$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$ 

Jessie Danielle Tomlinson

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Classics

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Copyright © 2019 Jessie Danielle Tomlinson

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements3
Abstract4
Introduction6
Chapter One: Summary9
Chapter Two: The Direct Tradition16
Chapter Three: The Indirect Tradition43
Chapter Four: Influencing the text and the influence of the text64
Conclusion
Bibliography103

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisors Dr. C. Michael Sampson and Dr. Mark Joyal for their support and guidance in taking this thesis to completion. Their assistance in navigating the papyrus and medieval manuscripts has been invaluable, and their suggestions for additional content have allowed me to create a more well-rounded thesis. A special thank you to Dr. Joyal for giving me access to draft versions of his preface to the forthcoming second volume of *Platonis Opera* in the new Oxford Classical Text and to its apparatus for the *Symposium*, without which this thesis would have been plagued by errors.

The completion of this thesis has been possible thanks to funding from several sources.

These are: SSHRC Insight Development Grant, Faculty of Graduate Studies GETS Program,

Lyla May Guest Hugill Scholarship, and an additional scholarship from the Department of

Classics.

### Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the history and textual transmission of Plato, Symposium 201d1–212c3. The first chapter summarizes the content of the passage. This summary reveals a passage which is of great interest at various levels to the study of Plato. Chapter two deals with the direct tradition. It demonstrates that the medieval manuscripts form a bipartite stemma, while the papyrus vacillates between the two branches of the stemma; the result is that the primary witnesses show a stable text. Chapter three looks at the indirect tradition. The variant readings of the testimonia do not link any author closely to any of the primary witnesses or manuscript families; in short, the testimonia do not provide compelling evidence to suggest that the state of the text in antiquity was different from that recorded by the medieval manuscripts. The first part of chapter four examines the indirect tradition (direct quotations); the second part of the chapter explores the ways in which Symposium 202d1–203a8 influenced later authors. The first part demonstrates that the variants in the testimonia conform to practices of quoting common in antiquity, showing that, for the most part, the text that the testimonia transmit is essentially the same as that transmitted in the primary witnesses. In the second part, a selection of passages demonstrates that the influence of Symposium 202d1–203a8 extends far beyond that of manuscript transmission and verbatim quotation.

To explore the textual tradition, the starting point has been the 1989 edition of Vicaire and Laborderie, but their readings have been checked against those of the apparatus to the forthcoming second volume of *Platonis Opera* in the new Oxford Classical Text, and, in some places, against the manuscripts, papyrus, and editions of the testimonia themselves.

The thesis concludes that the ancient transmission of *Symposium* 201d1–212c3 was relatively stable; that the testimonia show that the state of the text in antiquity resembled that transmitted in the primary witnesses; and that the influence of *Symposium* 212d1–203a8 can be seen from Plato's immediate successors to modern day sources.

Introduction 6

### Introduction

Symposium 201d1–212c3 contains the conversation between Socrates and Diotima in which they discuss Eros as a *daimon*, his birth and parentage, how the pursuit of Eros manifests itself, and what conclusion a properly conducted pursuit reaches. The outline of Eros as a *daimon* and the outline of what a *daimon* is, including its functions, has had historical importance. The influence of our passage extends from Plato's immediate successors all the way to the teachings of the present-day Catholic Church.

The text of Symposium 201d1–212c3 is understandably vexed. The presentation of our passage in modern editions of the text is not a clear one. Editions abound in editorial conjecture, but an examination of our passage, once stripped of these interpolations, extrapolations, seclusions, omissions, and rearrangements, should reveal interesting relationships and tendencies among our witnesses. Two centuries of determined scholarship have given us certain expectations of how the primary manuscripts will behave. Modern editions fall short here: many present only the evidence from three primary manuscripts (B, T, and W): for the Symposium there are two more that deserve consideration (D and P). Because it makes use of all five primary manuscripts, the 1989 Budé text of Vicaire and Laborderie (a revised edition of Robin's text) will be the starting point for drawing relationships between the witnesses to our passage. Vicaire's apparatus, however, is often inaccurate and in many places wrong. To remedy the situation, I have been able to make use of draft versions of the apparatus and preface to the forthcoming second volume of the Oxford Classical Text, comprising the third and fourth tetralogies, an edition which also incorporates testimony from all five primary manuscripts. A recent study on the textual tradition of the Symposium is Christian Brockmann's Die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Platons Symposion, which accepts only four primary

Introduction 7

manuscripts (P in addition to B, T, and W), and which tries to establish relationships between manuscripts without convincing support from the evidence of the text; Brockmann's book is not cited often.

The purpose of this thesis is to look at the textual transmission of *Symposium* 201d1–212c3 without the clutter of editorial interference. By looking at the primary manuscripts, the papyrus, and the indirect tradition, I expect that the state of the text in antiquity will reveal itself. Because our passage has been so important to the history of ideas, the witnesses to the text may reveal how the text was understood in antiquity, perhaps even betraying the influence of that thought in their transmission. The description of *daimones* contained within the passage (202d1–203a8) has such importance and influence, as a brief survey of its influence will demonstrate, that establishing the state of the text in antiquity will demonstrate both how the motifs contained within it were adapted and modified, and how these changes themselves went on to influence other texts.

