάτης εἰς τὸν άνθρωπον οἴκην οὐχ ἄλλοτε ἀρ
παλλακευόμεναι, καθός ηὐθέσσας καὶ ἐκατέχεις λέον,
καὶ συμφρονοῦσας ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνάριων.

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 140A. ... γυναικὴ μηδὲν
ἡδὸν πάθος ἐξελπίζοιν ἀλλὰ κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἄνδρα...καὶ παιδίας
καὶ συννοιαὶ γέλωσιν.

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 140A. ... γυναῖκας μὴ ἄρετας
βλέποντος ἐξελπίζεις μετὰ αὐτῶν συμφλοκούντες ἔσται
καὶ γελώσθηται, οὕτως οἱ μὴ συμφρονοῦσιν ἀλλήλων
gynaikei μηδὲ παιδίας κοινωνίασας αὐταῖς καὶ γέλωσιν ἰδίᾳ
γέλωσιν χρῆς αὐτῶν ἰδίᾳ γέλωσιν συμφλοκούσιν.

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 140B. ... γυναῖκα τοῦ τοῦτο
ἀφόρος συμφρονεῖν μηδον καὶ τοῦ ἀνδροῦ τοῦ τοῦ γυναικοῦ... ἐν
μόνης ἀνθρωποὶ καταὶ τὴν ἐξώπολεσιν ὅσοι ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων
λαμβάνοντες ὅτε ἐκατέρωσιν τὴν ἐκοινωνίαν ἀντίστροφον
ἀποκαλοῦντος ἡ κοινωνία σφίζεται ὁ ἄλφος.
Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 140F.

κοινωνία προσήκει μάλιστα τοις γυναικίσι εἰς μίαν οὖσαν πάντα
κατάχρασιν καὶ ἀναλήξιμον μὴ τὸ μέρος ἵδιον καὶ τὸ
μέρος ἄλλοτριων ἄλλα πάν ἵδιον ἔχειται καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλοτριον.

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 145E.

τὸ ἀλλοτριόν χρησμώ
πάντως ὑπέρ οὖσαν
τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοὺς
διδόσ ἀλλοτριῶν καὶ 
φανερώσατο ἀλλοτριῶν καὶ

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 138BC.

καὶ κατάποσα αὐτὸ
τούτῳ πάντως γινόμε

Plutarch Amatorius 770C.

καὶ συνήρχας ἐλιγμῶν ἐν
ψυχικῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ἐποιεῖτο πάντως καὶ παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κοινωνίας τὰ μὲν ἔχομεν καὶ ἐγένομεν

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 980AB.

ἡ Ἀρεία κατόπην
ἐπεξε τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντως
πρεσβίτης τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κοινωνίας τὰ ἐπεξε τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κοινωνίας τὰ ἐπεξε τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κοινωνίας τὰ

Plutarch Quaest. Roman. 263EF.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Quaest. Roman. 271E.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757C.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757D.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 769F.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 768D.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Quaest. Roman. 271E.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757C.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757D.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 769F.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757C.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757D.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 769F.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757C.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 757D.

καὶ κατόπην
περιέχεται καὶ
παραποιεῖτο καὶ
πρεσβίτης τοῦ 

Plutarch Amatorius 769F.
Plutarch Amatorius 752C. ... τοῖς γάμοις ἀνέραστον ἐπάγων καὶ Ἀμορφον ἐνθεοῦ φίλας κοινωνίαν...

Plutarch Coniug. Praec. 145D. Παιδίων μὲν γὰρ οἴδεμι ποτὲ λεγέσαι ποιήσαι δίκα κοινωνίαν ἀνδρός...

Plutarch Life of Artaxerxes 1020B. Αἰκάκα καὶ τεκνῶν κοινωνόν ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ τρηφομένων.

Plutarch De Soller. Anim. 962A. τὴν χοῦν πρὸς τὰ ἐγών φιλοτερψίαν ἔρχην μὲν ἢ μὲν κοινωνίας καὶ δικαίωσινς εἰπεμένοι...

Plutarch Con. ad Uxor. 608C. ὅσον δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τασούμεν ὡν τεκνῶν ἀναστροφῆς κοινωνήσασα, πάντων ἐκτεθραμμένων δικοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἦμων...

Plutarch De Frat. Amor. 485C. ... ἄλλα τῶν καλῶν πάντων κοινωνῶν ἀποφαίνων καὶ χρώμενος παρόντι καὶ περιπενω ἄποντα...

Plutarch De Frat. Amor. 486D. ὅθεν ἀποσεῖ δὲ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τρεπεσαι καὶ ταῖς φιλοτερψίαις τῶν ὀφελῶν τῶν ἄφοινον δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κοινωνεῖν μὴ περικόταις, ὅτε βοηθήσως εὐθυρεδοῦτες ἀλλήλους ἄλλα καὶ ἰδιώσ.

Plutarch X Orat. Vitae 835D. ... τοῦ πατρὸς ἡδὴ τετελευτηκότος, ὡς κοινωνήσων τῷ κληρῶν, εἰς μεγαλὸς πεντεκαίδεκα...

Plutarch Life of Theseus 5A. οὔκοιν ξίκος εἶναι τῷ κάκιστῳ τῶν ἅριστων εἰς κοινωνίαν ἥσυχος ἴθειν, τα μέγιστα καὶ τιμίωτα λαμβάνοντας καὶ σκότοντας.

Plutarch Life of Lycurgus 49A. ... ἐν καλῷ καταστήσας μήν μὲν καὶ ἄταξιν πλούς εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱματος παιδῶν δὲ καὶ τεκνῶνες κοινωνίας ἐκίνητο τῶν βασιλείων, καταβεβλημένων τῶν ὑπ' ἱεικετᾶ καὶ ἀκοινωνικότα ταύτα μετανόουσιν σφαγίας καὶ πολέμους.

Plutarch Life of Lycurgus 76D. Τῆς δὲ περὶ τοὺς ἱματος καὶ τα τεκνῶν εἰς κοινωνίας τό νησιτομον ὑφὸς καὶ πολιτικὸς ἐκμοιούσσες ἀκριβεστερὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν...

Plutarch Comp. of Lyce. Numæa 76E. δὲ δὴ Δάκων, δικοὶ ἐς γυναικὸς οὐς ἔσοι γὰρ ἀνδρὶ, καὶ τός ἱμάτιος μενοντὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἢς ἄρχεται σιγαίνειν, ὑπερείσδου τῷ πεῖσατι τῆς κοινωνίας ἔσως τεκνῶν.
Plutarch Life of Lycurgus 48F. ή δὲ τοιχύνη σύνοδος οὔ μόνον ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφρόσυνης ἀσκησιν ἦν, ἀλλὰ τὸς τοὺς ταῖς σωματικῶν χοίρωσ τις τὐ διὸν ἢ μή καὶ πρῶτος ἦσθε ἐπὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν, οὐ [ἐδὲ] διακορεῖς οὐδὲ ἐξείλους ταῖς ἀνέσιν κοινωνίας, ἀλλὰ τις λείψανον καὶ ὑπεκκαμα πόθῳ καὶ ἀρχίτος ἐκπολείποντας ἀναλύεις.

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 771A. Επιθυμῶν οὖν τῷ Κάτων μὴ συνήθης εἶναι ὡσδὲ σταίρος μόνον, ἀλλὰ ἀμώς ἐξ πᾶς τις οἰκείτης καταλυνον καὶ κοινωνίαν πάντα τῶν οἰκών καὶ τὸ γένος...

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 771B. κοινωνίαν οὖν δὲ τὸς διάδοχος ἀνέρας τὴν τῇ ἁρπήν ἀφθονον ποιήν καὶ πολύντων τοῖς γένεσι...

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 771C. εἰ δὲ πάντως περιέχοιτο τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ Βυβλὸς, ἀποδοτείν εὑρίσκων, ἐξείλους εἰκείτης ἀνερίαν τῇ Βυβλίῳ καὶ Κάτων κοινωνίας πάλιν ἐπουλοῦσι.

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 771D. Ἀποκριναμένου δὲ τοῦ Κάτων τοὺς Κρεόσιον μὲν ἀγάπας καὶ δοκιμᾶσι κοινωνίας οἰκείτης...

Plutarch Amatorius 759F. ἔτι δὲ μάλλαν κάκεισθαι ταυτόν κυνικὸν πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀφροδίσιον ἐξερεύνοντα κοινωνίαν, οὐ μόνον ἐκεῖνας ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικῶν προσκυρεύουσι.

Plutarch Life of Pompey 656F. ὡς μὲν γὰρ γενομένη συμπέρανσι καὶ τὰ πλούσια πίθα γαρ γάμος ἐκεῖνος ἐνδυματὸς ἐν ἀπάτηνα καὶ ὑπότο τοκούς κοινωνίας εὑρίσκει, συνισταμένη διαμέσους, πιλίασ εἴ διὸ ἀλήθειά τε οὐ μετέχειν.

Plutarch Life of Pompey 642D. τούτων μεντοῖο πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας οἱ Κάτων ἐθέρμανον ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κοινωνίας ἐξακολουθήσαντα οἰκείτης Πομπηίου γενομένου.

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 774E. εἰπόντως οὖν τὸν Κάτων πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας ὡς τοιούτων ἀντὶ κοινωνίας, καὶ ἀναπληθυνθεὶς πράγματος ἀνάγκη Πομπηίῳ συναφείν ἐξαιτίας οἰκείτης...

Plutarch Sept. Sap. Conv. 158F. δηομένοι...το κοινωνεῖν ἀναίθυντον εἶναι καὶ ἀληθείς...
Plutarch De Amic. Mult. 96D, ... tois d' eugenefi kai okieios okopathei keraunumena kai proseita tis koivniav leivos kai met' euneias ...

Plutarch Amatorius 769A. ... alla gunaiki ge kai metais dotai taouta filias, ousper iseron megallon koivnigmati.

Plutarch Life of Numa 62B. ... agnoostos d' osti to megalyvnon di meginata ti thn othn antapodiosi koivnei.

Plutarch Life of Numa 62B. ... wos d' kai swmatos anapthitinou kai xoros esto to thew kai ammoni koivnika kai harias, l' eron yesh kai to politei peidvenai.

Plutarch De Stoic. Repug. 1052B. ... kata to ton auton logos kai oti nomiontes autous xenesthes ye kai phoros koivnei.

Plutarch Amatorius 752A. ... ei d' wos phiari prosotigni, odik ezeti aphrodiai kai dikai koiwnia, prosw epopo ezeti Aphrodites kai parrus ...

Plutarch Life of Lycurgus 51D. ... ekoiwnon d' oti ezestai tois patois thes doxas ep' amerotera.

Plutarch Life of Alexander 692E. ... en os to toto xroni Makedon ton omal Limos, ex khalistras, epipodeunen Ailezandhno, Nikomachon ina ton nevon, pros ois autous erwteis elxen, epie thn koivniai thn práxei parkeilai.

Plutarch Life of Pelopidas 287D, lestei d' kai toon sileon to Thukleous eunvnon d' ena koivnei ton ablon kai parrapizivn.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 708D. ... koivnia har esti kai aposth kai paidia kai logos kai práxei to symposion.

Plutarch Sept. Sap. Conv. 158C. ... suvanairizetai har auth pur estioun esti kratei pros upodoxa, xenisou, filan thriptata kai prota koivnigmati pros allhlous ...

Plutarch Sept. Sap. Conv. 158E. ... har en melos thevnoi koivnouvin allhlois deipnwn kai trapezj, aphroditwn, de nukta kai prono probedonou skotous evnous eno menoi to koivnein anastigwv enai kai thepides, wos to eni koivnein ekejhs.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 741AB, enetwba shon kai nev koivnei mete ths thewas, en o kai rhmas esti Aigeis Ippomenos.
Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 614B. ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτον προβλήματα μαθητεύεται οὖν ἐν τῷ Αἰσιωπείῳ τεράνω καὶ ἀλώπεκος ἐπιτίθεται πρὸς κοινωνίαν φανεῖν.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 697D. τὸ τούτον κοινωνίαν καὶ φιλοφροσύνην ἐφηδύνωσαν δεῖ ποιῆτος.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 726E. τὸ μὲν γὰρ τούτον φαίνεται ἀλήθεια τῆς κοινωνίας καθένας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιτείχεις οἱ παλαιolta ρωμαῖοι συνειπώντες τοῖς φίλοις.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643A. οὐ γὰρ τοῦ φανεῖν... χαίρειν οὖν τοῦ πιθείν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πρωτειντι καὶ συμφαίνειν ὡς ἔχουσι καὶ ἀλλοιώσεις ἀλληλούς, ὡς ἐστὶ νερίδας αὐτήν κρεσδαίοι τῆς κοινωνίας ἀναρροσον πολλὰ δείπνα ποιεῖ καὶ πολλοὺς δειπνοῦντας...

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 707C. γνωρίσαμεν δὲς καὶ ἐπιτιθεόμεν παρακελέσεις εἰς κοινωνίαν, σύνεχος καὶ τραπέζης καὶ λόγων ἐν σύνεχι γιγαντεύουσαν καὶ φιλοφροσύνης.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643B. ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτῳ ἰδίᾳ αὐτὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντησιν κοινωνίαν ἔκκαλεται τοῖς συνόντες, ὡστε καὶ λόγω κοινῷ πρὸς ἀλληλούς Χρισμεθα καὶ ὡς ἔχον γαληρίας τοὺς τριπόδας καὶ ἀβδηρίδιος ἔμμοινς μετέχουσι.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643D. οὐ μόνον ομοσπονδίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ διοικοῦρσι καὶ διοικτικοῖς εἰς πάσαν σεβόμενοι κοινωνίαν ἐν τῖ μητὶ τιθεμένων.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643E. τὰ δὲ Πιθανικαὶ διεργαζόμεν ἐν ὅσις ἰδιοίας ζωήν ἵπποι ἐξαιτοῦ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν διαπέδημα τοῖς κοινωνεῖν ἀπάντως ἀλληλοῖς.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643E. ἐξερέω γὰρ ἄνοι ἀνάλημας καὶ συγκρατήσεως ἀληθῶς τούτῳ δὲ διαίρεσις καὶ ὁπιστολὴ τῶν φιλίτρων εἶναι δοκούντων, ὡς μηδὲ ὦροι κοινωνεῖν συναντέοντο.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 718C. ἐξ ὑπὸ τοῦτον ἔρως τῆς κοινωνίας παλιν καὶ διαφυγεῖν ἀρκαίμενος ἀρκαίμενος τοῖς ἀριστεῖς εἴπει ν. ἔτει λόγοι περὶ θεών καταγορεί. ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ ἐπὶ ἐπικρατεῖται ἀλληλός ἕπει σκέφτεται περὶ τοῦ κοινωνοῦν παραλαβομένην ἐπὶ -

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 718C. τοῦ θεοῦ.
Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 660B. Ο ή παντεινός ούκ ὑποτίμησε τον ὀίνου ή τον κακομάθων μόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγων κοινωνίας ἀλλά καὶ παιδίας καὶ φιλοσοφίας ζεις εὐνοίαν τελευτάτην.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 643F. ...οιδέν ἔδωκαν ἕνας ἐπειδὴ τράπεζαν κοινωνία δεῖται, φώτει καὶ νόμων καὶ ἀναλογίαν οὐ καὶ ὀδοὺς ἔπειτακτον ἐπὶ οὐδὲν ἔχουσα Χρέιαν.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 664A. οὐδέν δὲ χρόνον ἔστην ἡ Μοῖρα καὶ η Διάκος ἱσοτετή ὑπὲρ τα ἐτείνα καὶ συμπόσια κοινωνίαν ἐφράζοντο, οὔτε ἢ ἔχειν ἠκομοῦν ἡν αὐτὸς ἀνελεύθερον.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 679A. οἱ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τόπος ὑπάρχει καὶ παρασκευή, τὸ πλῆθος δέ μεν φιλαγκτέον, ὄσον ἡμικεχώρι ἡν συνόπτων ποιοῦν καὶ ἑπροσήγορον. οὖν γὰρ ἔλεγεν ἦττον ἐτοὶ καὶ τὸν ἱπποῦς κοινωνίᾳ ἐκ θείνου.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 679A. λόγων δὲ κοινωνίαν ἀναφορὰιν ὁι πολλοὶ εἰς ταὐτὸ συμφοροῦντες, μᾶλλον δὲ ὀρθοῖσα ποιοῦσιν ἄλληροις συνεῖναι.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 618A. ...οὔτε τὸν ἐνὸς ἐκάστου σκόπεων ἄλλῳ τῷ ἐτέρῳ πρὸς ἐτέρον στηθών καὶ ἀρμονίᾳ, οὔτε πέπειρον ἄλλων εἰς μίαν κοινωνίαν παρκλαμβανομένων.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 709B. εἰ δὲ μὴ τῶν ἱδίων φίλων ὅσι ὃν καὶ θελεῖν ἄτικας ἐλέεσθαι εἰς ἐτείνας ἔπειτακτον ἕπειτα, ἐπιζήσας ἑν ἐπιζήσας καὶ προσαράξος παρακατίσπα, ἄτικας ἑν ἐπιζήσας καὶ κοινωνίας ἐπεράτος.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 709D. εἰ δὲ φίλως καὶ συνήθης οὐκ ὑποκοιμήσας, ἀλλ' ἣν ὅσι δεῖσθαι τίνας ἀναφιάκα ταῖς διμηλίας καὶ κοινωνίας μαριάν ἄλλων οὐκ ἔχομεν...

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 644D. εἰ καὶ ὀδεῖν ἡ τούτων ἱδίωσις εἰπεται τῇ κοινωνίᾳ...

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 615A. ...ἐκείνοι δὲ παλίν ἐπὶ ὑδάς τινας καὶ διηγήματα πλαρώνῃ καὶ λόγως βανδάους καὶ ὁρατίους εὐμβαλλον ἐκεῖνος, αἰτεῖται τῇς συμπόσιας κοινωνίας τῇ τελος καὶ καθορίσται δὲ Διόνυσος.
Plutarch De Tuenda San. 125A. εὕτω γὰρ ὁποῖον προάγεται πολλάκις χρόνοι τοις περιθορεῖροι καὶ σπανίοις, ὡσπερ ὁποῖς κνίσις τῆς κείσις δοξής δόγμασιν καὶ τὸ σωμα λαϊκοὺς ἕνα σεβισθήν ἄνασκα ἢδονα, διότι ἥξυ σιντρός ἐπέκειν δαί, ἀλλοιωμένοι τῆς ἀπαλάσεως τῶν οὖν ὑποπόστεστων καὶ περίττων.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 634B. Ποιεὶ δ` ἄλλοτερα ζαί οἰκώματα καὶ το λαϊκοῖς ἀναμνήσας οἷος λέγονται.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 741D. εἰ μὴ νῦν Δία φήσουσι ὡς ἠθοποιεῖ τῆς ἐν οἴνῳ κοινωνίας, Δημοσθένους εἰπινέεται καὶ Χηλωτᾶς οὖν, ἄναρξ ἐν ἄκαρτῳ τῷ δίῳ ἤρεν πιοντος ὑποκρίτων οἱ συνήθεσες κοινωνήσουσιν.

