Socrates has told Theages and his father Demodocus (Thg. 128d8–129a1) that misfortune befell Charmides when that young man refused to heed Socrates' warning not to practise for the Nemean Games: the δαιμόνιον had come to Socrates at the very moment Charmides informed Socrates that he was about to train, and the divine sign's apotropaic nature (128d3–7) was enough to indicate to Socrates that Charmides must stop. As a second proof of the efficacy of the δαιμόνιον in Socrates' associations with others, Socrates relates the story of Timarchus, who along with a certain Philemon, hatched an abortive plot to assassinate Nicias, the son of Heroskamandros. Socrates begins his account: εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε, τὸν Τιμάρχον ἀδελφόν Κλειτομάχου ἔρεωσε τί εἴπεν αὐτῷ Τιμάρχος ἦν ικά αὐθεντού­μενος ἢτιν ποτὲ τοῦ δαιμόνιου; εἰκείνος τε καὶ Εὔαθλος ὁ σταδιοδρόμων ὃς Τιμάρχον ὑπεδέξατο φεύγοντα (Thg. 129a1–5).

Burnet is responsible for the formal identification of the crux εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμονίου, but it appears that the obscurity of the passage was attested several centuries earlier. In his 1485 Latin translation of the dialogue, Ficino renders αὐτῷ Τιμάρχος ἦν ικά . . . αὐτῷ δεξιόν with the words cum iam moriturus esset. Is enim et Euath­lus guidem cursor qui illum fugientem suscepit . . . Ficino’s neglect of a Latin equivalent for εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμονίου might be interpreted in a couple of ways: 1) his exemplar did not contain the words, or 2) he did not understand how they should be construed and translated. A third possibility, that Ficino considered εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμονίου trivial enough to omit, has little to recommend it, since the δαιμονίου is the focus of attention for this part of the dialogue. 1) is highly unlikely: all MSS. containing Thg., one of which is in the hand of Ficino himself, preserve the problematic εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμονίου. On balance, 2) remains the likeliest possibility. In spite of this, Johannes Serranus, who supplied Stephanus with the Latin translation to his 1578 edition of Plato, felt confident enough of the meaning to turn the phrase by the words contra daemonis mandatum. This explanation satis­
fied most scholars, with hardly a murmur from a dissenting voice⁷, until Baiter⁸ suggested (he did not print) δημοσίου or δημοσίου pro δαμοσίου: ‘(straight) to the executioner/prison’⁹. Subsequently, C. F. Hermann¹⁰, Schanz¹¹, and Lamb¹², incorporated δημοσίου into their editions of the dialogue.

One thing, however, is certain: εὐθὺ τοῦ δαμοσίου cannot stand in our texts. εὐθὺ as a preposition normally (and always in Plato¹³) means ‘straight to’ or ‘to’¹⁴ (cf. Thg. 129dε εὐθὺ Ἐφέσου καὶ Ιωάννας; ‘(straight) to the δαμοσίου’ is nonsense in the present context, and no parallels have been discovered to prove the meaning contra daemonis mandatum correct¹⁵). Knebel¹⁶ thought he had found a parallel for the latter in Max. Tyr. 9.7 Ὑφ. Ἀχίλλεως νήσου οἴκει εὐθὺ Ἠστρού κατὰ τὴν Ποντικὴν θάλατταν, but the alleged similarities are illusory, for εὐθὺ in that passage is locative in sense, as contra daemonis mandatum is patently not. Nevertheless, this approach has recently been resurrected by A. Papanikolaou¹⁷, who further addsuces Hom. II. 5.849 and Hdt. 1.207.4 in defence of the MSS. reading of Thg.; but those instances too are essentially locative, and in any event we are still without adequate Attic parallels. Baiter’s suggested emendations are the most attractive solutions that have been offered, yet to my mind neither δημοσίου nor δημοσίου are wholly satisfying conjectures, as they supply a circumstantial detail which the story about Timarchus can do without. Souilhe¹⁸ is also sceptical about the text, but refuses to offer a replacement for τοῦ δαμοσίου; he prints εὐθὺ ἐπὶ τοῦ δαμοσίου.

