

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 δαίμονιον 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)¹) was enough to indicate to Socrates that Charmides must stop. As a second proof of the efficacy of the δαίμονιον 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 Τιμάρχου ἀδελφὸν Κλειτόμαχον ἔρεσθε τί εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τιμαρχος ἡνίκα ἀποθανούμενος ἦει εὐθὺ τοῦ δαίμονιου†, ἐκείνός τε καὶ Εὐάθλος ὁ σταδιοδρομῶν ὃς Τίμαρχον ὑπεδέξατο φεύγοντα (Thg. 129a1–5).

Burnet²) is responsible for the formal identification of the crux εὐθὺ τοῦ δαίμονιου, but it appears that the obscurity of the passage was attested several centuries earlier. In his 1485 Latin translation of the dialogue, Ficino renders a3 ἡνίκα . . . a5 φεύγοντα with the words *cum iam moriturus esset. Is enim et Euathlus quidem cursor qui illum fugientem suscepit* . . . Ficino's neglect of a Latin equivalent for εὐθὺ τοῦ δαίμονιου might be interpreted in a couple of ways: 1) his exemplar did not contain the words³), or 2) he did not understand how they should be construed and translated. A third possibility, that Ficino considered εὐθὺ τοῦ δαίμονιου trivial enough to omit, has little to recommend it, since the δαίμονιον 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 himself⁴), preserve the problematic εὐθὺ τοῦ δαίμονιου⁵). On balance, 2) remains the likeliest possibility⁶). 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-

1) Cf. Ap. 31d1–4; Phdr. 242b8–c3; Tht. 151a2–5; Euthd. 272e3–273a1; R. 496c3–5.

2) Platonis Opera III (Oxonii 1903).

3) It was the verdict of M. Sicherl (Scriptorium 16 [1962] 51) that Ficino's model was Laurentianus 59.1. He may be correct, but from my own comparison of Ficino's translation and Laur. 59.1 for Thg., it seems possible that Ficino used a copy of Laur. 59.1 no longer extant.

4) Ambrosianus 329 (F. 19 Sup.); of Thg. only 128d2–130e7 was copied.

5) I derive this information from personal collation of photographic reprints of the thirty-four MSS. which contain all or part of Thg.; for a list of these MSS., see L. A. Post, *The Vatican Plato and its Relations* (Middletown 1934) 65–92; N. G. Wilson, *Scriptorium* 16 (1962) 386–95; R. S. Brumbaugh and R. Wells, *The Plato Manuscripts: A New Index* (New Haven 1968) 143–4.

6) Cf. the comments on Ficino's treatment of the text of Men. in Bluck's commentary on that dialogue ([Cambridge 1961] 145).

fied most scholars, with hardly a murmur from a dissenting voice⁷), until Baiter⁸) suggested (he did not print) δημίου or δημοσίου *pro* δαιμονίου: '(straight) to the executioner/prison⁹). Subsequently, C. F. Hermann¹⁰), Schanz¹¹), and Lamb¹²), incorporated δημοσίου into their editions of the dialogue.

One thing, however, is certain: εὐθύ τοῦ δαιμονίου cannot stand in our texts. εὐθύ as a preposition normally (and always in Plato¹³) means 'straight to' or 'to'¹⁴) (cf. Thg. 129d6 εὐθύ Ἐφέσου καὶ Ἰωνίας); '(straight) to the δαιμόνιον' 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 Hob. Ἀχιλλεὺς νῆσον οἰκεί εὐθύ Ἰστρου κατὰ τὴν Ποντικὴν θάλατταν, but the alleged similarities are illusory, for εὐθύ 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 adduces Hom. Il. 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 δημίου are wholly satisfying conjectures, as they supply a circumstantial detail which the story about Timarchus can do without. Souilhé¹⁸) is also sceptical about the text, but refuses to offer a replacement for τοῦ δαιμονίου; he prints εὐθύ ττοῦ δαιμονίου†.