Plutarch De Virt. Moral. 45E. κοινωνός γὰρ ἐστι τοῦ λόγου καὶ συνεχής τοῦ λέγοντος ...

Plutarch De Virt. Moral. 43D. τὸ δ` ἔτερον προ- τείνοντος ἀκροαταὶ μετὰ εὐκολίας φιλόλογοι καὶ κοινωνικοῦ.

Plutarch De Amic. Nult. 96D. ... ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἕξιον τὴν οὕτης κοινωνίας χυλάτεις τοιοῦτες τοῖς συνώσ φιλεῖν καὶ κοινωνεῖν δυναμεῖν.

Plutarch Quom. Adul, abAm. Int. 50E. γεγορεῖ τα πολλὰ καὶ πολυπράγμονες καὶ πράξεων μετέχειν οἰκεῖα ἐστι καὶ λόγων ἀπορρήτων βούλεται κοινωνοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὀλίγων τραγικὸς ἐστιν ὑπὸ σατυρικὸς φιλός ὅποκρίτης οὐδὲ κωμικὸς.

Plutarch Life of C. Marc. Coriol. 225D καὶ γὰρ ἔχοντο πολλὴ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκεῖας ἐπιζίζει καὶ ἔνδοσ, διὸ κατοικήσαν καὶ τῷ κοινωνεῖν διαίτης ἡμερώτερον ἔχοντες πρὸς αὐτῶν καὶ οὐν ἔχοντες.

Plutarch Life of M. Cato 339A. πλὴν τὸ τοῖς οἰκεῖας ὑπὸ υπολοχίως ἀπογράφουσιν ισο ἀρμόδιαν καὶ πράξεως ἀκύρως Ἰάκωβου ἔχει ἢδεια, καὶ μηδὲν ἄνθρωπον πρὸς ἄνθρωπον οἰκουμενικὰ κοινωνίας τῆς χρέιας πλεόν ὑπάρχει.

Plutarch Aetia Romana 279E. οἱ γὰρ οὕτως λαμβάνοντες ὑπὸ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἀρμοδίως, κοινωνεῖν τρόπον τινα ἀπεξάκης ἡγούμενοι τοῖς διστολάξαι.
Plutarch De Virt. Moral. 441A. κοινωνίας δὲ καὶ συμβαλλόντων
διήλθε τοῖς πρὸς ἑτέρους διαλεγομένων...
Plutarch Adver. Coloten 1125E. τούτο μέντοι το συνεκτικὸν ἀπόψεως κοινωνίας καὶ νουοθεσίας ἔρεισσαν καὶ μᾶθεοι. οὐ κύκλῳ περιόντες οὐδὲ κρῆμα καὶ οἱ ἐνυπαίκταις, ξιλά τὴν πρώτην τῶν κυριωτέρων δοξῶν προσλαβοῦν εὐθὺς ἀνατρέπεταιν.

Plutarch Adver. Coloten 1127A. καὶ οὗ τούτῳ δεινόν ἔστιν, ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἁγιῶν φιλοσόφων μόνον ἅγιῳ συμβολοὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πάλιν ἁγίοις κοινωνοῦσιν...

Plutarch Adver. Coloten 1108C. τὸ δ' ἐδὴ ἐν ἑνὶ κοινωνίκῳ ἄναιρ καὶ σωφρόνισ καὶ δικαίως.

Plutarch An Sen. Sit Ger. 786C. ἀπ' ὧν ἑκατοκοπουμεν; δήλος ἡδονᾶς αἳ ἐφεξῆς σφιχήνων ἄπο τῶν καλῶν ἰκράτεων καὶ τῶν κοινωνίων. ἐργῶν καὶ φιλανθρωπίας παράκεισθαι θεοῦ, ὡς κοινῶς ὀδὸς θροποτοῦσα, ὥστε περὶ τὸς σάλλος λεία καὶ προαναφέρθηναι γίνομενοι κινήσεις.

Plutarch De Fortuna 97E. ... ἀκίλλοι δὲ τῶν ἐκδοτικῶν ἐν μὲν ἡδονῶν ἁγιῶν παρέξους ἑγκράτειας καὶ σωφροσύνης καθοῦν. ἐν δὲ κινδύνοις καὶ πάνωις, παράκεισθαι καὶ ἁγιοπράγματι ἐν δὲ κοινωνίασι καὶ πολιτείας θεωροῦν καὶ δικαίουν.

Plutarch De Stoic. Repug. 1038E. ἀναφέρει γὰρ τὸν ἐν δικαιοσύνης ἐκείνοις δὲ σφαλείς. καὶ κωστὰς τοῦτον ἡ κοινωνία φρονεῖς. ἔστι καὶ ἀπόλιμον, δ' ἐδὴ κρατοῦσαι καὶ φιλανθρωπίας χώτης σίδασιν.

Plutarch De Virt. Moral. 445E. ... καὶ ὅπως μὲν ἡδονῶν κοινωνεῖν ὑπάρχει τῶν ἀμαρτανομένων ὅπως δ' ἁμομενῶς...

Plutarch Aqua an Ign. Util. 957A. ἄρην ἐὰν οὐκ ἔνων τόι καὶ συμβολοὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖνοι τοῦτο καὶ τέλοις ἰσαρχής, οἱ πρὸς ἱλαρούς ἐπικουρίας καὶ ἀντιδίδεις, κοινωνίας το ἀρχαλομενοὶ καὶ φιλιῶν.

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 703D. ... ὃς ἔνοι φαινεῖν, ἄλλῳ διεκφράζετο το ἐενεργοῖς ὃμοι καὶ κοινωνικοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἁμαρτάνοις καὶ διεφράζετο πρὸς ἰλλάηως.

Plutarch De Inv. et Odio 538A. ... ὃς μηδε πάρειν ἀποκρίνεται πυνθανοῦνοι, μὴ λουσεονοὶ κοινωνεῖν ὅταν...

Plutarch De Latent. Viv. 1129B. ἦν δὲ τῶν ἐν μὲν φυσικοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἄνω καὶ ἠγαθοῖς καὶ πρόνοιαν ἐν δ' ἡθικοῖς νόμον καὶ κοινωνίαν καὶ πολιτείαν, ἐν δὲ πολιτείαν τοῦ καλὸν ἄλλα μη τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὁι το λάθη βιωμασ.
Plutarch Praec. Ger. Rep. 796E...τον ὑδ κοινωνικὸν καὶ φιλόνθρωπον καὶ φιλόπολιν καὶ κοινομοικὸν καὶ πολεικὸν ἀληθῶς...

Plutarch Praec. Ger. Rep. 812D...οὕτως δὲ πραγμάτων ἐτέρως ἐν πολιτείᾳ μεταφεῖται ἐνεργεῖται ποιεῖ τὴν κοινωνία τὴν πράξιν...


Plutarch An Sen. Sit Ger. 787E...ὁ τῷ φθόνῳ διανοομένως πολὺν χρόνον, εἶτα παυσαμένος καὶ ἔπορεξθέντος ἀνακρούομενος ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας καὶ προϊέμενος ὅμως ταῖς πράξεσι τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ τὰς εὐεργείας...

Plutarch An Sen. Sit Ger. 792D. καὶ ἔστε τῷ φιλόνθρωπον εἰκὸς ἐστιν ἀποκαλυφθήναι καὶ τῷ κοινωνικῷ καὶ τῷ εὐχαριστεῖν, ἢν οδυμένοι εἶναι δεῖ τελευτὴν οὐδὲ πέρας...

Plutarch De Ser. Num. Vin. 559D. Εἰ δὲ ἔστε [τι] πόλις ἐν πράγμα καὶ εὐεργείης, ἐστι δήποτε καὶ γένος, ἐξηρευνέον ἄρχη μῦκας, καὶ δύναμιν εἶνα καὶ κοινωνίαν διαπερφυων ἀναφερούσης...

Plutarch Quaest. Conv. 679D. οἱ κατὰ γένος προσήκοντες καὶ Διὸς ἐμοίνου κοινωνοῦντες.

Plutarch Life of Theseus 3F-4Δεχόμασθον δὲ καὶ γένος κοινωνούντες, ἢ ἐξ ἀμερίων ὑπερεῖς. Αὖθια μὲν γὰρ οὕτως πιεθεῖς δυνατέρας, Ἀλκήνης δὲ Δυσσίδης Δυσσίδη δὲ καὶ Πίτιθος ἄδελφοι εὐεργοῦντες ἢς Ἰπποδαμείας καὶ Πελοπός.

Plutarch Aetia Romana 265D. ἢ μὴ νεκρομαινόντων συγγεινῶν ἀμαίνων, οὐχι χαὶ λάθως ἢ φιλοφροσύνῃ προϊέμεναι καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἀρετείρα ὡς βολοὺ καὶ κοινωνίας τῆς συγγενίας...

Plutarch Life of Romulus 25D. ἢ πλῆθυν τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς Σαβέονοις τὸν μὲν συγκρατεῖς καὶ κοινωνίας ἀρχῆν ᾖτες τὸ ἐπίκην ποίησεν διανευσαμένοις τὰς ρυμαίκας...

Plutarch Comp. Thea. Rom. 39A. ἐπειδὰν τῇ μετα τοῖς τιμής καὶ διαφθορᾷ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ περὶ τὰς οὕτως ἄρετες ἡμᾶς τῆς ζευκινὴς καὶ τὴν αὐθεντικὴν καὶ τὴν τὸν πολιτικὸν ἐς κοινωνίαν ἰδον ἀρετῆς.
Plutarch Comp. Thes. & Rom. 39B. Πλυταρχής ἐπικάλλετα καὶ διακοσμοῦσαν οὗτος άνδρας ἐξολοθρεύοντες τοὺς γυναῖκας τῶν κοινωνιῶν ἄλλοις ἑκατάρκειαιν, ἂλλος ἀνέτρεψεν τὸν Σαλαμίνη αἱρετικῶν φημίς. 

Plutarch Comp. Thes. & Rom. 39B. Καὶ γὰρ ἀρχῆς ἐκκινήσαντος ἀνδρεῖς καὶ πολιτείας τὰ γένη ἀπὸ τὸν ἐπιστήμ σὺν βασιλείαν... Plutarch Life of Flamininus 375D. αλλόφυλοι δὲ ἄνδρες, ἑνάκληται μικρὰ καὶ βλέψαντες κοινωνίαν παλαιοῦ φίλου ἔχειν δοκοῦσον... Plutarch Life of Numa 63F. τοῦτοι προσῆν ὡς δεῖται σημεία τῇ χρήστει καὶ σπουδῇ τῶν πολιτειῶν καὶ ἁθλος, ὡς ἐπικόντιον τὸν προσπεραίσθησαν φιλίας καὶ παραλαμβάνειν τὴν μεταβείαν ἐπὶ κοινωνίας καὶ συγκράτητε τῶν πολεμιῶν. Plutarch Life of Numa 71D. κοινωνίαν δὲ καὶ συνόδους καὶ δεῖν τιμᾶς ἀποδόσιν ἔκασθαι βέβαιο πρεπούσα... Plutarch Life of Numa 72F. οἱ γὰρ Πολιτείαν ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς εἴτε δαίμονες εἴτε βασιλείας ἐχαράκης καὶ κοινωνικοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὑπερήφανοι καὶ ἀρνίου λεγέντα μεταβάλει τὴν διαῖταν. Plutarch Life of Lycurgus 54C. καὶ τοῖς φαίνεται τὴν Ἀλκιβιάνην ὡς προσεχέοιν οὕτως κοινωνίαν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ πέρα τῶν Πολιτείας ἀρνίου τὸ γεγονός ἑπικούροντα καὶ θεώμενον. ἄκουσας δὲ φωνήν ὡς προσανατολίσθητε πρὸς τὸν Πολιτείας ἑπικούροντας, ὡς τοὺς πολίτους ὡς προτρέπεται κοινωνίαν τῆς παντούρεως. Plutarch Lives of Lycurgus & Num. 77D. ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐπιστησίμοις τε παῖδευν καὶ συμφέροντες καὶ παντότεν καὶ κοινωνίας, περὶ τε δεξίας καὶ γυμνασίας καὶ παίδευς αὐτῶν ἐμμεθέλους καὶ διακοσμήσεσιν... Plutarch Life of Marcus Cato 354B. ὡς άλλοις οὕτως νομοθέτεσκαν καὶ ἄριστον καὶ πέντε εὐφυοῖς ἐνίοτε κοινωνίας, πολιτείας ἀλλὰ τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ ὑπερφοβίας. Plutarch Inst. Lacoica 237D. ὡς τοῖς ἐπίτευχοι καὶ παπατικοῖς ἐως ὀικεῖοιν.
Plutarch Lives of Agis & Cleon. 798E: 'ων δὲ σωφροσύνη καὶ 
λιτοτησί καὶ μεταλοφθης τὰς ἐκείνων ὑπερβλομένοις τυφώ 
ζώτης καὶ κοινωνίαν καταστήσῃ τὰς πολιτικάς...

Plutarch Life of Solon 85C. Ἡνείθη δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὁ 
φρονιμωτάτος συνορίωτες τῶν Ἐλλήνων μόνον ὡς ἀλλιττα τῶν 
αμαρτημάτων ἐκεῖς ὤντα, καὶ μήτε τοῖς πλουσίοις κοινωνοῦντα 
τῆς ἐπικίας μήτε ταῖς τῶν πενήτων ἀνάγκαις ἐνεχόμενον 
ἐδένει τοῖς κοινοῖς προσελθεὶν καὶ καταπλάσσαι τᾶς διάφορας.

Plutarch Life of Themist. 123C. Ἡς ὡς εἶδεν ἐκπέπτωκότα 
τῆς πολιτείας καὶ φέροντα χαλκῶς ἐβαρεθηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν 
τῶν πραγμάτων παρακάλειν...

Plutarch Life of Themist. 123D. ὡς ὡς τὴν μὲν δεξίῃν 
ἀπετρίφθη τοῦ Παυσανίου καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν ὅλως ἀπειπάτησεν.

Plutarch Life of Pericles 157EF. Πῶς ὡς αὐτὸν τις 
ἰδονείς πιστεύσει κατηγοροῦν τοῦ Περικλέους, ὥσ τον ἐν 
ἐφιδέλην φίλον, ἐνομούν καὶ κοινών ὅτι τῆς ἐν τῇ 
πολιτείᾳ προφερόμενα διαφοράνησεν ὡς ἀποτύπων καὶ 
φόνον τῆς δόξας;

Plutarch Life of Alcib. 204AB. πρόξενων πασῶν ἐκοινώνει 
τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις.

Plutarch Life of Alcib. 207D. ταῦτα ὡς ὡς ἑκεῖνην ὡς 
μετα τῇ Ἀλκιβιάδου τοῖς μετὰ τοῦ θραύσεως, μεταλύνοντες 
ἄξεσθαι καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν, ἐκεῖνος δὲ μήτε γυμνασίων 
μήτε χώρας ἐν στρατοπέδῳ κοινωνίας ἐπεβαίνει.

Plutarch Life of Timoleon 239F-240A. Τιμολέοντα σύμβουλον 
ἡκεῖν παρ’ ἑκεῖνην καὶ κοινωνίαν ἐν διασκεδασμένων 
ἀμύνεσιν τὰς δὲ ναοὺς καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας ἀποστέλλειν εἰς 
Κόρινθον...

Plutarch Life of Aem. Paulus 256B. ὡς μὲν οὐκ ἐπεδέτο 
τὸν συμμετέχοντα κελέτοις μᾶλλον μὲν ἀχονοῖς ἂν 
μετέσχην ἀπὸ τῆς τὰς δὲ φύλης οὐκ ἐκοινώνησεν...

Plutarch Life of Marcellus 303C. ὡς ὡς Μαρκελλὸς ἀνέλει 
μὲν ἀνθρ. ὑμνημὸν ὑπὸ τὴν φύλην καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν καλὰ 
τῶν μεγίστων ἔριμαίοις ἰχώνων ὡς ὡς ἑκεῖνο ἐγέρα...

Plutarch Comp. Pel. & Marcell. 317C. τῶν ὡς ὡς Μαρκέλλω 
διαπραγματεύονται ἐκκοινωνήσῃ τοῖς τῶν δόξαν.
Plutarch *Life of C. Marius* 411A. καὶ ταῦτα χρώμενος ἢτις διετέλει, φιλόσοφον ἄνδρα καὶ πρὸς κοινωνίαν ὄφεις ἐφικόμονα καὶ ὑστερεῖν ἔρεισθαι τοῖς Μάριοι.

Plutarch *Life of Sulla* 454E. πολλά γὰρ ἄκουσ τρόμων τοῖς πιθανότατοι ἐπιδόσαν δύνα, προτότατος ἐν εἰς κοινωνία γενέσθαι τῆς ἄρχης.

Plutarch *Life of Cimon* 485A. ... ἐπὶ· Κρόνου μυθολογουμένη κοινωνίαν εἰς τοῖς βλοχ ἁδῆς κατήγεν.

Plutarch *Life of Lucullus* 501E. ἐπὶ δὲ ήτοιμος ἐκεῖνο (λόγος γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ πολὺς ἐν τῷ σφαλμένῳ) καὶ ταχύν ἐπὶ ἡμεῖς ὄρασκε τὸν τῇ ἄρχανοιν αὐτόν καὶ τοῖς αἰτήσις, ὧστε τρέπαντας καὶ συνεδρίου προς ποιεῖσθαι κοινωνίαν.

Plutarch *Life of Lucullus* 511A. καὶ τοῦ οὐδὲν δρόμον κοινωνοῦντα, τῆς αὐτός τότες περισπόσαστο τὸ διάδημα τῆς κεφαλῆς κάκεινον δικρύσας παρέδωκε...

Plutarch *Life of Sertorius* 570D. ... ἐξανάμενον δὲ τοῦ Μάριον τῇ συμπτῷ διεθέσθαι τῆς ἀδίκης ἐκείνουν καὶ τῆς ὑστερείας ἀρχής καὶ ἀπιστῶν.

Plutarch *Life of Sertorius* 570D. ... ἑλέγειν δὲ καὶ διαπορεύς οὕτως ἀποκαλεῦται τοῖς Μάριον ἀυτός ἔπικοι κοινωνίᾳ πραγμάτων κεκληκός...

Plutarch *Life of Alexander* 672B. "Οὐκοῦν," ἡρμή, "καὶ ἡμεῖς τούτων κοινωνήσομεν οἱ μετὰ σοῦ στρατευόμενοι.