I suggest that another explanation for the appearance of εὐθὺ τοῦ δαμοσίου at Thg. 129a3 can be offered. At a relatively early stage in the transmission of this dialogue, a note may have been entered alongside, or in the immediate vicinity of, the line or lines containing ἰδαν πάσα ἰδανομένης ἦν (perhaps supra lineam). If this note read αὔθις τὸ δαμοσίου (the point of reference is, after all, Socrates’ second anecdote about the δαμοσίου), we may imagine that marginal αὔθις was corrupted into εὐθὺ, and that the genitive required to complement εὐθὺ was

---

⁷ Cf. Ruhnken’s comment on the interpretation (Tim. Lex. s. v. εὐθὺ [ed. nova cur. G. A. Koch, Lipsiae 1828]): ‘qui formulae usus ob raritatem notandus.’
⁹ For δῆμος = ‘executioner’, cf. R. 439e8; for δημόσιον = ‘prison’, cf. Thuc. 5.18.7 (no Platonic instances of this usage). LSJ list no examples of δημόσιος = ‘executioner’ earlier than D. S. 13.102.
¹⁰ Platonis Dialogi ... ex rec. C. F. Hermann, vol. II (Lipsiae 1873).
¹³ Cf. Grg. 525α6; Lys. 203α1, b2, b3; as an adverb at Ax. 364β1.
¹⁴ But cf. H. Richards, CR 15 (1901) 442–5, who questions the nuance of immediacy implied by the translation ‘straight to’.
¹⁵ The interpretation is accepted by LSJ s. v. εὐθὺ B.1.1.a.; cf. also Ast, Lexicon Platonicum (Lipsiae 1835–38) s. v. εὐθὺ, who translates by contra, adversum.
¹⁶ Platonis Dialogi Tres: Theages, Amatores, Io proleg. et annot. instruxit H. Knebel (Confluentibus 1833) 43.
¹⁸ Platon Oeuvres Complètes 13.2 (Paris 1930).
fashioned from τὸ δαμιόνιον). This may have occurred through multiple-stage corruption: 1) αὐθής – εὐθής; αὐθής is glossed εὐθής by Hesychius, and palaeographically the alteration is easy enough; 2) εὐθής – εὐθύ). From this point it would have been a simple matter for a scribe to insert the aberrant gloss εὐθύ τοῦ δαμιόνιον into the text, without thinking a great deal about precise meaning; the most natural place for it would be after a verb of motion, in this instance ἤμε. The δαμιόνιον is moreover a topic which was bound to invite even cursory acknowledgement from a copyist: for marginal notes on the δαμιόνιον, cf. Scholia Vetera ad Alc. I 103a5–6, Arethae Scholia ad Ap. 31c8–d1; ψωνή at Ap. 31d1 is generally accepted as a gloss on the δαμιόνιον which was wrongly entered into the text as it now stands. An example of an intrusive gloss which, like the one postulated above, simply alluded in its original form to the general subject of discussion in a particular portion of the text, is Hp. ma. 283a2–3 ἢμετ ἡγεται (bracketed by Burnet [OCT], following Stallbaams; deleted by Croiset [Bude]). Since these words occur in the two MSS. families represented by TW and F, which are known to have diverged at an early stage in the history of the Platonic text, we can safely assume that the interpolation of the phrase is quite ancient.

If this analysis is correct, εὐθύ τοῦ δαμιόνιον has no place in our texts, and should be excised completely, rather than emended. Such a measure may gain support from 129a7–8 εὑρόμαι ἀποθεομένους, 129c6 ἤμε ἀποθεομένους, and 129c7 τοι ἀποθεομένους, in all of which instances the phrase εὐθύ τοῦ δαμιόνιον is absent.
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19) We may compare the behaviour of ἐμβραχυ in Platonic MSS.: when ἐν- or ἐμβραχυ appeared in an exemplar, scribes were naturally disposed to alter ἐμβραχυ to βραχεῖ, for the simple reason that ἐν takes the dative, and that ἐμβραχυ was an unfamiliar form; cf. Gr. 457b1 ἐμβραχυ BTP, ἐν βραχεῖ F; Hp. mi. 365d5 ἐμβραχυ TW, ἐν βραχεῖ F; Sm. 217a2 ἐμβραχυ Cobet, ἐν βραχεῖ BTW.


22) See the edition of W. C. Greene, Scholia Platonica (Haverford 1938) 89, 423.


24) I am grateful to Professor C. W. Müller for drawing my attention to this parallel.

25) On the future participle + εἰμι, ἔχομαι, or the like, where the verb has lost its primary notion of movement and has assumed the function of a virtual auxiliary, see V. Magnien, Le Futur Grec II (Paris 1912) 8–20.