I suggest that another explanation for the appearance of εὐθύ τοῦ δαιμονίου 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 ἠνίκα ἀποθανούμενος ἦει (perhaps *supra lineam*). If this note read αὐθις τὸ δαιμόνιον (the point of reference is, after all, Socrates' second anecdote about the δαιμόνιον), we may imagine that marginal αὐθις was corrupted into εὐθύ, and that the genitive required to complement εὐθύ was

7) Cf. Ruhnken's comment on the interpretation (Tim. Lex. s. v. εὐθύ [ed. nova cur. G. A. Koch, Lipsiae 1828]): 'qui formulae usus ob raritatem notandus.'

8) Platonis Opera Omnia. rec. J. G. Baiterus, J. C. Orellius, A. G. Winckelmannus (Turici 1839).

9) For δῆμος = 'executioner', cf. R. 439e8; for δημοσίον = 'prison', cf. Thuc. 5.18.7 (no Platonic instances of this usage). LSJ list no examples of δημοσίος = 'executioner' earlier than D. S. 13.102.

10) Platonis Dialogi . . . ex rec. C. F. Hermann, vol. II (Lipsiae 1873).

11) Platonis Opera quae feruntur Omnia, ed. M. Schanz, vol. VI.1 (Lipsiae 1882).

12) Plato, with an English translation, vol. XII (London 1929).

13) Cf. Grg. 525a6; Lys. 203a1, b2, b3; as an adverb at Ax. 364b1.

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. εὐθύ B.I.1.a.; cf. also Ast, Lexicon Platonicum (Lipsiae 1835-38) s. v. εὐθύ, who translates by *contra, ad-versum*.

16) Platonis Dialogi Tres: Theages, Amatores, Io proleg. et annot. instruxit H. Knebel (Confluentibus 1833) 43.

17) Athena 76 (1976-77) 196-8.

18) Platon Oeuvres Complètes 13.2 (Paris 1930).

fashioned from τὸ δαιμόνιον¹⁹). This may have occurred through multiple-stage corruption: 1) αὔθις – εὐθύς: αὔθις is glossed εὐθύς by Hesychius, and palaeographically the alteration is easy enough²⁰); 2) εὐθύς – εὐθὺς²¹). From this point it would have been a simple matter for a scribe to insert the aberrant gloss εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμόνιου 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 ἦει. The δαιμόνιον is moreover a topic which was bound to invite even cursory acknowledgement from a copyist: for marginal notes on the δαιμόνιον, cf. Scholia Vetera ad Alc. I 103a5–6, Arethae Scholia ad Ap. 31c8–d1²²); φωνή at Ap. 31d1 is generally accepted as a gloss on the δαιμόνιον 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 περὶ Ἀναξαγόρου λέγεται (bracketed by Burnet [OCT], following Stallbaum; deleted by Croiset [Budé]). 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 text²³), we can safely assume that the interpolation of the phrase is quite ancient²⁴).

If this analysis is correct, εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμόνιου has no place in our texts, and should be excised completely, rather than emended. Such a measure may gain support from 129a7–8 ἔρχομαι ἀποθανούμενος, 129c6 ἦει ἀποθανούμενος, and 129c7 ἴοι ἀποθανούμενος, in all of which instances the phrase εὐθὺ τοῦ δαιμόνιου is absent²⁵).

University of Calgary (Canada)

M. Joyal

19) We may compare the behaviour of ἔμβραχυ in Platonic MSS.: when ἐν- or ἔμβραχυ appeared in an exemplar, scribes were naturally disposed to alter βραχύ to βραχει, for the simple reason that ἐν takes the dative, and that ἔμβραχυ was an unfamiliar form; cf. Grg. 457b1 ἔμβραχυ BTP, ἐν βραχει F; Hp. mi. 365d5 ἔμβραχυ TW, ἐν βραχει F; Smp. 217a2 ἔμβραχυ Cobet, ἐν βραχει BTW.

20) Cf. Plut. Per. 164f. for the restoration of αὔθις pro εὐθύς of all MSS. (accepted by Flacelière-Chambray [Budé] and Perrin [Loeb]; Ziegler [Teubner] retains εὐθύς).

21) For the confusion of εὐθύς and εὐθὺ, cf. Pl. Lys. 203b3.

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

23) See Dodds, Plato: Gorgias (Oxford 1959) 41–2.

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

25) On the future participle + εἶμι, ἔρχομαι, 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.