Plutarch *De Alex. Mag. Fort.* 330E. Οὐκοῦν πρῶτος μὲν ἐὰς τῆς στρατείας ὑποθετοῖς φιλόσοφον τὸν ἄνδρα συνιστάσας, οὐχ ἔναμως τροφήν καὶ πολυτέλειαν ἄλλα πάσιν ἀνδρῶποις ἐλονοιαί καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ κοινωνίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους παρασκευάζας διανοηθέντα.

Plutarch *Life of Alexander* 691E. ἔθαρησαν γὰρ οἱ βαρβαροὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τοῦ γαμου, καὶ τῶν Ἀλέξανδρον ὑπερηφάνησαν...

Plutarch *De Alex. Mag. Fort.* 329F. ... οὐ ξύλοις οὐδὲ σχεδίαις οὐδὲ ἀνύχιοις καὶ θυματάθησι δεσμοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐρωτή ποιμὴν καὶ γάμοις τιμωρεῖται καὶ κοινωνίαις πάθοις τα γέννα συνάπτεσθε.

Plutarch *Life of Alexander* 691D. ... ἀνακραίει καὶ κοινωνίας μᾶλλον ὃ ἐννοεῖς καταστήσετε τα πράγματα νόμιμως ἢ μικρὰν ἀπαίρουτες αὐτοῖς.
Plutarch Life of Demetrius 890B. Οὔεσσα γὰρ πάνηγυρισμένη ἡ ἁρπὴ καὶ μεσοῦ ἀπίστεια καὶ χυστοτης, οὐδὲν ἀγηγέρασθαι τήν μεγίστον τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου διμόσχιν καὶ προσβεςτον, ἵνα μὴ φοβηθῇ τοιούτον ὅτι...

Plutarch Life of Demetrius 893C. Εἰς τὸ τοῦτο δὲ ἡ μόνη τῶν ἀγαλμάτων εἰς τοὺς ἅγιον Φίλιππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου περενάοι σώκουν ἀδίκων ἔσωτος καὶ ἀκοινωνήτων.

Plutarch Life of Demetrius 902A. Καὶ τὴν γὰρ τοῦτο σύστασιν καὶ κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν ἔδειξεν ὡσπερ ἐφίδιων ἐπιμολογῶν συνδρομῆς ἕν εἶναι λίθῳ καὶ ρόῳ συνιδατάξειν.

Plutarch Lives of Tib. & C. Gr. 836A. Ἕπειρον πάλιν ἄλλος ἄγγειλεν αὐτῷ καὶ δίκαιας ἔπηγον, ὡς τοῖς συμμάχοις ἀφίσκεται καὶ κοινωνήσκετο τῆς περὶ Ψευτίλλην ἐνεδίδησας συνωμοσίας.

Plutarch Lives of Tib. & C. Gr. 838BC. ἀπαρχίας μὲν εἰς Ταραντα καὶ Κάτινην πεπνέστει τάγμαν, καὶ ἔτη τοῦ κοινωνίας πολιτείας τοὺς Δακίνους.

Plutarch Lives of Tib. & C. Gr. 824D. η γαῖς καὶ Πελαμίαν τοῦ δαυιδῶν κοινωνίων τοῦ διαδήματος καὶ μισομένων τῶν γαμῶν αὐτίκα ἐθρήσκετο...

Plutarch Life of Cato Min. 784. ... ὡσπερ οὖν ἡ ἐξῆρας ἡμᾶς συνωμόστης καὶ κοινωνίας, ἠκαλλάφας, καὶ διδάξας ὡς οὐ Γερμανῶν όδος ἱετῶν παιδα...

Plutarch Life of Pompey 661E. Ἀλλ' οὖ μόνω σοὶ ἥτη τοῦτο τὸ καλὸν ἀπορῆσαι. Καὶ μὲν ὡστερ θαρρόμενος ὑποθεσι φησιν, κοινωνίαν, ὡς οὐ κακὰ πάντα ἀληθεύεται τὴν ἀποφέξασθαι.

Plutarch Life of Antony 919DE. ... καὶ τῶν Ἀντώνιον αὐτῶν τοῦ φίλου οὔτε καὶ ρουλόμενον δει τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἀφρόσκει αὐτὸς συμπράστει καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ πολιτείατος.

Plutarch Life of Antony 952B. δὲ δὲ ἐν Περσί περιπλούτιστον καὶ πολυπλοκεμένον ἐποδήσαντος καὶ κοινωνίων καὶ παραγωγῶν καὶ πολλῶν δρῶν καὶ πραγμάτων κοινωνίων.

Plutarch Life of Dion 964D. ... πολλὰς δὲ διαλλαγὰς καὶ σείσεις ποιομένων πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἀκροασθῆναι δὲ τῶν λόγων καὶ κοινωνίων τῆς περὶ καθολικῆς πράγματικής σφοράς λόγω ὑπερφορίας, αἰσιομένων δὲ τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων ὅσα δια-

φαναρχησούμενον.
Plutarch Life of Dion 967E. τὸν δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦ τυράννου περιγραφθέντα, όμοιον ή χιλίων δύσιν, πέντε καὶ έκαστο μόνοι τῆς στρατείας ἐκοινώνησαν, οὐ δὲ ἐκέρδησαν ἀποστειλάντες.

Plutarch Life of Dion 972A. Ἡ πρακτικὴ, στρατικὴ καὶ γενερικὴ ἐφ' ἡμερομίας ἦν ἑκάτερα παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις, ὅπως ἄρα παρά τῇ γνώμῃ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα κόσμον, ἕκαστος δὲ βέβαιος ἐν κοινωνίᾳ πραγμάτων ἐξόντων καὶ ὠδέων.

Plutarch Life of Dion 982E-983A. Ὁμιχθεὶς δὲ πλεῖστον ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῆς πράξεως, καὶ δὲ ἱμάτων Δίωνος ἐν οἰκήματι κλίνας χὶνᾶς ἔχοντι μετὰ τῶν φίλων.

Plutarch Life of Aratus 1030D. τότε μᾶλλον τοῦ Ἀράτου ἐπιρρωσθέντας ὀλομένους τῶν κυνήγων ἔπικρότητι κοινωνοῦσα ἐν πράξει εἶναι δὲ πολλάς καὶ ἀλλούς ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν συνεργοῦντας.

Plutarch Life of Aratus 1031DE. ὁμονοίας ἐθνῶν καὶ κοινωνίας πόλεων καὶ συνεργίας καὶ συνέργων μίαν φωνήν ἀθρίκης ὡς οἴκερος ἄλλη ἔνας καὶ μὲν καὶ δοκεῖ.

Plutarch Life of Aratus 1035F. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ πρώτος ἁδελφὸς Ερίνου καὶ Διοκλήσεων οὕτως Διονύσιος οὐκ ὑπερερχόμενος τῆς πράξεως οὐκ ἐκείνης καὶ συνεργάτης ἐν τῇ Διοκλήτη, προστεθεὶς κατὰ τύχην.

Plutarch Life of Artaxerxes 1019D. ἀλλὰ καὶ διατήρησε καὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐκοινώνει συμπράξεισα καὶ παροῦνα...

Plutarch Life of Galba 1065E. ἀποστείγετο δὲ καὶ ὁδίνιος διομογωνοῖς κοινωνὸς ἐγενότατος ἐπὶ τὸν Γαλβαν ἀνακοινώσας.

Plutarch Mulierum Virt. 260F. ὁποῖοι καὶ κεραυνοῦς ἀφεῖλεν δὲ Δαρῆς ἐκνηστεύσας καὶ τὸν βασιλέα ἱλείον παράθεσαι ἐκείνης καὶ κοινωνίας ἀποδείκται καὶ ἀρχῆς.

Plutarch De Frat. Amor. 490A. ὅμοιος εξέπτωσεν τῆς Κύρου διαδοχῆς ἦν ἐφ' ἑξεναπόθεσαν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ Δαρῆος γένος ἐξασίλευσεν, ἀνδρός οὐ μόνον ἀδελφός ἄλλα καὶ φίλος ἐπιστημονεῖν κοινωνεῖν πραγμάτων καὶ συνέμενως.

Plutarch Life of Pyrrhus 385B. πλὴν ἄλλας δείκτας, ὑπὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀλλήλων βασιλέων καὶ Νεοτόλεμου τράπεζας ἐνδιάλεγες θέσει καὶ πιλιάν πρὸς αὐτον ἐπὶ κοινωνίας ἀρχῆς.
Plutarch Amatorius 770D. Κιούλιος γὰρ, ὁ τῶν Ἱπποτῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδή πάντως τῶν Ἱπποτῶν τοὐτῶν ἔσχε καὶ Σαμῦναν ἄνδρα, ναζόν οὐκ ἦλθεν, πλούσιον δὲ καὶ δόξα Γαλατῶν παίτων ἐπιφάνεστατον.

Plutarch X Orat. Vitae 848E. ὡς δὲ κακοκοινωνήκειν τῶν Περσίκων ἤρριπτας ἐπερέατέρας τις ἐπιφάνειος ὑπάκτων ἐπιλονορκεῖς Φίλιππος, θεονομοί τοιοῦτοι εκπροφθείς, κατὰ τὸν Ἰνομοντον τουτού ὕποτην χαρηθείς...

Plotinus Ennead III.5, 6.45. Τίς οὖν ἢ λείπα. Κύριοι, ἵνα δη νοεῖν ὑποθέθεται, ἵνα τῶν κοινωνήσεων ἀκείμης ἢ πρὶς καὶ ἔστι τούτῳ τῶν τῶν ὁμολόγων ὀμότας.

M. Aurelius Meditations V.30.1. Ὅ τοῦ θου νοῦς κοινωνικὸς.

I. Stobaeus Antholog. I.47.8. Κοινώνια δὲ ἦστι φωτίων, καὶ κοινωνοῦσαι μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ὅτε δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων.

Philo De Virtutibus 80-81. Τό μὲν οὖν δείγματα τῆς τοῦ νοοῦτος φιλανθρωπίας καὶ κοινωνίας, ἢ ἐχθροσταὶ καὶ ὁμοοργία χαῖρεσις καὶ τῆς τῶν ἱερὸν λόγων ὑφηγήσεως μεμηχανεῖ... τοῦ ὅπερ ἐπικείμενος καὶ ἱκανὸν οὐκ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς ἄνθρωπος αὐτῷ μονον ἱδρύεται κοινωνίας...

Epictetus Discourses IV.11.1. Ἀνυφηγηθοῦτε τινες, ἐὰν ἐν τῇ φύσει τῶν ἄνθρωπων περιέχεται τὸ κοινωνικὸν. ᾳχας δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅταν οὐκ ἔχων ἡ λείψεως ἁμαρτηθήσατε, ὡς τῷ γάρ καθαρίων πάντως περιέχεται καὶ, τοῖς ἐπὶ Ἀλῶ, καὶ τοῖς τῶν λύμων ἕφραξατε.

Epictetus Discourses I.28.20. Ὄρα μὴ τῷ παρακολούθειν οἷς ποιεῖ; ὃρα μὴ τῷ κοινωνικῷ, μὴ τῷ πίθῳ τῷ ἄλθειν, τῷ κοπαλεῖν, τῷ συνετᾷ, τῷ οὖν τοῦ μέγα ἐν ἄνθρωπος καὶ τῷ ἱγανόν, ὅπου οὐ διαφορά.


Epictetus Discourses IV.5.17. Τίνα θέλει χαρακτηρίζει τῇ δομῇ οὗτος; Ἡμερον, κοινωνικοῦν, ἀνέκτικον, πιθαλαλείαν.

Philo De Spec. Legibus III.204. ἐστι τῶν δικῶν εἰς ταῦτα ἄριστον τῷ συνόμενον κοινωνικόν, τῇ δὲ ὄνομῃ, ἡμῶν εἰς κοινωνικά ἐστι καὶ ὡσα ἐπεροτείνα, κατὰ ταὐτατον ἠμικτα καὶ ἀκοινώσεται, οἷς ὁ μνημόνευς ἐκδόσεως διαλίθας ἔδικες, ὅπων φύσις ἀναίρετων.
Philo De Mig. Abrahami 178. ... τὰ ἐπίγεια τῶν μετεώρων καὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμά τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς ἀμαλάκηναι καὶ ὦστερ διὰ μονακῶς λόγων τὴν ἐμφαντάζουσαν σωφρόνισιν τοῦ πάνθου ἐπιδείκνυτον τῇ τῶν μερῶν πρὸς ὀλληλα ἱκενών καὶ ὑμαθείνιοι τόποις μὲν ἀπεικονισμένοι, υφισμένοι δὲ ὦ διψακούμενοι.

Aetius Placita II.3.4. Ἀριστοκράτης ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀφθαλμῶν ὑπὸ ὄφθαλμον ὑπὲρ λόγων ὑπὲρ νοτερῶν ὑπὲρ προνόητοι διάκοσμοι. τὰ μὲν ἀριστερὰ τάξεων πάντων κοινωνίαν φαινομένων γὰρ περὶ ἰδίων ἱκεφάλως, καὶ ἵστασις, τὰ δὲ περί ἱστησία, ἱστησίας ἀκτιῶν, τῆς δὲ εἰσαγωγῆς καὶ ἰσαμβρήσεως ὀς προαγομένας μετειχεῖν.

Plotinus Ennead II.1.7.15. ... ἐνῶτον τε καὶ οὗτε ἱκετεύοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἀγαπή κοινωνίαν, ὡς ὃς ἔστω, λαβεῖν οἷς αὐτὸ ἀλλὰ ταὐτὸ ταὐτὸ ... .

Dio Chrysostom Discourse XI.36. τὰ τοῦτο ὡς τὴν κοινωνίαν διαδικασθεῖσαν καὶ στάσεις ἐπίχρησθεν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν ἤτοι δοκεῖτο καὶ παραδόθηκαν ἡ πρὸς οὕτως ὑπὲρ τὴν ἱκανόχαι τε καὶ ἱστησίας, τοῦ πολεμικοῦ τοῦ πολεμίου ἢν ἑπετεῖον τοῦ ἱκετευόμενον τῶν ἔργων ὅπως τῷ οἷς ὑπὸ αὐτῶν.

Dio Chrysostom Discourse I.40. Πολεμεῖς δὲ κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τὸ κοινὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν διὰ τῆς τῶν κοινωνίας Ἰδέες τε καὶ ἰδιωμόμενοι...

Dio Chrysostom Borry Disc. 23. μιᾶς γὰρ ἡ ταύτης καθαρῆς ἐξάπαθες πολιτείας εἰς τῶν πόλεως ἡ ἐκατοντάκοπη καὶ πολίν ἄλλης ἡ ἀκτιών περιτίθεντα, ἄνθρωποι τῶν δὲ Ἑλλήνων κοινωνίας, ἡ τοῦτον ἡ ἱστησίαν ἔργων συνεισφέρειν, ὡς εἰς πολεμικὸς σχῆμα, ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς ἱστησίας περί οὗτος, ὧν τε φρουρεῖ ται καὶ πράξεων τὰ πολιτείας ἔτη τοῦ κοινωνίας τοῦ νόμου, λαμβάνει ὃς ὀκτώ τοῦτο.

Plotinus Ennead IV.3.9.9. ... ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρτος ὧν ἡ ἱστησίας ὑπὸ ἰδικρίσεως, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἀναμάτου εἰς διδάσκειν σῶμα, ὡς ὅτι καὶ πρόκειται ἐν τῷ μυστῆρι κοινωνίας σώματι — .

Plotinus Ennead VI.4.16.13. ... οὗτος ὡς ὧν ἡ ἱστησίας ἐκείνη ἡ κείσθαι ἐκεῖνη τὴν σωματικὴν τὴν ἱστησίαν καὶ ἱστησίας ἱκετευόμενοι καὶ ἱστησίας καὶ ἱστησίας καὶ ἱστησίας τοῦ τρόπου τοῦτος τοῖς τοιούτοις κοινωνίαις.

Philo De Sac. Abel et Cain 73. ... τα μὲν ὃς ἐκ τῆς τετελεσθεὶσας πρᾶξεως τοιαύτα ἐστίν, οἷς κατὰ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἐθνῶν ἱστησιμότηταν, πρὸ τοῦ ἱστησίας ἑλλήνων ἰερὰς ἰεραρχίας ἱστησιμότητας ἠδονὴς ὑπὸ σωμάτων, μερες, μερας, μερας, σωματικὸς ἰερὰς ἱστησιμότητας ἵκεται, σωματικὸς κινήσεως ἅπατοι καὶ σχῆμα αὐτῶν ἰστησιμότητας.
Plotinus Ennead II.9.7.3. "Οτι μὲν οὖν οὗτος ἦσαν οὗτος παύσεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἔστε οἷς καὶ ὁς τὸ κόσμος, ἠκούσαν ἐκεῖνος ἢ γινθείτη. Τὸν δὲ πρὸς τὸ σώμα τῆς φυλῆς κοινωνίαν τῇ διάτερᾳ πρὸς αὐτῶν γινθείτω ὡς οἷς ἀνεικόν τῇ φυλῆ.

Plotinus Ennead VI.9.1.34. "γινθείτω δὲ ζηλλὸν ἐμπροσθέτου καὶ σκυθῆ.

Plotinus Ennead I.6.2.28. "Οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ τὸ καλὸν σῶμα γίνεται λόγου ἀπὸ τὴς πλήθους κοινωνίας.

Epictetus Discourses II.19.27. "ἄρθρον ὡς ἀνθρώπου ἐπιθυμεῖται γανέβαι καὶ ἐν τῷ συμμαχίᾳ τούτῳ τῷ νεκρῷ περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δίαν κοινωνίας δευτερομενίν.

Dio Chrysostom Bor. Dis.31. "ὁ δὲ λόγος οὗτος ἐνθρωπὸς ἀποστολὴς ἐσειρόοις τὸν τεῖς τὸ ἀνθρώπων τῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις περιλαβεῖν πάν ἐν λογικῷ, κοινωνίας ἀρίθμην καὶ δικαίωσιν τῆς μονῆς εὐχαρίαν ἐκδήλοις καὶ ὀλοκληρώσει.

Philo De Virtutibus 84. "σύν ἀκριβῶς ἐντ萜τεῖν τόκων οὗσαν ἐκεῖνον οὐκ ἠξίων. ἐπιθυμεῖται τῇ κάλλιστῃ καὶ τιμώτατῃ τοιν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἡμεροφαίρει κοινωνίαν, χρηστοτητα, ἐμπροσθέτου, εὐφημία, εὐκλεία.

M. Aurelius Meditations III.2. "ἔστω γὰρ αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν τόσον κοινωνίας φυσικῶν νόμων ζύνον καὶ δικαίωσι, ᾧ ἡμῖν μέντοι τού καὶ ἐξίσου ἐν τοῖς μετοίκοις εὐστοχοῖς.