A summary of the contents of our passage, namely the key points in the exchange between Socrates and Diotima, will comprise the first chapter. In the second chapter the focus will be the five primary manuscripts and the papyrus. The purpose of this chapter is to draw out the relationships between these witnesses and to compare them to the expectations formed by modern scholarship; arguments about the relationship between the papyrus and the manuscripts will be drawn without the influence of prior assumptions. Special attention will be paid to how the evidence of our passage either confirms or challenges scholarly views about the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For more on Brockmann, see Murphy's review (1994) and that of Joyal (1996).

Introduction 8

independence and dependence of the primary MSS, namely the relationship of B and D, and the relationship of P to both T and W.

In the third chapter the focus will be on the indirect tradition and its relationship to the direct tradition, not only to determine the state of Plato's text as it was available to the authors of testimonia, which predate our medieval manuscripts but not our papyrus, but also to see whether the testimonia preserve traditions later found in particular primary witnesses.

The fourth chapter falls into two parts: the first part looks at the indirect tradition again, but focuses on the particular changes made to the text in order to determine whether these changes are consistent with ancient practices in citing, quoting, and paraphrasing and whether they point to deliberate tampering by an author: how true to Plato's text and ideas are his successors? This part of chapter four also deals with the difficulty of knowing whether the changes originate in the authors of the testimonia, or whether these changes are the result of error in the transmission of their texts. The second part of the fourth chapter deals with the influence of the description of *daimones*, with a brief survey of the *Symposium*'s *daimones* and the changes they underwent throughout history, all of which reinforces the importance of ascertaining the state and history of Plato's text.

## Chapter One

## Summary

### Introduction

The industry of the ancient authors who quote our passage should suffice to demonstrate its interest and importance. A brief summary of the content of our passage will provide context for a look at the extent to which this passage influenced and inspired later authors.

The passage (201d1–212c3)

Diotima asserts that Eros is by nature in an intermediate state: neither good and beautiful nor bad and ugly, neither god nor mortal. His position is that of a δαίμων. As a δαίμων his purpose is to be an intermediary (one of several δαίμονες) between gods and mortals, and his δύναμις is to perform these intermediary acts. To accept these statements requires acceptance of several premises: a) there are intermediate states rather than a dichotomy of opposites; b) Eros cannot be a god because gods (apparently) must be beautiful and happy on account of their *possession* of good and beautiful things; and c) Eros is defined as lacking and therefore *pursuing* good and beautiful things (201e-203a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Sheffield (2006, 43–44, n.2) (see also 40, 46–47) for Eros as a "dynamic" intermediary, a sense which I think is also embodied in his active mediating between the mortal and immortal spheres. Osborne (1994, 110–111) argues that Eros is an intermediary daimon between gods and mortals because he needs to make humans aware that they lack immortal "features" (beauty, wisdom, happiness, and immortality) and inspire their pursuit of these features: "Eros is responsible for their ability to perceive a lack and their desire to make good the lack."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Sheffield (2017, 125–138) discusses the type of desire that Eros must be and the nature of the object it desires, and why the very specific characterization of it in the *Symposium* is necessary to make philosophy an erotic art (127–129). Nussbaum (1986, 177–179) argues that lovers lack and yearn for particular *instances* of beauty (because all that is beautiful is not identical), but are not wholly devoid of beauty themselves.

Eros receives his intermediary nature from his parents and from the circumstances of his birth. His mother Penia sought to conceive him by Poros to satisfy her lack of resources. <sup>4</sup>

Because Eros is born of two opposite parents he is intermediate between them and participates in their natures equally: <sup>5</sup> he is (paradoxically) always in a state of lacking but his abundance of resource pulls him back. It is also from his father that Eros pursues the beautiful and good and possesses all good or noble aptitudes (κατὰ δὲ αὖ τὸν πατέρα ἐπίβουλός ἐστι κτλ. 203d4–8). Underlying these statements are several premises which need acceptance: a) the occurrence of his conception on Aphrodite's birthday makes Eros her attendant and somehow establishes beauty as the object of his desire; b) even though Eros both utterly lacks resource and abounds in it, he is intermediate not because he is between those states but because he moves from one to the other and does not wholly participate in the nature of either parent; and c) because he participates in the nature of his father Poros, somehow Eros inherits only resource for noble pursuits or qualities, including, of course, wisdom, which Eros cannot wholly possess because he is not wholly his father (203b–203e).

