A. 1. An object of love is not loved, because it is a loved

2. But it is a loved thing, because it is loved (ot $\phi \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota$ $\phi(\lambda o v \mu \varepsilon v o \nu)$.
B. 1. With reference to holiness in particular, it is loved by

2. Its being loved by the Gods is not what makes it holy
 of its being loved by the Gods makes it merely (A. 2) a

 is supposed to need emendation. But, taking it, as I have done, without Bast's supplement, its effect is to throw a fuller light upon the negative statement, that the circumstance of holiness being loved by the Gods is not what makes it holy, by shewing positively that this circumstance makes holiness God-loved ( $\theta \epsilon 0 \phi \lambda^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon$ ), and nothing more.
C. Hence it follows that the holy and the God-loved are not (as Euthryphro's definition implied) the same. For, on
 twofold contradiction arises.

First, it has been grauted (B. 1) that the holy is loved because it is holy. But, by hypothesis, the holy and the God-loved are the sume. Substitute, therefore, God-loved for holy in the proposition (B. 1) just quoted; and the proposition will become-the God-loved is loved because it is God-loved: which is at variance with A. 1.

 étvat é $\phi \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \tau 0$ ảv тo $\theta \epsilon о \phi(\lambda \epsilon s)$.

Again, it has been granted (A. 2) that the Godloved is God-loved because it is loved by the Gods. This proposition, by the substitution of holy for Godloved, according to the hypothesis of the identity of ro oftov with $\tau 0$ 的о $\dagger \lambda \epsilon s$, becomes-the holy is holy because it is loved by the Gods : which is at variance with B. 2.