Epictetus Disc. I.23.1. "ἕπινοι καὶ Ἐπίκουρος οἴτι φύει ἔστων κοινωνίας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ καλοῦθες τοιοῦ ἠμῶν, οὐκέτει σύνεται ἐκλεῖ δικαίως εἴπετέν.

Chrysippus Ethica X.686. "ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθους πολιτείας, πολιτείας οὐκ έξερχόμενον γὰρ κατὰ τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, καὶ γὰρ κατεύθυναν καὶ παιδοποιήσαντο δισκολεύθην ζῷον ἢ τὰ ὑμῶν λογικοὶ ζῷοι καὶ κοινωνικοὶ καὶ παλληλοίου φύει.


M. Aurelius Meditat. V.29.2. "θείω δὲ <ά> καὶ πρὸς τοῦ λογικοῦ καὶ κοινωνικοῦ λόγου.
Chrysippus Ethica VI. III. 346. οδε ἔχετε το κοινωνικόν περιγραφήται ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἱμάτων ὄρμων οὖν, καὶ ἣτο τοις ἀνθρώπων κοινωνικών ἢ ξένης καὶ ποιῆσας ἡμάς πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ποιητής κοινωνικόν.

M. Aurelius Medit. V. 1. 7. σω δὲ κι οἱ κοινωνικοὶ πράξεις εὑστελέστηρει φαίνονται καὶ ἄρετος σπουδή καὶ ἱερός.

M. Aurelius Medit. III. 4. 2. οὐ δὲ ἡμῶν εὐθύς ἀλήθεια εἶναι ὧν πάνη ἀπέλευθα καὶ θυμίζω καὶ ἄλλους κοινωνικούς καὶ ἀνέκδοτος ἀθέτησιν ἢ καθαράς ἀπαφορῆς συναφής ἢ περιστασιακῆς φαντασμάτων ἢ φιλοσοφίας τινος ἢ πράγματος καὶ υποθέσις ἢ ἀλλατίνοις ἐφ' ἐν ἀνθρώπιναις ἔξηγομενοι, ὡς ἐν μιᾷ ἄλοι ἄρτοι.

M. Aurelius Medit. IV. 33. 3. ὡς τούτῳ. -διάνοια δικάλει καὶ πράξεις κοινωνικοὶ καὶ λόγοι διαμ. μήποτε διαφραγματίζω, καὶ διεθέσεις απάντησιν πάν το συμβαίνοιν ἢ συμβεβηκίν ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τελευτῆς καὶ περὶ ἔρευν.

M. Aurelius Medit. VI. 14. 2. . . . πρὸ ἄπαντι δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνοις μυκῆν λογίσας καὶ κοινωνικοῖς ἔχουσα καὶ κοινωνικῆς διαδραμάζοντι καὶ τῷ διαφημίζοντι εἰς τοῦτο ποιεῖται.

M. Aurelius Medit. VII. 5. ἔδε καὶ ἀπεικόπη ὅτι παραχώρησιν τοῦ ἐμοῦ τῷ συμαφεῖ τῷ ἐπιστήμονοι, ἢν ἄλλως τούτω μὴ καθήκη, ἢ πράξιμοι, ἢς συμβαίνει, πρὸς παραλαβόν οἷον συμμετοχινά καὶ πρόσχρησιν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἡμεροθείου ποιήσιν τὸ εἰς τὴν κοινωνικὴν τούτον καὶ ἱερὸς.

Epictetus Disc. II. 14. 8. ἄληθες, ἀφοῦς ἔτι πράξεις ἀπειρώρησιν ἀπεκτήσας τοῦ πολιτικῆς καὶ ἐπιστήμων τόν ἄθροι, τόν ἄριστον τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, τὸν ἄριστον τοῦ ἀρχομένου τῶν πολιτικαί, τῶν ἄγορά, τῶν πολιτικά, τῶν γνώσεων, τῶν κερδών, τῶν συνιῶν, τῶν ἀρχομένων τῶν πολιτέων.

Epictetus Disc. I. 22. 10. ἔστι γὰρ ἄνὴν, δέ τοῦ ἐκείνα τὰ μέρα τῶν γνώσεων, κερδῶν, γνώσεων, ἀξιώματος, τέχνης, παρὰ, ἀληθῶς ση κοινωνών.

Epictetus Disc. III. 1. 21. Οἰνον καὶ λέγεις; κοινωνίας μου ἄν καὶ γοητείας, ἀνεξαίρετος σεαυτοῦ, καὶ εἰς πολὺ παραβιέσεις πολιτείας καθώς, καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν συγγένως, καὶ τῶν γείτονος γείτονα.

Epictetus Disc. III. 11. 3. Διὸ δὲ ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ λέγειν, τοῦτο μὲν παρὰ θεῷ ἢκεῖ. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τῶν συνεχείς καὶ τῶν συνεκεῖς τὰ καὶ τῆς. τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τοῦ συμφόρου καὶ συγγενούς καὶ κοινωνίας, ἀποδομοῖς λέγειν ὅτι ἐδώ καὶ καὶ ὕστερον ἦτον.
M. Aurelius Meditat. V.6.6.8. 'Vae tibi autem tunc, si parakoloutheis in tribus uxoribus, quibus esti omnes cives, in eis omnes urbes, in eis omnes civitates, in eis omnes gentes, concurrere, cum tamen abditum tulisse omnes gentes, aut eis gentibus, aut eis urbis, aut eis civitatum, aut eis nations.'

M. Aurelius Meditat. VII. 'Esto nimirum, si praxem veniam tuum ad praemium censuris, ut praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

M. Aurelius Meditat. VI.30.1. Eris, si cum sociis tibi epistola iubet, ita dixeris sociis tuis, ut praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

M. Aurelius Meditat. VI.23.1. Esto te anbriptois, esti lumen exousi, cum ictu censuris.'

M. Aurelius Meditat. VI.16.5. 'Esto te idem fides emptoris aliis etiam tuum emptorum etiam tuus thesauri.'

Josephus Against Apion II.208. 'Hoc est, quod sociis tuis, qui praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

Epicurus Ethica XXXVII.153.5. 'Te manum triumphorum ostendi, ut sociis te praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

Epicurus Ethica XXXVII.153.2. 'Existe de consensu sociis, ut sociis te praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

Epicurus Ethica XXXVII.151.7. 'Ego de <nomen> moneo de his, quae, ut sociis te praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

Epicurus Ethica XXXVII.152.4. 'Katac, ut sociis te praemium censuris, etiam mense eris.'

Chrysippus Ethica II.112. 'Filium de ictu censuris.'
Diogenes Laertius Zeno VII.124. ἐλέφαντες δὲ καὶ τὴν φίλων ἐν μανίς τόσον εἰσοδοίσιν εἶναι δὴ σὲ σὲ δοιοτήτα. φασί δʼ αὐτὴν κοινωνίαν τινὰ εἶναι τῶν κατὰ τὸν θλ. ἱματίων ἥμων τοῖς φίλοις ὡς ἐδυνάσθη.

Diogenes Laertius Epic. X.120. δεῖ δὲντο προκατάρχεσθαι - καὶ γὰρ τὴν γένος σπειραμα—συνήτωσθαι δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν ἐν τοῖς ταῖς ἀρχήσεις ἐκπλήθησιν ἔνοιοι.

Alexis Frag. 296. λύπη μανίας κοινωνίαν ἔχει τινὰ.

Diogenes Laertius Zeno VII.99. ἡγιασθὲν ἔτι νομίζοντες τειχῶν καὶ κοινωνίας ποιητικών.

Theophrastus Phys. Opin. Fr. 4. Ἀναγοράς μὲν γὰρ ἡγομένους καλόπνευσιν κοινωνίας τῆς ἀναγορας δηλοφροσύνης πρῶτος μετέχετε τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχήσι τοῖς καὶ τὴν ἀνεπίπεμον αὔλης ἀνεπιπήμορῳ τοῖς μὲν εἰσαγωγικοῖς ἀνεπίπεμον ποίησις.

Theophrastus Phys. Opin. Fr. 8. Ἀναγοράς δὲ τὸν Ἁρέτης Ἠλέατος ὁ Μιλήσιος ἀναγοράς μὲν γὰρ ἐτεκνείν περὶ αὐτοῦ—κοινωνίας.

Parmeinidēς ἡς ἡς δηλοφροσύνης ὁς τῇν αὐτῶν ἐφάρσεις Ἀρμένιδης καὶ Ἐνοράκει τοῖς τῶν ὀρεγνῶν ὀ ῥῶν, ἀλλʼ ὡς ἐκεῖνω τῆς ἐναξίως.

Empedocles Frag. 21. φασὶ δὲ Νεάνδρος ὅτι μικρί Φιλολόγος καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς κοινωνίους ὑπὸ Πιθομορίων ὑπὸ ὑπομορίων.

Josephus Jewish Antig. II.62. τῶν δὲ ζώτων ἑνῶν ἐπὶ ποινωνίας πρὸς τῆς περὶ τὰ ἑρμ. ποικίλλωρας ἐς ὑμῖν ὑμᾶς ἀναγοράς, ὅτι φίλη κατὰ κοινωνίας ἠς ὑμῶν ὑμῶν, ἔθετο καὶ τῆς ἐναξίως τῶν ὑπομορίων, τρεῖς ἑνῶν καὶ παρὰ ἐκεῖνω τῆς ἐναξίως.

Dephilus Frag. 32. ὃς τῶν ποιοῦντων τινὰ κοινωνίων τούτων...

Antiphanes the Younger ὡς γὰρ, <δ> παράστατο, ἰν ἐρημ. σκόπησι, κοινωνίς ἀλφὼν τῆς τύχης καὶ τοῦ βίου.

Amphis Frag. 20. ἐν τοῖς ὑποκίνεσις τὸς ἑκάστορ θαλαμονεύματι ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν ἑκάστορ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κοινωνίαν ἀνεπιπήμορῳ ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἂν καὶ τῆς ὑποκίνεσις τῆς ἐκείνης τῆς τύχης τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις τοῖς ἑκάστοις.

Josephus Against Apion I.35. ὃς γὰρ ὅτι τοὺς αἰγυπτιακοὺς ἑκάστοις προσέφερε τοὺς ἑκάστοις ἔχοντας αὐτῶς ὑπ’ ὑποκίνεσις ἀλφών κοινωνίων ὑποκίνεσιν.
Philo On Abraham 100.

Dionysius of Hal. Rom. Antiq. II.30... ἐπὶ κοινωνία πυρὸς καὶ ὀδατος ἐγχών τοις ἰεραίς.

SEG Frag. 247. ... συγγενεῖς καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνίας καλῶς πρὸς τὸν θεόν...

SEG Frag. 250. ... ἰδίῳ τούτῳ παρεχθὲν ἅλιστα δὲ οἰς τοις κοινωνίας τῶν ἱερῶν...

SEG Frag. 255. ... καὶ η ἵδι τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνίας - - - τοις καὶ τας συγγενεῖς καὶ ὀσιορόδους...

SIG Frag. 647. Ἡρακλείῳ ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς ἐν Στείριῳ πασίν, καὶ τοῖς τοῖς Στείριοι ταῖς ἐν Μεσινί πασίν.

SIG Frag. 873. ... καὶ ἅμα τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνίας, ἤσοις ἡ ἥγεσις τῆς ἱδιαίης ἡμολόγως καὶ οἰς Ἑθυμοποίησις σίναι.

SIG Frag. 1106. λογαρίζεται τῇ ἑπετειεμένῃ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς κοινωνίας ἡ ἱερᾶς πάντως ὑμελεύεσται καὶ ἑπετειείς τοῦτος ἵκελον.

SIG Frag. 531. δόθην ταῖς πολλαῖς τῶν ἱεραίς κοινωνίας την Λυκίᾳ [καὶ] ἡς πολίες δυνατὰ ἔθεσεν... ἐὰν δὲ Χίρα ἐθέρβησε καὶ ἤκτος ἔθεθη ὑπνων ἤν κοινωνίας τοῖς πολίσι... τοῖς... ταῖς... καὶ... καὶ... γενέας.

SIG Frag. 531. [καὶ] κοινωνίας ἡνίκαι, ἵνα τοῖς πολλαῖς καθιστῆκα ταῖς τοῖς πολίσι καὶ ἱεραίς τῶν τε τε οἰς τοῦ κοινών ἑθέρβησεν καὶ ἤκτος θροφόρος ταῖς... τοῖς τοῖς κοινῶν καὶ...]

SIG Frag. 646. ἐσοφότως περὶ τοῖς οὖν, ὁι οὗτοι Θράκες ἐφεπάνωσαν περὶ σῖτου καὶ ἥλιου εἰσοδῆς κοινωνίας πρὸς Ξυνίῳ Πανδοῦνον γεφορεῖν.

Polybius Histories II.45.2. ... καὶ Κλεονεὶν τῷ βασιλείῳ Λικεδαιμονίῶν κοινωνίαν, καὶ συνπλήκτειν ἄμοιν ἄμοιν τὰς ἱεραίς.
Polybius Histories II.61.11. διὰ τόσος δ’ ἐργοῦ μᾶλλον ἐν παραμήνῃ πρὸς ρωμαϊκὴν πίστειν καὶ πρὸς Ἑλληνικὴν πραγμάτων καὶ βεβαίων κοινωνιῶν.

Polybius Histories IV.35.10. καὶ κατέστησαν δι’ κοινωνιῶν ἐφορὰς τῆς αἱρέσεως τῆς στασιμότητας.

Polybius Histories III.2.3. ἐπιφάνεια κοινωνιῶν καρδιών τῶν αὐτῶν ἑλπίδων.

Polybius Histories IX.31.4. ἰταὶ δὲ ταῦτα βούλευμαν καὶ πολλάκις ἐκτὸς δόντες ἐργον, πολλοίροι διὰς δεῖ κοινωνίαν πραγμάτων, Ἀἰγυπτίοι καὶ Μακεδονί.

Polybius Histories IX.39.6. Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ καὶ Μακεδονί κοινωνίας τῶν αὐτῶν ἑλπίδων.

Polybius Histories IX.37.5. τοῖς δὲ νῦν κοινωνίης τῶν ἑλπίδων, ἡ πρὸς ποιαν παρακάλεται τούτων συμμαχίαν;

Polybius Histories 18.48.7. καὶ τῶν μὲν πρῶτος καὶ πολιτικῶς μεμφημοροῦντων αὑτοῖς ἔτι ἔτι μὴ κοινωνικὰς χρήσας, τοῖς ἐσχικημασί, μυθὲς τηρῶν τις τῆς ἀρχῆς συνήθεις...

Polybius Histories IX.25.5. πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς ἐλλήνες ἔτη γενναίοτα, τεκοινωνικότας εἴδων πραγμάτων τοὺς προερχόμενους ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης Ἑλλάδος.

Polybius Histories I.43.3. ἔτιν ταύτης ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτῶν πίστει καὶ μὴ κοινωνίσσωσι τοῖς ἐξελληνικοῖς τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

Polybius Histories 31.18.6. Πολλοίροι τοὺς τε κυριαρχούν, ἀφετέλει καὶ ταῖς πόλεις συμπροσενέντοι, καὶ κοινωνικάν ταῖς ἀποστάσεως...

Polybius Histories I.6.7. ἡ πολιτείας παραπέμφουσι καὶ κατεκτᾶσαν τοὺς κοινωνικάν τοὺς Πύρρος τῶν πραγμάτων.

Polybius Histories II.32.8. ἑυλαμπόντως ξοιοῦσιν ἄνδρᾳ τοπίου καίροι καὶ πράγματος κοινωνίαν.

Polybius Histories II.42.5. πολλοίς γὰρ κοινωνικάν πραγμάτων πλείστων δὲ καὶ καλλίστων ἐξουσίων...

Diodorus Siculus Histories V.9.4. ...οὶ δὲ πρὸς τῶν ληστῶν ἀντιτάσσομεν καὶ τὰς οὐσίας δὲ κοινάς οικοδέματον καὶ ἱντεῖς καὶ λύνσις, διεςάλεγαν ἐπὶ τινὰς χρόνους κοινωνικάς προθύμεις.
Damoxenus Frag. 2. 
τοις αὐτοῖς ἔδι 
tετελῶν ἔχει κοινωνίαν, διὰ πέντε, διὰ πλασών πάλιν.

Athenaeus Deipnosophistae XIV. 617. 
κοινωνεῖ γὰρ ἐς 
μειράκιδιον ἐν τοῖς ἀδλοῖς ποιητικὴ καὶ τῇ λυρᾷ τοῖς 
κύριεροι παίζοις.

Ephippus Frag. 
κοινωνεῖ γὰρ ἐς 
μειράκιδιον, ἐν τοῖς ἀδλοῖς μουσικῇ καὶ τῷ λύρῳ 
τοῖς κύριεροι παίζοις.

Lucian Prom. in Words 6. 55. 
καὶ ἐμὸς ἐστολή 
θυμάγγειν καὶ θυμαρίῳ, οὔ πανα πείθημεν αὐτῇ ἐν μαρα 
ἀνέχομεν ὑπὸ κοινωνίαν.
Philo De Vita Mosis I.158. οδη και μετάνοιας τῆς πρὸς τὸν ματέρα εἶλαν καὶ ποιήσαν κοινωνίας ἀπέλαβον προφέρησαν τὴν αὐτὴς ἢξιοδείς.

Philo De Spec. Legibus I.131. ἐς τοις δινώταις τιτῆς ἤτεροι κοινωνίας τῶν μετέχοντές αὐτοῦ νόμου δεῖ καὶ τοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν πραγματεύεσθαι δεῖν τῇ περὶ ἡμῖν ἡγεσίας ἄρα περὶ τοῖς κλήρους ἐπιμελητέας.

Philo De Spec. Legibus I.221. εἰς τοὺς ὑπόκεισθαι τοῦ κεφάλας τούς ἀπὸ τοῦ προερχόμενος μετὰ τοῦ πρωινοῦ καὶ προμακρύνον τῷ συμπόσιον τῶν τῆς θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦντων, διὸπαραγγέλει μὴ νομίζειν ἐστίν.

Philo De Spec. Legibus II.107. ἐς δὲν τοῖς πλαστοὶ διδάσκονται μετατιθέμενοι καὶ κοινωνίας τῶν ἐξουσιών παραμορφώσεως δὲν τέλεσε, ἡμᾶς πάντως τοῖς οὕτως τοῖς οὕτως καίναι ἐπὶ φαίνεται ἀναφεξασμένοι πρὸς ἐπανάθεσις τῶν ἐνεργεῖς ἐστιν...

Philo De Spec. Legibus II.108. ἐς δὲν τοῖς πρὸς κοινωνίας ἐκάθεν τῶν κτερόν τοῖς τῆς ἐραίς ἔρθομεν ἀριθμοί.

Philo Hypothetica I.1. Μερικοὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῶν ἀληθείας ἐπί κοινωνίας...

Philo Quod Omnis Probus 84. τοῖς δὲ πρωινοῖς τῶν εὐνοίας, πιστεύοντα, τοῖς πάντως λόγοι κρίτετον κοινωνίαν, πρὸς δὲν ἢκιριοὶ φροντὶ πρὸς.

Philo Quod Omnis Probus 91. ἀπὸ νὰ συστείλῃ καὶ τοῖς πάντως λόγοι κρίτετον κοινωνίαν, δ’ ἡ ὑπ’ ἑλέον καὶ σοφὰ ἀλφαίμονος ἐγεί ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐνεργεῖς.

Josephus Jewish Wars II.8.3. ἡ ἱστορία μὲ τοῦ πλούτου, καὶ θαλαμήσεις τοῦ ἀυτοῦ τῶν κοινωνικῶν, ὅπερ ἐξιν ἐφιάλει τοῖς παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὑπερέχεισθε.

Sirach 13.17. τί κοινωνίας λόγος ἀληθός.

Sirach 13.2. κοινωνίας χώρα πρὸς λέιτους ἀυτῆς προέρχομεν, καὶ διὸν συνεργίσθησαι.

Sirach 13.2. βάρος ὑπὲρ ὑμῖν ἀργὸς καὶ ἐχειροτέρῳ σοι καὶ πλούσιωτέρῳ μὴ κοινωνεῖ.
Wisdom 6.23.  οὐτε ἐνιαυτὸς ἢ κοινωνία ἑαυτῆς.

Malachi 2.14.  οὐτε μὴν φθάνῃ τίτηρα τῶν εὐνοούντων,

II Maccabees 14.25.  ἐγένετον κοινωνίαν ἑνίων πλῆθος.

II Maccabees 4.6.  ὑπελαμβάνει πατέραν νεανίδας.

Job 34.8.  τῇ ἀνομα τῷ περιδύνοντι καὶ δοξηλούν;

Proverbs 1.11.  κρυφωμένον ἡ ἐν χειρὶ ἄλλων ἀδέλφων.

Proverbs 28.24.  ἐν θησαυρῷ καὶ 

Ecclesiastes 9.4.  δεῖτις ἐν κοινωνίᾳ πρὸς τοὺς νικηφόρους,

Isaiah 1.23.  δεῖ ἄρχοντές σου ἀπειδήσων, κοινωνοῦντες κλεπτούν.

Sirach 13.1.  ὁ εἰσῆλθεν πίστης κοινωνίαν 

Sirach 6.10.  καὶ ἔστως ὁ λίθος κοινωνίας τραπεζής

καὶ ὁ μὴ παραμείνῃ ἐν διμεσίᾳ ὀλίγως σου.

Wisdom 8.18.  καὶ ἐξυκλεῖ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ λόγων αὐτῶν.

IV Kings 7.11.  καὶ ἐποίησαν κοινωνίας καὶ ἐξάραβαν

τὸν παροργίζον τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐκλήσαν τοὺς ἔθνους.

II Maccabees 5.20.  δισέπερ καὶ αὕτως τόπως συμμεταχθῶν

ἐν τῷ ἑνώτῳ βουλευταίον πανομίκον διέρχεται ἐκκοινομήσας.

IV Maccabees 7.6.  καὶ ἔξοψε τὸν ἤρων ἀργείου, διὰ τὰν 

ὑπάρχοντας ὑπὸ τοὺς ἀρχιπρέπους ὡς ἐνετρεπτῶς καὶ ἂν ἦς 

χάρισμον καὶ καθαρίσμον χαράσσεσαν 

μαθητῇ, ἐκκοινομήσαις μιμοφαργῇ.

III Maccabees 2.31.  ἴδοι μὲν ὁ ἄγιος ἐπίσκοποι τῶν πάλαιος 

ἐντρεπτῶς ἐπιρρήματος συγκεραυτοῦ ἐκτείνας ἐντούς ἄλλους ἐνδοθέντας ὡς καθάρισμα τοῦ 

κοινωνίας τῶν ἑκοιμάτων τῷ βασιλείῳ συμπαραφρέτης.

III Maccabees 4.11.  υπὸ τοῖς συνάντηται αὐτοῦ κοινωνέων

μιμήτε ἐν σύνεχεις καταξίωσαι περιβόλους.

II Chronicles 20.35.  καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο εὐκοινώνησεν Ἰωσαφᾶς

βασιλεὺς Ιουδαί πρὸς Οχθίαν βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ...
Esther 8.13.
καὶ τὴν ἀκμαστόν τῆς βασιλείας
κοινωνοῦ ἔδηρ...  

Leviticus 6.2.
...τὰ ἀνθρώπων, περί κοινωνίας...

Sirach 41.19.
...καὶ φίλον περί αἰδικίας...

Sirach 42.3.
...περί λογοῦ κοινωνοῦ καὶ ἀδοτορίου...

Matthew 23.30.
εἰ ὑμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρας τῶν πατέρων
ὑμῶν, οὐχ ὑμᾶς περί ὑμῶν κοινωνοῦ ἐν τοῖς αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν.

Luke 5.10.
...Ἰσαὰκον καὶ Ἰωάννην ὄνομα...

Acts 2.42.
...Ἡσαΐος δὲ προσκαιρεύοντες τὴν ἡμέραν
tῶν ἁποστόλων καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ τῆς κληρονομίατος κύρου καὶ τῆς προσωπικῆς...

Τίς ἐν κοινωνίᾳ φωτείν ἐστιν σκότος;

Apocalypse 18.4.
...μὴ συγκοινωνήσατε τοῖς ἐμαρτημάτοις...

Ephesians 5.11.
καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἐρρους τοῖς
ἀθώοις τοῦ σκότους...

I Timothy 5.22.
...συν καὶ διὰ τῶν κοινωνίαν ἔχετε μεθ' ἡμῶν.

I John 1.3.
...τινος καὶ διὰ τῶν κοινωνίαν ἔχετε μεθ' ἡμῶν.

I John 1.6-7.
...ἐὰν εἰδωλομεν ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχουσιν
μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰ τὸ σκότος περπατοῦσιν, ἐνυποκειμένοι, καὶ ὡς ποιοῦσιν τὴν ἀληθείαν...
...εἰν δὲ εἰ τῷ φωτί περπατοῦσιν, ὅς αὐτός ἐστιν ἄντων φωτὶ,
κοινωνίαν ἔχουσιν μετ' ἀληθείαν, καὶ τοὺς καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τοῦ ὑδότος αὐτῶν
καθιστάτω ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπους ἐμαρτήσας.

Galatians 2.9.
...δεξιὰς ἡμῶν ἐνει, καὶ Ἡρῴδαρ
κοινωνίας τῆς ἡμείς εἰς τὴν ζωήν, οὕτως δὲ εἰς τὴν περπατοῦν.

II Corinthians 8.23.
...εἰτε ὅπερ Τίτου, κοινωνία ἐκμοῦ καὶ
eἰς δόμα συνεργῶς... ἐτεῖ ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίαν, ὀθῦν Χριστοῦ.

Philemon 17.
...εἰ οὖν μὲ ἐχθεῖς κοινωνίαν, προσέλθου
αὐτῶν ὡς ἐμε.
I Corinthians 1.9. πιστὸς ὁ Θεὸς, διὸ ἐκλήθη εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

I John 1.3. καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

II Corinthians 13.13. Ἡ κύριος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Αγίου Πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

Philippians 2.1. ἦταν εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν πνεύματός...

I Corinthians 10.16. ὑπὸ κοινωνία τοῦ δόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; καὶ ἵνα ἐν κλίμακι ὑμῶν καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ δόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν;

I Corinthians 10.18. Ἐλέησεν τοὺς Εβραίους κατὰ σάρκα; ἂν οὖν ἔνδοξοι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κοινωνοί τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τούτῳ;

I Corinthians 10.20. ὅταν δὲ ὄλος κοινωνεῖ ταῖς δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι.

Hebrews 2.14. ἐν πνεύματι καὶ σάρκι ὑμῖν, καὶ ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης πάθεσις μετέχειν εἰς ἀδελφοὺς...

II Peter 1.4. ἐν γένεσι θείῳ κοινωνίᾳ φύσεως, ...

Philippians 3.10. ἐν κοινωνίᾳ αὐτοῦ...

Apocalypse 1.9. Ἔγω Ιωάννης ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἀπεστάλας ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἑρῴδων...

I Peter 4.13. Χριστὸς παθήματι Χριστὸς...

I Corinthians 9.23. ἡ συγκοινωνία αὐτοῦ γένηται.

I Peter 5.1. μεταξὺ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλιῳ, ...

Hebrews 10.33. ἡ συγκοινωνία γενήθηκεν.

Philippians 1.7. οὗτος καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως.

II Corinthians 1.7. ἡ συγκοινωνία ἐπὶ τῶν παθημάτων,
Romans 15.27. ...εἰ μή τοσι πνευματικοίς αὐτῶν ἐκκοιμήσως σαρκὶς, ἐφετέρους κατὰ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικῶς λειτουργήσας ὄφειοι.

Romans 11.17. ...εἰ δὲ ἤφελίσθης τὸν ἐνεκκεντρικὸν ἐν αὐτῶς καὶ συγκοινωνίας τῆς ρίζης καὶ τῆς πίστεως τῆς εἰλίας Ἰρένου, ὡς ἐνσακακίως σαρκὶς κλάδων.

II Corinthians 8.4. ...τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς δικονίας τῆς εἰς τούς ἁγίους σώζοντοι ἡμᾶς.

Romans 15.26. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακαδονία καὶ Αχαία κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθι, ἐν τοῖς περικροῖς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν Ἰερουσαλήμ.

Romans 12.13. ...ταῖς ἁρπαξίσ τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες... ...καὶ ἀποτείχη τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς τῆς δὲ ἐποίησαν καὶ κοινωνίας ἦν ἐκλεισθή.

Hebrews 13.16. ἐν ὑπνοῦντες.

I Timothy 6.18. ἐκτὸς όμολογον μικρὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ μελλον...

Galatians 6.6. Κοινωνεῖται δὲ ὁ κοινοκύματος ἐν λόγῳ τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πάσιν ἁγιᾷ.

Philémon 6. οὕτως η κοινωνία τῆς πιστεύσεως σου ἐνέργησ γεννὴται ἐν ἐπιγνώσει παντὸς ἄγιῳ του ἐν ὑμῖν ἐς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Philippians 1.5. ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀγίου απὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀχρι τοῦ νῦν.

Philippians 4.15. ...οὔτε μια οὐκ ἐκκλησία ἐξοικονόμησεν εἰς λόγῳ δύναμις καὶ λήμφασις εἰ μὴ δι᾽ αὐτῆς μόνοι...

Clement Protrepticus II.25.3. ἢν δὲ τοῦ ἐνεμομοῦντος ἀρχαίον πρὸς σωμάτων ἀνθρώπων κοινωνίαν, ἀγνοών μὲν ἔκαστον, ἄρα δὲ τοῦν ἔκαστον εἰς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἀναλύσασθαι δὴν δὲ ἐκείνον λέλεκτη τινὶ τῇ...

Clement Paedagogus III.25.2. ματέρχοντάς τοῦ λόγου, ὅπως καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπινον καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κοινωνεῖ.

Clement Excer. ex Theodoto 5.4. ...δὲ Ἀχαίας ἐδεικνύοντες, μεταδότας καὶ κοινωνοῦντες τῇ ἡμερίῳ τοῦ ἀρχαίου καὶ ἐκείνου ἔναλετο.

Clement Paedagogus I.6.30.2. ἔοισεν δὲ καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φιλαδρόμου τὸν θεὸν ἔναντι πρὸς πάνας.
Clement Protrepticus IX.82.5. τῆς βασιλείας τῆς πατρίδος κοινωνική τις γνώσις τῷ ἡγαθμένῳ.

Clement Paedagogus I.VII.56.3. φιλίας ἐνεαπό ἐπιστασίας ζητεῖ κοινωνία.

Clement Paedagogus I.VI.50.3-4. οὐδ' ἀπελευθερωθεὶς τῇ γάλα ἐκ ἡ πρὸς τὸ ὦδερ κοινωνία, οὐκ ἀπτεράδει τοις, προσπεπνομένοι οὐ προσπάθεια, καὶ δὴ λόγος ἔχει πρὸς τὸ διδασκαλεῖ κοινωνίαν, τοῦτο ἔχει τῇ γάλα τῇ συλλαβῇ, πρὸς τῷ ὦδερ.

Clement Paedagogus I.VI.51.2. κατὰ τῇ ὠψίν δὲ τῆς πίστεως η κοινωνία η πνευματικὴ πρὸς τὸν παπάτον ἄνθρωπον, τὴν σαρκικὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐξαρχεῖται τῆς αἰδείας υποτέλεσθε τῶν ἄνθρωπων, τοῦ δὲ αὐθαυστικοῦ.

Clement Paedagogus II.I.6.1-2. δείγμα δὲ εὐνοίας κοινωνίκης καὶ εὐμεταδότου.

Clement Paedagogus II.I.7.3. ἐνραχὶ γὰρ κοιροτρόφως ζωοτρόφως ἐς κοινωνίαν ἐωτὴ εἴρητων ἔσορων πλούσιον.

Clement Paedagogus II.I.10.2. μεταλλητέου δὲ τῶν παραπομπῶν, ὡς πρὸς τὸν ἡρετικὸν, τιμῶντες μὲν τὸν πελάτη καὶ ἀποσκοπή τῆς συνεργίας κοινωνίαν...

Clement Paedagogus II.I.14.6. ποιητές δὲ όυκ εἰς ἀπολαύον ἔμοιον, ἢ ὡς μεταδότων κοινωνίκης ἐπιθυμίας.

Clement Paedagogus II.VIII.73.2.ὅδ' οὐκ ποιητέου ἐδοξοῦσιν δαίμονι, ὡς γὰρ τὸν εἰρίκων τὸν θεοῦ τὴν λουθαν ὅτιν εἴδεις τῶν νεκρῶν καταστεῖτεν.

Clement Paedagogus III.IV.3113. καὶ γὰρ ἦν πενῶμεν τὸς ποιηθῆς μὴ μεταλλακτάνουσα τῶν ἔως κοινωνοῦσα λοιπῶν.

Clement Paedagogus III.X.52.1. ...τῶν δικαιοσύνης ἔστι κοινωνίκης τῇ μανάσιον...

Clement Paedagogus II.XIII.120.3.παρόμοιον δὲ τῷ γένος ἡμῶν ἐπὶ κοινωνίας ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωποι τῶν εὐαγγέλως πρὸς τοῖς μεταδότας καὶ κοινοὺς πασίν ἄνθρώποις τῶν εὐαγγέλως ἐπικοινωνίας λόγων, πάντα ποιήσας ὑπὲρ πάντων.

Clement Paedagogus II.III.38.4. οὐ δὲ καὶ κτήματος ἰδίως καὶ χρύσου εὐκόλως ἐπιταχύνει καὶ φυλάσσει μδίσι καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν εὐκόλως ἀδελφῶν <δύνατον>.

Clement Stromata VI.IX.79.2. μὴν περιεχεῖν πραγματεύομαιν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τοῦτο βιβλιοφυώμενον, ἐκτὸς τοῦ κατὰ τὸν βίον κοινωνίας ὡς ἀγαθή.
Clement Paedagogus II.XII.129.1 ἐπὶ μὲν καρπῶς τῶν χεριῶν ὑμῶν κόσμος ὅριον, εὔμεταδότος κοινωνία καὶ ἔργα ἀκαρπίας.

Clement Paedagogus III.VII.38.2...τοῖς δεόμενοις κοινωνήσατε...

Clement Paedagogus III.XII.120.4 ὅπις πάρσει τοι καὶ πλουσίως μείν, διὰ τι καὶ τρυφεῖν; ἦν γὰρ ἀνδρώπινον οὐδὲ κοινωνικόν, έκεῖνο δέ μίλλον ἡμῷ ἀκαρπίακοι.

Clement Stromata I.VI.34.4. φύει δ' οὖν κοινωνικὸς καὶ δίκαιος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐδικαιοδότησεν.

Clement Stromata II.XVI.73.4. κοινωνικὸς μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπος ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης γίνεται.

Clement Quis Dives Salv. 13.6. Γῆν κοινωνίαν ἐπιτάσσει...

Clement Quis Dives Salv. 13.7. ἢ δὲ τάς χρήσεις οὐδὲν τε ἐκληρούν ταύτα μὴ ἀπὸ χρημάτων τῶν ἔτι χρημάτων ἀφίεται καὶ ἐκεῖνο σύνδεσι τῷ κυρίῳ. ἢ τοῦτο διόντι καὶ καὶ διὸντι παραίνει, τρέφει καὶ μὴ τρέφειν, διοδέχεσθαι καὶ ἐπικλαίειν, κοινωνεῖν καὶ μὴ κοινωνεῖν, ὅπερ ἐπάνων ἔλογοτάτων.

Clement Quis Dives Salv. 13.1. τὸ γὰρ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ διαλείποιτο παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, εἰ μὴ οὐκ ἔχει μηδὲν;

Clement Quis Dives Salv. 31.8. δίκαιος οὖν καὶ δικαρχεῖσθαι καὶ λύτης [καὶ] κοινωνοῦσα, ὅπερ ἔστιν ἐκδέχεσθαι καθαρᾶ.

Clement Stromata II.XVIII.84.4. περὶ τε τῆς μεταδόσεως καὶ κοινωνίας πολλῶν ὄντων, ἐπειδὴ χρήσεις μονοὶ τούτοις οὐκ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἐπιστρέφει, ἀδελφοὶ ἀντιτίθενται εἰ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ μονοὶ τῶν εἰς τούτοις σύνεσιν ποιέων ἄλλα καὶ ἐς τὰς ὄρθορρας ἐν ἐμφόρουσιν εἰς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου κακομενικής ἐις σιγῶν ἐξερχόμενοι σύνοιτο χρήματιν, ἄλλα ἐνενεῖναι χερᾶς καὶ ἐναίσχοι ἀνεματική τοῖς συμένοις.

Clement Stromata II.XVIII.85.3. διὸ τοῦτο εἰς μᾶλλον εἰς τῶν κατέχοντας τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ μεταδοτοῦσαν κοινωνίαν ἐκ τοῦ προίημα τι τῶν ἐδώκατο τοῖς συμένοις, τοῖς πάντοις δὲ ἀφορμῆν περίλημμα ερωτῆς.

Clement Stromata II.XVIII.86.4. ὡς οὖν συνέισαν εἰς εὐδοκεῖσθαι καὶ εἰς κοινωνίαν καὶ εἰς δικαιοσύνην καὶ εἰς φιλανθρωπίαν παρευομένους ἔλας πρὸς τὸν νόμον;

Clement Stromata II.XIX.102.4. φιλοκατηρίτευον, εἰς τί εἰς καὶ μᾶλλον περιπλεύρα φίλος, ἢ ἐξόρυξιν ἐπικουρείαν, ἢ μὴ μετέρα ἐξόρυξιν.

Clement Stromata II.IX.42.1. Ἠραλδείον καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῖς τοῦ νόμου πνεύματος κοινωνίκοις.
Clement Paed. III. VII. 39. 3. οὖσας ἡ μετάδοσις ἀρθίς, φιλανθρωπίας ἡ ἐπαρχεῖσα πηγή, κοινωνία τοῦς διημερῇ τοῦ ποιῆσαι πᾶλιν καὶ πιστάλατα... 

Clement Quis Div. Salv. 32. 1. ἑπεξεῖδα τηλικοῦτοι μηδὲν ὁρίζει τῆς κοινωνίας, διόνυσι φημῆν. 

Clement Strom. IV. XVIII. 112. 2. κατὰ τὴν τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς ἀρπαγηκής λόγον... 

Clement Ecl. Prophet. 27. 7. καὶ κινδυνεύει ὑπὸ πάθος τῆς ἀρπαγῆς εἰ μόνον παντὶ τῷ προσηκοναι, καὶ εἴ τις ἄναξι λιπαρὸς αἰσθάνεται κοινωνοῖς. 

Clement Strom. I. I. 6. 3. μὴ μεταλλήσωσιν χάριν τῶν κοσμικῶν προΐσιν κοινωνικοὺς τῶν ἐπιστήμων μιᾶςν ἄλλοις τῶν κοινωνικῶν τῆς Χριστοῦ. 

Clement Stromata I. I. 1. 2-3. κοινωνικὰν δὲ ἡ γοφίλι καὶ φιλανθρωπικάν. 

Clement Stromata I. I. 6. 1. μὴ φιλανθρωπίας ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ λόγου... 

Clement Stromata I. VIII. 42. 2. ἔρμηνεύοις τῷ οἴδατι καὶ δύσεως λόγου τῷ κοινωνοῦσι τὸν ἐρεύνοις πιστεύειν. 

Clement Stromata I. XXVI. 168. 1. πολυτείνα χεὶς ὁμοκοινώνει ζωηθήν ὥς ἐν οὐ 'τροφὴ ἀνδρώπων' καὶ κατὰ κοινωνίαν. 

Clement Stromata II. IX. 163. 1. ἀγάπη δὲ δεμόνια ζωὴ τῶν κατὰ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὴν βίων καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἡ τουράλοτε φάνοι κοινωνία ἄλλοι. 

Clement Stromata I. XVIII. 872. 3. αἰματφυτὸν ἄτοιν ἐν πάσην, ὑδαίνιασας, κοινωνική... φυσικὴν κοινωνίαν διδάσκει. 

Clement Stromata II. XIX. 101. 3. στερρᾶ γὰρ ἐκ λόγου ἀρθίς, τοῦ δὲ ιδεστῶν καὶ μέσον ἐκ τῶν ἀθωμίων κοινωνικῶν τῶν τούτων καὶ μεταδομῶν καὶ βιοφιλῶν. κοινωνικῆς ὡς ἐκ χάριν διαθέλουσα τοῦ δὲ ιδεστῶν καὶ τρίτων ἡμῶν μὲν τὸ ἐκ συνθείται φαίνει, δὲ τὸ δὲ καθ' ἓρων τρεξτῶν καὶ μεταβαλῶν. 

Clement Stromata II. XV. 68. 1-2. 'καθότα τὰς λοιμῶν καὶ τὰ θέταρα καὶ τὰς δικαστηρίας εἰς τὰν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἀπὸ καὶ μᾶλλον ἡ ἐρακολοῦθες τὼν πονηρῶν καὶ τῶν Λύσσιν τῆς ὕδατος καὶ τὰς Ἀμαρτικὰς ἀδίστορας καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἁρμα αὐτῶν κοινωνίαν. 

Clement Stromata II. XX. 108. 3. ...ἀκολούθωσι αυτῷ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν συνθήματος βίων κοινωνίας. 

Clement Stromata II. XVII. 102-3. ἀπὸ τῶν ἁλάνων ἄραν τὴν ἐπιστήμωσιν τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκ' ὧς πηγῆς καὶ παρατίθεται τῇ κοινωνίας ἐκ τῆς Εὐσεβίας ἑκατέρωθεν τῶν Αδὰμ τοῖς... 

Clement Stromata III. XVIII. 92. 1. πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἔνας καὶ τολμᾶτος τις, ἀντιμέτωπος τῶν ὀμματιῶν, εἰ μεταπλαστῇ καὶ τῆς πλάνης οἰκολογίας καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν μορφῶν καὶ προσθεωτῶν καὶ ἀδιόπου.
Clement Strom. III.XVII.104,5. ἡ γὰρ ἰματσία ὑπῆρε τὸν οὗτος αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐνναταί Κοινωνιῶν έχειν μετά τῆς ἐπισκεψίας, δει τῆς ἔκθεσιν.

Clement Stromata III.II.6.1. ἐγνώμονοι τῆς ὑποστήριξιν τοῦ θεού κοινωνιῶν εἷς εἶναι μετὰ ἔστησος.

Clement Stromata III.II.7.1. ἔστησος δὲ καὶ γεγονούσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Κοινωνιῶν ὑπὸ ἐλεγόμενης ἐμφάνον ἔχοντες.

Clement Stromata III.II.7.2. ἢ τοῖς ἐθνῶν τοὺς νόμους τῆς κοινωνίας τοῖς δεῖ τούς κωδέχοντες καὶ παρατρέγεις.

Clement Stromata III.II.7.4. ἢ δὲ κοινωνία παρανομοθείται καὶ τὰ ἣδε ἱεροτές δέσιν ἄρρητος ὑπεράνως καὶ ψυχῆς κάλεσθαι.

Clement Stromata III.II.74-8.2κοινὰ τῶν δὲ θεῶν ἀπενε ἀνθρώπων ποιήσαι καὶ τὸ δῆλον τὸ ἄρρητον κωδεχόντας καὶ πάνθε ἐλοίως τὰ ἱματικὰ καλύπτοντες τοὺς ὑποκοινωνιῶν ἐνέργειαν κοινωνίας μετὰ ἱεροτές. οτι δὲ γεγονὼς εὔθεια τῶν ἐνεργοῦσαν κοινωνιῶν τῶν γένεσιν αὐτῶν ἐνέργειας καὶ σώματος. ὥς καὶ ἦν ἐθνῶν ἡ ἱεροτές, διαφανέων κοινωνίαν ἐπάνων, ἀκοπὴ ἐνέργεια τὸ λοιπὰ τῶν ἱμάτων.

Clement Stromata III.II.8.6. πάσας γὰρ οὐ πλήσιον ἢ οἰκίας τῆς κοινωνίας τοῦ πνεύματος, οὐ γὰρ μόνον Ἑβραίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἰκίας παῖδος Ἰηρᾶς.

Clement Stromata III.II.9.3. ἔδεισε τὴν κοινωνίαν ἐγκαλίσκων ἔχει γελοιοτρέπον εἰπέν.

Clement Stromata III.II.10.1. μετέπειτα τῆς κοινωνίας ἐναγάκτης εἰς γελοιοτρέπον εἰπέν.

Clement Stromata III.IV.25.5. ἐπιπληθηκόμενοι δὲ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ κηρυκτά χαῖς καὶ κοινωνίας.

Clement Stromata III.IV.27.1-2. ἂν κοινωνία ἦν ἐν μεταδόσει, ἐφημικό καὶ τροφής καὶ στολῆς.

Clement Stromata III.XII.86.4διαστήματα περὶ τῆς τεκνοποιίας εἰρήκει καὶ τοὺς κοινωνιῶν προστάτων τοὺς καταφέρει μὲν τὴν τοῦ πλαύτου περιομαίαν, ἐπικουρεῖν δὲ τοῖς δεσμεύοις μὲ βουλομένους.

Clement Stromata III.IV.27.12. ἔδει τὸν ἀριστοτέλη Ἀρνοτήτη κοινωνιῶν μοστήρων ἀναγραφομένων.

Clement Stromata III.IV.27.2. ὁ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπίκειται ὅποιον ἀγοραστών συμπλωκὴν κοινωνιῶν ἀφεθῶς καταλέγει.

Clement Stromata III.IV.274-5καὶ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου φωναίς ἀναγράφονται οἱ τῆς ἁγίης κοινωνίας, ἐπὶ τῆς λαγείας ἀδελφῷ.
Clement Strom. III. IV.27.4-5. Ο έρως τριελάθηκε τὴν ἑτέρους καὶ ἑτεροτροφοσκοπίας καί κατά τὴν ἀλλήλην ἀνάξιον τῷ θεῷ. ὡς τῇ ἀνακατευήθη μὴν οὐδὲ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ εἶπεν καὶ ἑδραυλασία ὡμολογεῖα...  

Clement Strom. III. IV.29.2-3. ἐν ἧν τῇ πάντῃ ἐπιτί ἐξεδέξαν αὐτῷ τῷ ἑαυτῷ μὴ εἶχαι μέν, ἀποκρίθηκαν ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἐπιτίτικς καὶ ἑκοινωνήσαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἑπέτραγαν τῷ ἑκατέρῳ. ἐκ τῆς τούτου ἐξεδέξαν ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἐπιτίτικς, ἡ ἑκοινωνίας ἑπέτραγαν συνάξεις μὲν ἢ ἡμᾶς ἢ ἕκαστος ἑκεῖνος συνενώμενα.  

Clement Stromata III. IV.29.3. εἰ ἂν καὶ ἑκατέρῳ καθήπερ οἱ ἀπὸ οὐδεμάντεινον πνευματικὰς ἔποιησαν κοινωνίας ἤσαν τοῖς αὐτῶν τὴν ἀνάξιον ἐπεκδέχεται <2ν>. ἀρκετὸς δὲ ἐφες κοινωνίαν εἰς προφητείαν τῇ ἀνάξιων ἐπεκδέχεται ἢτοι τὴν ἐνημέρων;  

Clement Stromata III. VI.54.1. ἢ δὲ κακοποίησιν δικαιοσύνης μὴ τῇ ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ τὴν ἐκκαθάριστον καί τὴν ἀνακατευήθη μὴ τῇ ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ τῇ ποιήσῃ. οὐδὲ γὰρ τῇ αὐτῷ τῇ αὐτῷ ἢ ποιήσῃ τῇ ποιήσῃ καί τῇ ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ τῇ ποιήσῃ, καὶ τῇ ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ τῇ ποιήσῃ καὶ τῇ ποιήσῃ.  

Clement Stromata III. VIII.62. δὲ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ φοιτεῖ πρὸς σκότος;  

Clement Strom. VII. XII.89.2. κατεύθυνθαι ἐν τῇ ἀλληρίᾳ τῇν [τα] κοινωνίαν καὶ ἀλλήλων ἀδιάφορον τῷ κοινωνίᾳ συμμετοχὴν καὶ ἀλλήλων ἀδιάφορον τῇν ἀλληρίᾳ συμμετοχὴν καὶ ἀλλήλων ἀδιάφορον τῇν ἀλληρίᾳ συμμετοχὴν.  

Clement Paedagogus II. X.90.4. ἢ αἰτεῖ ἢ ἔρθῃς πάντως μᾶλλον ἀποκρίνεται τῇν κοινωνίαν καθίσας ὑμέναι πρὸς μίαν ἀρρητοστίας τοῖς νεότοις.  

Clement Paedagogus II. X.87.3. ἢ αἰτεῖσθαι ἀνθρώπως κοινωνῆσαι...  

Clement Paedagogus III. XII.23.1. ἢ αἰτεῖσθαι παλαιότοις Ῥωμαῖοις νομοθέτες ἄνθρωπων ἐκλεκτοῖς ἐπιστήμοις ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινωνίας τῷ πρὸς τῷ διὸ καὶ τοῦ κοινωνίας τῷ πρὸς τῷ διὸ καὶ τοῦ κοινωνίας τῷ πρὸς τῷ διὸ καὶ τοῦ κοινωνίας τῷ πρὸς τῷ διὸ καὶ τοῦ κοινωνίας...  

Clement Strom. IV. XIX.123.2. ἢ ἐλεύθερος αἰτεῖ ἢ αὐτῆς κοινωνίας μηδὲν πείδεις τῆς ἀνθρώπως κοινωνίας σπάσεις τῶν πρὸς εὐαισθησίαν περίπουν...
Clement Stromata IV. XX. 127. 2. ...συλλήφτωρα καὶ κοινωνίαν τῆς 
τοιμάσεως πράξεως τῶν θεῶν εἶναι νομίζουσα.

Clement Stromata IV. III. 12. 1. Ὑδάτως μὲν εἶναι ἡ ἐν ρώμῃ 
κοινωνίᾳ τῆς φυλής ἀμαρτησίας οὕτως, ὡς ἐδὲ ἡ χωρίσμεν ἡ ἁμαρτίας.

Clement Stromata IV. IV. 17. 1. ἢδέι ἢ πρὶν τινα ὁμοστοι, ὡνοῦ 
τοῦ δώματος κοινωνίας, ὡς ὁ οὕτως παραδίδοις ἐπιθυμοῦσα τῇ πρὸς τῶν 
οντισμορχῶν ἐπιθύμεια ...

Clement Stromata IV. VII. 27. 2. ...Θείμα δὲ τῶν θεῶν ἐπίγνωσι τῶν 
θεῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖ θείως ἡμώνας...

Clement Stromata IV. VII. 47. 4. Καθὼς κοινώνετε τῶν τῶν Χριστοῦ 
pαιδισμοί, ἡμεῖς...

Clement Stromata IV. XIII. 90. 3. τὶς κοινωνία πνεύματος...

Clement Stromata IV. XVI. 101. Ἰεωτὸ μὲν οὐνίσκοντος τοῦ καὶ Θάλατον 
ἐπαρίστομεν, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων ἐγγένετε.

Clement Stromata V. XIII. 83. 5. ἢ σοφία, δύναμις θεοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς...

Clement Stromata V. IX. 57. 5. ἢ τὶς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;

Clement Stromata V. IX. 59. 1. Ναὶ μὴν καὶ ὁ Παραθύρῳ συνεσθε καὶ 
ἡ πρὸς τοὺς δυνάτας διεαίρεσι κοινωνίας, ἀκουστικοῦς τῶν πολλῶς καὶ τῶν 
μαθηματικοὺς ἐπάρκεια καλούμα...

Clement Stromata VI. X. 81. 1. ἢ πρὶς ἐκ τῆς πάθους πλάνης καὶ προδοσίας 
άνθιον τοῦ μὴ δύνασθαι διαλύσειν, πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλήλους ἐκ ἐνόμω 
κοινωνεῖ καὶ πρὸ ἀληθεύειν.

Clement Stromata VII. IX. 52. 1. πρὸς τὸν θειόν συναρέιν τοῖς καὶ κοινωνίαν 
καταλείπεις.

Clement Stromata VII. XI. 62. 3. ἢ τῶν κοινωνῶν τοῦ βίου...

Clement Stromata VII. XII. 80. 1. κοινωνεῖν τοῖς οἴδαν ἀγαθῶν προβολόμενοι, 
τοῖς φιλότοις...

Clement Stromata VIII. III. 4. 2. ὧν τὸ προβλήθειν ὅσον μεταλλάζειν 
χρῆ τοῖς λόγον ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῖς καίσαρᾶς τοῖς κοινωνοῦσι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ...

Clement Stromata I. XXV. 166. 1. ἔθεσι τῶν ἑκείνων ἐπορεύοντα 
συμπαθεῖς τοῖς καὶ κοινωνία τῆς πρὸς ἀληθεύειν...
Clement Eclog. Proph. 55.1. Οἱ ἀντέχοντες σῶμα την πνευματικήν, κοινωνηκότας ἔφυγον ἐξελθοῦν διοικοῦντα...

Clement Protrepticus IV, 48.6. οὕτω καὶ τοῦτο σημεῖον ὑπερτεταλήτο τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς καθηγίας...

Clement Stromata I, XXI, 142.2. οὕτω καὶ τῆς τοῦτος σήματος σημεῖον τῆς κοινωνίας, ἐξηγεῖται ὡς ἐξήγερσις, ὧν καὶ ἡ κοινωνία πλεούση τοῦτος σημεῖον τῆς κοινωνίας.

Clement Stromata VIII, VIII. 24. Διάδοσις ἡ καὶ νόμος, οὗτος ἑπόθετο καὶ καὶ καλή, καὶ οὖν καὶ λόγον ἔχουσιν ἐξελθοῦν μηδὲ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου κοινωνίας, ἐξηγεῖται διὰ διδάσκεις, ὧν ἐκεῖνον ὑποκειμένον.

Justin Apologies XIV, 2. Εἰς πάντας μᾶλλον στέρησετο, καὶ καὶ οὐκ ἔχειν εἰς κοινωνίαν φέρετο καὶ καὶ πάντας σχολής κοινωνίας.

Justin Apologies XV, 10. Εἰς τοῦτο κοινωνίας τοις σχολής καὶ σχολὴς πρὸς θάνατον ταῦτα ἑποθεῖ καὶ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σχολὴς καὶ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σχολής ἐνδοξάσθηκαν, καὶ ἐκδικηθήκαν.

Hermas The Shepherd 51. 2. 9. Γίγνεσθαι οὖν ἄμφοτεροι κοινωνία τοῦ ἔρημος τοῦ ἡμετέρου.

Origen Comm. on Matth. XI, 9. 489. Εἰς τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, φησίν, οὗτος ἐνθαρρυνήσθησθαι περίπτωσιν χρείας καὶ οὐκέναις μὲν καὶ θεωροῦσι καὶ ἐποδεικνύοντες εἰς τὸν καθῆκον καὶ τοῦ τῶν πεντελῶν λόγων, διὰ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς καὶ τοῖς εὐφροσύνους ὑπὸ εὐκρίνειας (ὡς θάνατος τῶν θεωροῦσιν αὐτοὺς κοινωνίας).

Origen Comm. on Matth. XI, 9. 489. Ἐπετέλεσεν τοῦτος γονέως τιμῆς μέρος ὅτι καὶ τὸ κοινωνίας αὐτοὺς τῶν διδασκαλίας καὶ τῶν κοινωνικῶν.

Busebius Demonstratio Evangel. III. 64. Ἐξύπνοος δὲ τῆς τοῦ τοῦτος προσφέρεις καὶ τῶν παραφράσεων ἐπεστρεφείς καὶ τοῦ παραφράσεως καὶ τοῦ κοινωνικοῦ περί παλαιότερος εἰς ἐκεῖνος, συμφωνεῖς δὲ μιᾶς διδασκαλίας εἰς τὸ ἐνδοξάσθηκαν τοῦτος, εἰς τὸ δεινὸν ἔτι εἰς τὴν σκολὴν.

Theodore Kirchengesch. IV, 13. 2. δὲ ἐστίν ὁμολογεῖται μὲν νεώς ὃς ἐν τῷ τοῦ καθῆκον λόγῳ, ἐν τῷ δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ, τῇ πρῶτῃ τῶν γένους ἡμέρας τῶν ὕπειρης τῆς κοινωνίας προτερεῖς τῆς νωμον καὶ προμεροδομὴν ἀδιαφορίαν ἄνευ χαμηλῆς συναφείας ἐχεῖν αὐτόν ἐξελθόμεθαν.

Origen Comm. on Matth. XIV, 13. 632. Ὅπως τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεταφράσεως ὑποδοθέν ταῦτα τοῦ γονεῖς, ἄρα ὡς ἔχων ἑκοὺς αὐτοὺς ἠδὲ παρὰ τῶν τῶν τεκνῶν.

Origen Comm. on Matth. XI, 9. 489. Ἐπετέλεσεν τοῦτος γονέως τιμῆς μέρος ὅτι καὶ τὸ κοινωνίας αὐτοὺς τῶν διδασκαλίας καὶ τῶν κοινωνικῶν.
Origen Homil. in Lucam VII. Επειδή γὰρ παρθένος οὐδὲν ἐν γάστη σωματίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν εὐσκλημανίας φύσις, σωματικῶς μὲν ὕπαινε, συμμετέχει δὲ καὶ ἐν κοινωνία, ὡς ἐπεὶ ἐρέα τὸ παράλογος ἀκολουθοῦντος φησὶν. κηρύχθη δὲ καὶ γοῦν, μοι τὸν κύριον.

Origen Comm. on Matth. XVII. 21. 79. ἔχεις πρὸς ἄλλους κοινωνίας, ἄνθρωπος μεταλαμβάνεται καὶ γεννώνης ἐποίη ταῦτα ἐκ τοιούτων ἁμαρτῶν λογικὰ γεγονότα.

Methodius Symposium III. 13. 85. Καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀξιωματικὴν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἀναφορεῖν καὶ τὴν δημοψήφισιν, ἐπέπεμψαν ἀλλάν ταῖς ὁρίουσιν κοινωνίας χαμηλάται καὶ τὴν ἀξιωματικὴν ἐκπρόβλησιν νομικοὶ περιόδον οὐκ Ἐφεσίου, ἐὰν ἄλλοτε ἐκφράσωσιν.

Methodius Symposium III. 11. 80. καὶ ἔνοχος ὁ θεοτόκος, πονητῶν ἀναφορεῖν καὶ τὴν δημοψήφισιν, ἐπέπεμψαν ἀλλάν ταῖς ὁρίουσιν κοινωνίας χαμηλάται καὶ τὴν ἀξιωματικὴν ἐκπρόβλησιν νομικοὶ. περιόδον οὐκ Ἐφεσίου, ἐὰν ἄλλοτε ἐκφράσωσιν.


Methodius Symposium VII. 4. 159. καὶ ἔνοχος ὁ θεοτόκος ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ ἐκφράσωσιν τῆς ἁγίας ἡ Οἰκουμένη θὰ τῶν καθεκάσθω προφήτων, ἐν παρθένοις, ἐπεί δὲ καθορισμένης ἐκκλησίας τῶν βίῳ σωτηρία ὁταν τὴν πρὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν κοινωνίαν.

Methodius Symposium VII. 8. 166. μόνον ἀρχαῖος ἐστὶν οἱ πόροι εἰπεῖν ἀποστολὴς καὶ ἄμεσας διὰρέθη καὶ πάνες ὑπερήφανα διὰ τὴς δικαιοσύνης κοιμῶς καὶ καλλίζει, ὡς καὶ πάντες μοναστικὰς καὶ τῶν ἔρωτ θεαμάτων ἐξερευνημένοι εἰπεῖν πάνες ὑπερήφανα διὰρέθης θαλαγχής τῇ ὁσίῳ ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ καθημερινωτὸς κοινωνίας ἀναφερθέται τῆς ἀναλογίας τοῦ μονογένους, ἀπὸ καθορισμένης εἰς καὶ ἐνωδεῖσιν.

Acta Martyrii Justin et Soc. καὶ καὶ τῆς ἠθοποιεῖ αἰσθητώς θαυμάσθη ἄνευ ήμῶν υἱῶν τῆς τῆς ἐθνὸς λόγων. ἦν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν. ὥστε δὴ ὁ ἄνθρωπος λάτρειας θεολογοῦ ἐστιν. καὶ καθημερινῶς εἰπεῖν. θαυμάτως εἰπεῖν. Ναὶ, λάτρειας εἰμι. 

Origen Against Celsus VIII. 17. Μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ θὰ Κέλσως φιλον μᾶς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀνάλλως καὶ νέος ἀνθρώπων φιλεῖται εἰπεῖν ἐπεὶ τὸ πιστὸν ἀνὴν ἀφάντος καὶ ἀποκρητὸς κοινωνίας ὑποτάσσεται εἰς τὸ κύριον.

Origen Against Celsus VIII. 20. Οὐκ εἰς τὸ πιστὸν ἀνὴν ἀφάντος καὶ ἀποκρητὸς κοινωνίας καὶ τῇ τουτούς ἐκκλησίας ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀνάλλως καὶ νέος ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦτοις διὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦν σιδερακλαίνεται τῶν ῥίπτων εἰς τὸ μὲν ἑαυτῶν ἱστορίας σχολήσει με τὸν οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ τὴν διὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦν ἑαυτῶν ἱστορίας.
Origen Against Celsus VIII.24.Εἴ μὲν οὖδὲν ταύτα ἔστι τὰ ἔδωκά, οἱ δὲ οἷον κοινωνεῖ δὴ πανοικίας, εἰ δ' εἰσί τίνες φαίνεσθε, δειλινοί καὶ οὕτωι τοῖς θεοῖς εἰσίν, οἷς καὶ πιστεύετε καὶ καλλιεργεῖτε καὶ καλῶς νόμος καὶ προσκυνεῖτε, ἵνα εἰμένεις ὑμεῖς.

Origen Against Celsus VIII.30.Τὸ μὲν ὅπ' ἐνδοξότων θυεῖται, καὶ οὐ χρῆ τὸν τῷθεν ἀνθρώπον κοινωνὰς τραπέζης συμφωνοῖς γίνεσθαι.

Origen Against Celsus V.41. ἐκ δ' ὥσι τοὺς ἐνδοξοὺς ἐδοξοῦσας συμφωνοῦσι τε καὶ τὸν ἄλλον κοινωνίαν ὅτι οὐκ ἐξηγοῦτον καθὼς ἀποκαλεῖτον, ἡς ἐπικάλεσαν οὐδὲ τῷ περὶ οὐφραντῷ δόμα τῷ ἐνδοξῷ λόγῳ, τἀλλας τὰ πᾶντα ἐδίδετο καὶ περίπτεσιν, ὡς που οὐκ ἦν ἠρονος, πάλιν ἐδοξοῦσιν.

Origen Against Celsus V.43. καὶ μὴ ρωσάεται δὴ Κέλεσ, ἐνδοξότων τι εἰς ἐδοξοὺς ὑπαίτιοι ὅτι μόνον τῶν πολλῶν ἄλλα καὶ τῶν ψευδοφιλόσοφων, καὶ μὲν ψευδοφιλόσοφοι μετὰ τῶν σεμνῶν ἐν ψευδοφιλίᾳ, καταπίπτοντες ἐκ τῆς ἐνδοξοῦς καὶ τῶν διάλογων, ὑπαίτιοι δ' ἐνδοξοῦς καὶ δ' ἐπικάλεσαν μόνον χωρίᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ πλήρει θεῷ, καὶ κατάλυσα τίνης ἐνδοξοῦς συμφωνοῦται καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ὡς ἰσόν καὶ ἅμας ἐκ τρεῖς συμφώνων καὶ κοινωνικῶν.

Origen Against Celsus VI.2. οὐκ ὥσαν, ἐν οἷς χαρίζεις φράζεται δὲ ἀποκαλείτον καὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν ἐν σωφρονίσει λόγον καὶ καταπίπτοντας μετὰ τῶν σεμνῶν ἐν φράσει λόγου καὶ ἀποκαλείτον, ὅς ἐνδοξοῦς καὶ κοινωνικόν εἰς κακιδίαν θείων καὶ διάχορο εὐνυχαίρον.

Origen Against Celsus VII.61. Οὐκ ἐντὸς μυστηρίως δὲ καὶ κοινωνικῶς συμφωνεῖ 'ἐν μυστηρίῳ ἀπεκκριμίμενος, ἐντὸς προσώπως δ' ἐν τοῖς διάλογοις εἰς ὅμοιον οὖν...
Martyrum Polycarpi VI.2. καὶ δ' εἰρήνας, δ' εκκλησίαν τοῖς ἀνέμοις Ἡρωδοῖς ὑπευθεν ἐπὶ τοῖς τάσσον ἀνέμοις εἰσελήλθεν, εἰς ἡκέμιον οὖν τοῖς Ιωάννου κλάδου διήρκεια, Χριστοῦ κοινωνίας δεδομένος, οὗ δὲ προδότες ἦσαν τὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Τισώδι ἐπισκόπησαν τιμωρίαν.

Eusebius Kirchenges. IV.15.40 οὔτε ἀνατύπωσι καὶ βάσιμως πανομοσχ. δ' ἀνακηρύσσε οὐ γίνεται τῶν σιγῶν, καὶ δὲν ὁ μέγας αὐτῷ τῇ μνήμῃ καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ ἐρχούσας ἀναπελήπτης πολιτείας ἐστηραγμένων τε ἐν τοῖς ἀδρασίαις σφετέρων καὶ βασιλέως ἀναπελήπτης ἐπιτυγχανόμενων, ἐπιτεθεῖσαι δὲ καὶ μὴ δὲ τοῖς συμμέτοιχοι αὐτῷ ἥμιν λειτεθεί, καὶ πολὺν ἐπιδιορθοῦντος τοῦτο ποιημένος καὶ κοινωνίας τῷ ὁμίῳ αὐτοῦ σερικὸ.


Gregory Naz. Eclogae de Bas. LXXII.5. ἄνωθεν καὶ μοναστηρίῳ δειμάμενος μὴν, ἐν τῇ πυρῷ δὲ τῶν κοινωνιῶν καὶ μισάς, ὅπερ ὑπέτειχος την ἐνεργείαν διπλούσην, καὶ μετὰ εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τὴν ἀλλήλων χωρίαν, ἔτη μηκετε ὁ προθετῶν ἀπειροθήκη νήπιοι εἰς τοὺς πράκτορας ἀποφθηγμάτων.

Eusebius Kirchenges. V.24.17. καὶ τοῖς εἰρήνας ἐπετέλομεν ζητούμενης ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίας παρεχομένης ἐν Ἀνάκτονω τὴν κοινωνίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίας παρεχομένης, καὶ μετὰ εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τὴν ἀλλήλων ἀπειροθήκην, πάσης ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνης ἐχόμενον, καὶ τῶν ἐτεροντῶν καὶ τῶν μὴ τρισχείων.

Athanasius Vit. S. Ant. 690.9. Καὶ μηδὲν ἀπεκριθη εἰς ταιντροχωρία, ἀλλ' ὑπέφερεν πρὸς τοὺς αἰρητικοὺς Ἀρειούνους.

Theodore Kirchenges. I.30.1. Ἀρπάγοις τούς Μελισσίων κοινωνιῶν ἐπίσκοπος ἦν.

Athanasius Ep. Ad Drac. 209.4. Δεί χρή ὑμᾶς κατὰ σκοπὸν τῶν ἀνίκων καὶ τῶν πατέρων πολεμεώνθηδα, καὶ τούτων μιμεῖσθηνει σεισμοί δὲ, ὅτι, τούτων διαστάζοντοι, ἀλλότριοι καὶ τοῖς τούτων κοινωνίας ἱερά ἐστι.

Sozomenus Kirchenges. IV.24.10. καὶ δὲς τοῦ Ἡρῴδου ἔπεισομεν, ὅτι ἐπεκρίνοις τούς τοὺς συνάδους, ἄθροις μεταγενεσμένους, εἰς κύκλον ἐφικομένους ἐξειροθήκην ἐκκλησίας.

Athanasius Ep. ad Epis. 725.9. καὶ ἔλλος ἡμᾶς ἀνεμένη τῶν Αὐτηπρωτιστῶν σώματος προθετήμενης εἰς τῆς τοῦ Δοῦαν πρὸς αὐτὸ κοινωνίας τε καὶ ἐνυπόλεον.

Athanasius Vit. S. Ant. 677.66. ἢ γὰρ ἐτέλεσαν τῆς τούτου συνυπάρχειν τῇ Παρθένου ἀνθὲς μίαν ἐκεί κοινωνίαν πρὸς τοὺς ὅστιστοις Ἀρεινοῦ.

Athanasius Ep. ad Mon. 771. Ἣν οὖν μὴ τούτῳ γενέσθαι, ἐξελέγοντο, ἀλλὰ μὲν παμφρῶς φρονοῦντας τὰ τῆς ἀπεβείας ἀποστρέφεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ νομίζοντες τὰ Ἀρείου μὴ φρονεῖν, κοινωνοῦντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν φιλάθεσθαι. καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν τὰ φρόνημα ἀποστρέφεσθαι, τούτους ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας προσήκει φεύγειν. Ἐπὶ δὲ τις προσποιεῖται μὲν ὀμολογεῖν ἐρήμου πις, φανερῶς δὲ κοινωνῶν ἐκείνων, τὸν τοιούτου προσερέχεσθαι ἀπεχθαίρετον τῆς τοιαύτης συνθέσεως.

John Chrysostom Ep. IX 1b. ὁ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐκ τοῦ καθολικοῦ ἀνίκητο καὶ ὁ ἀνδρὶ δεῖκεν ἑαυτόν ἐκείνων ἐκείνων ἐκείνων πρὸς τὸν μέχρι λόγου κοινωνεῖν εἰς τῶν παρὰ χριστιανῶν τῆς ἁλθεῖαν...

Athanasius Ep. Encycl. 5.4. καὶ οὐ μὴν ἐξερχυμένοι παρ' ἑαυτοῦ διὰ τῆς ἀπεβείας ἐξερχομαι τῆς ἀρτηρίας τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, δὲ δὲ τοῦ διὸν λαὸς καὶ οἱ κληρικοὶ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας μὴ δίκαιως ἐις κοινωνίαν τῆς ἀπεβείας τῶν θεοφάνων Ἀρείου καὶ μὴ εὐδιδόθαι εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας.


Athanasius Apol. ad Con. 248.29. τοὺς δὲ λαοὺς καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς πάντας ἀναγκάζομαι κοινωνεῖν τῇ Ἀρείᾳ ἀπεβείᾳ. τού δὲ μὴ ὑπακοόνσον, ἀποβλήσεῖ τοὺς τοιούτους.

Athanasius Apol. Secund. 49.4. καὶ ἐκρίσαμεν μὴ λογοῦ αὐτοῖς ἐπισκόπους μὴ εἶναι, ὡς ὅδε κοινωνίας μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν αὐτῶν καταστίσωμαι.

Athanasius Hist. Arian. 32.2. οὗ τὸν ἑρήμου βασιλεὺς τοῦ ὅστιστος τῶν ἐπισκόπων πλῆθος, τὰ μὲν ἐπειδῆ, τὰ δὲ ἐπισκόπους ἐπειδήν, ὡς ὅδε ἐπειδῆν μὴ ἐπισκόπους ἐπισκόπους, τοὺς δὲ ὑπακοόνσον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκόπους, τοὺς δὲ ὑπακοόνσον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκόπους, τοὺς δὲ ὑπακοόνσον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκόπους.

Athanasius Apol. Secund. 56.2. ἐγὼ τούτω πρὸς τοὺς τῶν κοινωνοῦσαν Ἀθανασίων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προστάχθην εὐφράστηθα, τῶν τούτων ἀπαλλοθωμὼν βουλώμεθα.
Athenasius Hist. Arian. 28.1. ἂλλα ταύτα ἄκουσθες καὶ βλέποντες οἱ λαοὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς αἰσθήσεως τῶν περὶ Εὐσεβίου Λεότυντος καὶ Ἴπόκοπος ἐν οὖν ὡς λαῖκον κοινώνειν ἔχον, οὕτως ἐμοὶ ἀπεφανείς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μετὰ ἔκκοιμης λοιπόν κοιμᾶσθαι μετὰ Εὐσεβίου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐκκοιμήσας μὲν αὐτούς, λεγόντας δὲ παρθένῳ, λεγόντας, τε καὶ ἱκανόν γαλακτώρος καὶ Ναρκίσσος, οἴνον καὶ βι ἐν τῇ σωματώ καθορίσθηναι, μεγάλως ἐχόντων ἑνώσοντο.

Athenasius Hist. Arian. 30.3. καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ δειμόμενος, ὃς πρὸς Ἕλεξτριῶν ἐπέσυνεν, καὶ ἐλένευσαν τὴν πρὸς Ἀθηνάδον τῆς ἐπικοπίας κοινωνίαν ὡς ὅποι πρῶτο ἄναρχες ἐπεβάλλεσαν τὴν γνώμην καὶ ὅποι ἐρημικοὶ ἐφημερίζοντον, ἂλλα καὶ ὁ ἐρημικὸς ἐπελέξθη καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὸν ἀδέρφον καθηκόντων ἐφόνων ἐγέρνει.

Athenasius Hist. Arian. 30.3. εἰς δὲ τὰ ἐγεῖ προστάτευτα πάλιν, καὶ νοτάριοι μετὰ πάλιν καὶ παλαιόης ἐρωτοκρίτου γέγονες, ἀπεστάλλοντο πρὸς τοὺς ἐπικόποις καὶ τοὺς δικαστὰς ὡς ὁ μὲν δικαστὴς ἐπείρωσεν, ὁ δὲ ἐπικόπος ὁ τῶν κατὰ Ἀθηνάδον ἄγραφοι κοινωνίας ἐχόντες πρὸς τοὺς Ἀριστοκράτους τῆς εἰσαχθείναι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμπιστευθῆναι οἷον τοῦτο τὸν ἐπιμένον, ἐμπρόσθεν, καὶ οὔτε καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τῶν ἐκείνων ἐδέξασθαι μεταμεμειωθέν.

Theodoret Kirchenes. IV.18.3. Τοιχορτοὶ ἔρημος ὁ ὑπάρχως, κοινωνόντων τῷ βασιλεύς. καὶ ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ ἀλλὰ χρηστῶς προσφέρεις καὶ ἐφέρες καὶ μετὰ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῆς ἰστικοκρατίας μεταλαμβάνεις. καὶ ἐν ὑπάρχως τῆς εἰσασθείναι αὐτοῦς ἐμπιστεύεσθαι διακατετάλευσεν καὶ διδοκρατίας κατὰ τῶν προαγόμενον κρατοῦντας καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων προεξεχθείσων. σοὶ τούτου ἐπιμένον, ἐμπρόσθεν, καὶ οὔτε καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τῶν ἐκείνων ἐδέξασθαι μεταμεμειωθέν.

Theodoret Kirchenes. IV.37.1. ὡς τὸν Ἱσραήλ ἐδιαίρεσε πρὸς τὸν Βαλκανικόν τῆς ἑρμήνευσας, ἐπικοπήν τὴν ἐπικοπήν ἐπετειλάτοι τὸν Ἠσίοδον. ἐδιαίρεσε τῷ βασιλείᾳ πειναῖς γιὰ κοιμώσεις τοὺς νόσοις. πάλαι γὰρ τῆς ἐκκοιμήσεως ἀκίνητως δεξαμενος τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἐνεπέφυγεν ἀσύνετος.

Theodoret Kirchenes. IV.37.3. τοῦτον καὶ λόγος ἀμφικλήσεως ἐνδεχόμενος καὶ ἀρμονίας ἐξελάτος πείγα τρεικάς εὐς βασιλέως τῶν βασιλέως κοινωνίας ἐπιτάσσερα.

Theodoret Kirchenes. IV.37.5. ἄλλος δὲ εἰς τὴν συνάντησιν τοῦ πάντων διδασκόντων κατέληπτον καὶ γὰρ Ἐφράμις Ἐσφαλμάς καὶ Βαλκανικοῦ κοιμώσεις πείνας αὐτοῖς ὧδε εἴναι δομάτων ἐμφανίζοντας ἀλλὰ ὑπερακόμενος ἐπιμένεις τῷ διαιτητῷ.

Theodoret Kirchenes. V.37.4. οἷς ἑκάστοι, μὲν γὰρ καὶ τίμερον, οἷς ἡμεῖς μὲν τῶν πατέρας λεγομεναι τὸν οἶκος, καὶ ὡς δὲ τῶν ὑδέων ἐπείν ὑπέχοντες, καὶ τοῖς κοιμώσεις τοῖς λεγομεναῖς.

Theodoret Kirchenes. V.2.1. νομίζως γὰρ ἐγκατάστασε καὶ τῶν ἐκκοιμήτων ποιμένας ἐπεμβαθήνει κοινωνίας καὶ τοῖς σφαιραίς ἐποδημάπτων ποιμένας καὶ τοῖς ἔρευνοις διαφορέσι τοῖς καθηκόντων προσημολογοῦμεν.
Eusebius Kirchenges. VI. 43. 10. Εξ ἵνα εἰς μεν οὖν πολὺ ἐπανδήθην ἐστὶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιοδομῶς καὶ ἐξομολογοῦμες τὸ ἐναντίον ἀμαρτημα, ὥστε καὶ ἐκκοινώσεσθαι λαϊκῷ, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιλεξότας πάντα τοῦ παρόντος λιμῷ.


Eusebius Kirchenges. VII. 5. 4. ἐπιτάξαι μὲν οὖν πρότερον καὶ περὶ Ἐλένου καὶ περὶ Οἰκινείου καὶ πάντων τῶν τε ἐπὶ Κιλικίας καὶ Καππαδοκίας καὶ οἱ τῆς Ἕλληνικῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἔχουσι δυσμορικῶν ἐθνῶν, δέ οὔτε ἐκκοινώσεσιν διὰ τὴν ἀκόμην τάσαν τῶν ἁγίων, ἐπεῖδη τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς, φησίν, ἀναβατεῖ ὑσσονί.

Dionysius of Alex. Ep. V. 5. ἢ παρὰ τοὺς ἀἱρετικοὺς βεβαίως, μὴ τοῦτο εἶναι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξειν εἰς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα κοινωνίαν.

Dionysius of Alex. Ep. V. 5. ὑπὲρ ἔκριμα μὲν οὖν ἐκκοινώσεσιν ποιήσας, φησίς ἀκραία τὴν παλαιᾷνν ἄκος καὶ κοινωνίαν εἰς τὸ σῶμα γεγονεῖαι.

Paschal Homilies I. τοὺς τοῖς εἰς εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐπεθύμους ἀντεπείτηκε τῆς κοινωνίας ἀντεπείτηκε τῆς κοινωνίας, ἀντεπείτηκε τῆς κοινωνίας, ἀντεπείτηκε τῆς κοινωνίας.

Paschal Homilies III. ἢ ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας, ἢ ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας, ἢ ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας.

Paschal Homilies III. ἢς ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας, ἢς ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας, ἢς ἐπείτηκε τοῖς εἰς κοινωνίας.

Isidore of Pelus. Ep. Liber I. 228. κοινωνία κέκληται ἢ κοινωνίας μεταλλησις, διὰ τὸ τὴν πρὸς Χριστὸν χαρίζεσθαι ἐνιαυτα, καὶ κοινωνίας ἡμῶν τῆς αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν βασιλείας.

Athenasius De Sent. Dionys. 17. 1. ὅτι δὲ οὐκ έκκοινωσθήσεται πατὴρ μιᾷ, ἢ πατὴρ, προκαταλείποντον χάριν ἐπὶ τοῦ νανάσας τῷ θεύμα, οὐκετε δὲ ὁδοίς ἀποκορυφαία τοῦ πατρᾶ, ἢ μὲ πατὴρ προσφοραία ὁμολογίας κοινωνίας, ἐν τοῖς χεριν καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ νευρῷ μιᾶς τοῦ πεποντος μιᾶς τοῦ φεροντος νουμένων θεραπευών.

Athenasius Or. III Con. Ar. 442. 9. ποίησις γὰρ κοινωνίας τῆς ἀληθινῆς καὶ εἰς μὴ ἄλλιν ἔστασιν.

Basil. of Caes. De Spir. San. 121a. ὁτι μὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντοτε, αὐτοῦς ποιεῖται ἀλλιν, ποιεῖται ἀλλιν, ἀλλιν, ποιεῖται ἀλλιν, ποιεῖται ἀλλιν.

Basil of Caes. De Sanc. S. 152a. καὶ ἕνεκα λόγου εἰς τὸν ἔσοχα τὴν ἐπανειλημμένην καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγνώσεως ὁ τρόπος, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ προαχόμενος, ὁ γεννήτωρ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος παλαιός, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐντὸς ἐμὸν στυματάς ἑώς.


Basil of Caes. De Sanc. S. 156a. Πάθους ἐν συν τῆς ἑπερικοσμίας πάντα χρόνος τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ ἐπανειλημμένης λαμβανομεν, εἰπέρ ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ Ἰσίου κοινωνία ἡ ἀξιόλογοτέρας, ὁ τρόπος, ἐντὸς ἐμὸν στυματός ἑώς εἰς τὴν ἡμερίαν, ἐπιτελεῖ τὸν θεοῦ ἐνεργείας, ἐντὸς ἐνοικοῦσι τῶν δρών, ἐν τῷ εἰς τὸ ὑπερήνων ἱεράς τῶν ἁγίων.

Basil of Caes. De Sanc. S. 182a. Ἀρίστη δὲ ταύτη παραδείγματα, καὶ τῆς ἐν πάση κοινωνίας ἐπιλαμβάνουσα, ἐπὶ τοῦ Πατροῦ καὶ Ἰσίου διαστάντα, ὁτι ἐν τῷ καθό τοῦ Πνεύματος ἑώς εἰς τὸν κοινωνίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος μετατρέπεται.


Basil of Caes. De Sanc. S. 177b. Ὑπὲρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνεργεῖ ἐν τῷ ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὴν κοινωνία τῶν ἐνεργείας παράστασιν. ἡ ἐν, τοῦ ἐν, πρόδειπτο τὴν κοινωνίαν παρὰ συνενεκτικισμοί.


Athanasius VitaS. Ant. 630. 72. Ἀπείτε τι βελτίων ἐστι, λέγειν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ δόγμα ὅμοι ἐμμέτρητο, ἀλλὰ δεδομένοι τὰν ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἐπεργεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἁπάντα ἐνθάνθην, ὡς ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπινη γενέτευς κοινωνίας, ποιητὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κοινωνίας, δειλινα καὶ νοστάς φιλεῖσθαι...

Athanasius Or. III Con. Ar. 468. 40 Ο μέτωπος ἐδών εἶναι, ὅτι εἰς δόγμα τῶν, τούτων καὶ γενόμενος ἀνθρώπος, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἀντίκτυπου, ἀνθρώπων πληρωμαί λέγει, ὡς ἂν αὐτῶν ὁ ἀνθρωπος, τοῦ μέν καὶ τοῦ τῆς γῆς ἡ κοινωνία γενόμενος, δειλινα καὶ νοστάς, λογίων, ἐκείνων κατα δικαίωμα...

Athanasius Ep. I ad Ser. 543. 30 Ο πτερός ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός ἔτη οὗ, οὗ οὔτε ἀρπαγήν χάρις, οὔτε δὲ ἡ γένους κοινωνία τὸς σώσεσθαι ἐν ἔρωτι, εἰ μή ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἔθελον.


Dionysius Ar. De Eccl. H. III. III. ἢ τὸ πάντα βοηθήσας, τῇ καὶ ἀπειπήσας, θεία πρόειρος, ἔστιν τοῦ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὕτως ἀνθρώπους κοινωνίαν, ἀλλ' ἦν διὰ τούτων ἔστιν ἀνθρώπους συνοπτοποιήσεις καὶ ἀπειπήσεις μίν

Dionysius Ar. De Cael. H. IV. 1. Ἰσθή τούτω τῶν πάντων ἀρίστας καὶ ἐπερ πάντα αὐτότητος ἤδη, τοῖς πρὸς κοινωνίαν εἰσεῖσθαι τῇ φαίνεται, ὡς ἐκάθεν τῶν ὅνεων ἔστιν τὸς τῆς ἄνθρωπος ἀναλογίας.


Dionysius Ar. De Cael. H. IX. II. Τῶν τούτων ἐπιπέτευρα τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ μή καὶ πρός, καὶ μετά, καὶ τελευταῖα συνόρων ἔχουσα, οὐ τῶν ἀρχικῶν ὑπερ ἀνθρώπων κοινωνίας, τὰς καθ' ἡγεμονίαν καὶ κοινωνίαν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀναλογίας...

Dionysius Ar. De Eccl. H. III. V. Ἀλλ' ἐπειπήσας τῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῷ καθάλοι αὐτῷ ἀναλογίας ἐν τῶν κοινωνίαν ἐναντίον καὶ, πρὸς ἐν τῷ ἐγκαλεῖται, ἀναθεμάτισθαι, ἀπαντήσεις τῆς τὸν ἐκκλησίας καθ' ἀναλογίας κοινωνίας, ἔστιν τὴν ἀναθεμάτισθαι ἐναντίον ἀναθεμάτισθαι...

 resilas, τῶν τούτων ἐπιπέτευρα ἄραις καθαρῶς... καὶ τῶν καθαρῶν
Dionys. Areop.DeCael.H. IV.2. Νομέως γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ θεομάτιον ἐκεῖς ἀποκατότομα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν θεραπείαν ἐμφανίσας ἐπικράτωσας δρώθα, καὶ μορφοῦν ἐφιλαμμένη τὸν νοσοῦν αὐτῶν ἔλεος, ἀφθονοτερὰς εἴσε ὄψιν τὰς πρὸς αὐτῶν κοινωνίας, προσεχεῖς μὲν ἐνθαμ καὶ ἐκ τὰς ἀνάκτες...

Dionys. Ar. De Cael. H. XV. IX. Οἱ μὲν ἑμπύροι ποταμοὶ σμαίνοντες, σὺς θεραπείας αὐτῶς, ἀφθονούσιν αὐτῶς καὶ διναλείπτον τῇ βίβλῳ ἕρατον καὶ ἑσπερία αἰσθήσεως καὶ ἱπποδικοῦ θεραπείας ἐρωτήσεως. Τα ἄρα ἀραμεῖς τοὺς συνεδριακοὺς ὁμοσπονδίας κοινωνίαν...

Dionys. Ar. De Cael. H. XV. I. Καὶ τὸ πρῶτον τὸ ἀνάκτες οὖν ἑπιτροπεύσας ἀνατείνασθαι, καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀφθεῖσθαι εἰλαῖσθαι τοῖς οὐκέτωσιν οὖσιν φροντικῶς συνανεμών, καὶ τὸ τῆς προσομοσίας φίλος ἐν μεσθείς συνάμενες εἶναι...

Dionys. Ar. De Eccl. H. III. I. Καὶ πρῶτον γὰρ τὸ οὕτως ἐποτεύσως-μεν, ὅτου ὅλη ἑνεκα τοῦ κοινὸν καὶ τῶν ἀλλαῖοι θεραπεύσας τελείας ἐκκριτέοις ἀρχή τὰς λοιπᾶς ἀνατείνασθαι, καὶ ἐναλίας ἀναγμέναις κοινωνία τε καὶ σύνεσις...

Dionys. Ar. De Eccl. H. III. II. Καὶ μετα τότες ἐκεῖς ἡγήσονται τὰς ἑσπέρας περιοχῆς οἱ καταχαομένοι, καὶ πρὸς ἔφεσιν οἱ ἑνεργοῦμένοι καὶ οἱ ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἔνεσι, μένουσι δὲ ὧν τῆς θείης ἐπορίας καὶ κοινωνίας ἦν...

Dionys. Ar. De Eccl. H. III. II. Μεταφθάνων δὲ καὶ μεταδοτός τῆς θεραπεύσας κοινωνίας εἰς εὐχρήσην ἐφάνταστη, τῶν πολλῶν ἐν ἑς μόνα τῇ θείᾳ συμβολῇ παρακάρατον...

Dionys. Ar. De Eccl. H. IV. I. Τοσοῦτον τῆς εἰρήτης συμφέρεις ἐστὶ, καὶ ὡς καὶ τὰ νοσεῖ θέματα τὴν πρὸς τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς πολλάκις εἰρήκαις, θεραπεύσας ἐρρημοσίνας κοινωνίαν καὶ σύνεσιν...


Dionys. Ar. De Eccl. H. VII. IX. Αὐτοὶ καὶ τῶν ἐρῶν ἡ θείᾳ θεομάτιον τῆς θεραπεύσας κοινωνίας ἀμφότερος συμπέμενεν την θυγκή μεν ἐν καλῷ θεωρῆμα καὶ ἐν ἑσπερίᾳ τῶν τελουμένων, τῆς σύμφωνος δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀνάκτημα ὑπὲρ θεομάτιον μὲν ἐν εἰκόνι μορὸν, καὶ τὰ τῆς θεραπεύσας κοινωνίας ἐξερή-
# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. PRIMARY SOURCES

### A. GREEK TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
465


Die Fragmenta der Vorsokratiker. Edited by Herman Diels, 3 Vols; Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.


... The Laws. The text edited with Introduction, Notes, etc. by E. B. England. 2 vols.; Manchester: The University Press, 1921.


The Face which appears on the Orb of the Moon. Translation and Notes, with appendix by A. O. Hickard. London 1911.


The Fragments of Attic Comedy. Edited and translated by John Max- 

Theodoret. Kirchengeschichte. Die griechischen christlichen 
Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; Leipzig: J. 
C. Hinrichs, 1911.

The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite. Now first translated into 
English from the original Greek by the Rev. John Parker. 

Thucydides. Historiae. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica 
instruxit Henricus Stuart Jones. Apparatum criticum cor- 
rexit et auxit Johannes Enoch Powell. 2 vols. Oxford: 

Translated by Walter Miller, C. L. Brownson, O. J. Todd, 
E. C. Marchant. 6 vols.; Loeb Library ed.; New York: G. 
Ltd., 1925.

B. COMMENTARIES

Kamerbeek, J. C. The Plays of Sophocles: Commentaries. Part I, 
The Ajax. English translation by Dr. H. Schreuder. Re- 
vised by A. Parker. Leiden: 1953. Part II, The Trachin- 

Nederlof, Arie Bastiaan. Plutarohus' Leven van Pyrrhus: Histor- 
ische Commentaar. Amsterdam: 1940.

Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van 
Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunke. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 
LXIV; Vol. I; Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers 
Maatschappig, 1957.

Speiser, Andreas. Ein Parmenideskommentar. Studien zur Platon- 
ischen Dialektik. Zweite, erweiterte Auflage. Stutt- 

Stewart, J. A. Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. 
C. CONCORDANCES, LEXICA, GRAMMARS, INDICES VERBORUM


II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. BOOKS


Den Boer, W. *De Allegorese in het Werk van Clemens Alexandrin*. Résumé in French. Leiden: Dissertationes Inaugurales batave ad res antiquas pertinentes, 1, 1940.


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---


Meifort, Joachim. Der Platonismus bei Clemens Alexandrinus. Tübingen, 1928.


1902.


Seesemann, Heinrich. *Der Begriff κατάφορος im Neuen Testament.* Beilage XIV; Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1933.


B. ARTICLES


Blair, H. A. "Two Reactions to Gnosticism," The Church Quarterly Review, 152 (June, 1951), 141-158.


Bruck, E. F. "Ethics vs. Law: St. Paul, the Fathers of the Church and the 'Cheerful Giver' in Roman Law," Traditio, 2 (1944), 97-121.


_____. "The Literature of Christian Antiquity," Theological Studies, 24 (September, 1963), 437-463.


488

---


Jaffa, Harry V. "Aristotle," History of Political Philosophy, eds. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey (Chicago, 1963), 64-129.


Marsh, H.G. "The Use of \( \text{ΜΥΣΗΝΙΩΝ} \) in the Writings of Clement of Alexandria with Special Reference to his Sacramental Doctrine," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVII (1936), 64-80.


Murphy, Charles T. "A Survey of Recent Works on Aristophanes and Old Comedy," The Classical Weekly, IL (April, 1956), 201-211.


Scott, C. Anderson. "The 'Fellowship,' or Κοινόν,", The Expository Times, ed. A. W. Hastings and Rev. E. Hastings, XXXV, no. 12 (September, 1924), 567.

Scott-Moncrieff, P. D. "Gnosticism and Early Christianity in Egypt," The Church Quarterly Review, 69 (October, 1909), 64-84.


Smith, R. E. "Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives," Classical Quarterly, XXXIV (January-April, 1940), 1-10.


Wycherly, R. E. "Aristophanes and Euripides," Greece and Rome."

XV (October, 1946), 98-107.


---


---


---


---


C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL


The dissertation submitted by Sister Mary Carita O'Brien, B.V.M. has been read and approved by five members of the Department of History.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 5, 1966

Date

Signature of Adviser

Assistant Professor of History