Eros is free to pursue wisdom because he neither altogether possesses it nor lacks it. The premises behind this statement are as follows: a) Eros has inherited pursuit of wisdom from his

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Much is made of the aetiological nature of his parents' names (Penia and Poros being, of course, on opposite ends of the spectrum of resource). But Sheffield 2006 48–49 provides a good discussion about how Penia has enough resource and calculation to identify an object and strategy to sate her need.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Sheffield (2006, 43) stresses that Penia is not included among the gods as Poros is, which must underly Diotima's claim at 203e3 that Eros is neither mortal nor immortal as a condition of his birth.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Sheffield (2006, 4–7, 41n.5, 45) discusses the educative purpose of *symposia* and the (moral) content appropriate to them, including the strategies of praise and *encomium* used to instruct youths. The origin of zeal for good, which is unclear from the simple aetiology of choosing the name Poros, might then be implicit in or requisite for the setting of a symposium. Certainly, *euporos* would have been more to the purpose if Plato did not think that pursuit of *kalon* and *agathon* was somehow implicit or naturally assumed. Sheffield does introduce the notion that Poros is in possession of these because he is a god (43), but does it necessarily follow that Eros seeks to obtain his father's characteristics? Or does he partake of them through being intermediate between his parents? Certainly by making Poros Penia's opposite, Plato artificially creates a Poros who is inclined to noble pursuits. Sheffield mentions Eros' pursuit of good (47–49) but does not seek an origin for it. The use of *euporos* and its cognates is dealt with by Sheffield (43, 49).

father,<sup>7</sup> from his affinity for beauty which stems from Poros and from the day of his birth, and from not being a god and therefore not being wise; b) because his mother lacks wisdom it is clear that Eros' intermediate state between wisdom and ignorance is not one of flux between the extremes (because he would neither need to seek wisdom if wise nor care to seek it if ignorant), but a general middle state (203e–204b).<sup>8</sup>

The intermediate nature of Eros is embodied in a lover because the lover himself is imperfect and pursues that which or he who is perfect. The premise behind accepting Eros as a lover is that lovers must love only what is beautiful, and therefore what is itself incapable of love because it is perfect, without deficiency, and it cannot desire if it does not lack something.

Eros is the desire<sup>9</sup> for beautiful things. Beauty is assumed to be the desired end here only because, as Diotima says, Socrates decreed it so. But love of beautiful things is untenable as the goal of a philosophical discussion, so it is necessary instead to discuss love as desire for good things, for the possession of good things, and further for perpetual personal possession, and for the happiness attendant on such possession.<sup>10</sup> This reduction to personal perpetual possession could not be possible without the switch from a desire of beautiful to a desire of good (for surely desire for a beautiful boy is not compatible with the aging of the boy, and perpetual possession precludes multiple *eromenoi*). How then can Eros be a desire felt by a lover? The application of Eros is metaphysical or at least transcends the human. Presumably physical beauty entails mental

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Sheffield (2006, 61–62) notes the difficulty of determining how or to what degree Eros inherits wisdom from Poros.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Sheffield (2006, 62–64) discusses how Eros' intermediacy affects his pursuit of wisdom and what it means for his attempts to attain wisdom (if in fact he is even able to attain wisdom). Sheffield (58–61) also discusses at length the importance of aporia to the pursuit of wisdom.

 $<sup>^9</sup>$  Sheffield (2006, 2n.2) provides compelling evidence for using "desire" as the best word to characterize *eros*.  $^{10}$  See Lear (2006) for a discussion on the substitution of good for beautiful (102–105), and for a discussion on the role of beauty and its connection to procreation, immortality, and the divine (106–118). For the moral difference between καλόν and ἀγαθόν, see Guthrie (1975, 247 n.1); and for what καλόν and ἀγαθόν meant to a Greek, see Guthrie (1975, 177–178).

and moral beauty which must on some level translate to mental and moral goodness (204d–206a).

Pursuit of Eros has as its (not necessarily final and ultimate) end the manifestation or birth of an inner divine element, <sup>11</sup> just as Penia was able to conceive an end to satisfy her lack. Beauty (*to kalon* not *to agathon*) provides the stimulus for creation. Creation fulfils the desire of Eros because Eros is not just a desire for beauty but a desire for immortality. <sup>12</sup> Immortality for humans comes through bodily generation or channeling the soul into a creative outlet. The premises for accepting these statements are as follows. The inner divine element will not manifest itself except in beauty because both the divine element and the divine process of creation, by virtue of being divine, are harmonious only with beauty; as noted earlier, beauty is strongly associated with the divine. The natural aging and educative processes are not enough to renew or regenerate humans or to create a sense of immortality, so they must seek additional means of immortality (206b–208b).

Fame and immortal reputation are the realization of this desire for immortality, as is the begetting of children. There are several premises behind this statement: a) a desire for immortality is Eros because choosing death or incurring danger brings immortal fame and this is the only reason for which people go to such extremes; b) parents run risks for their children so that their creation may endure; c) dying for a loved one (not limited to an *eromenos*) brings immortality through the resultant fame attached to the deed; and d) the loved one is not the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The all-important notion of pregnancy of the soul.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Osborne emphasizes that the focus of Eros shifts from a desire to posses something beautiful to a desire to possess immortality; the desire for *possession* of beauty is now a desire to *gaze upon* the beautiful (1994, 102–103).

immortal creation that a child is, so his or her survival is not the goal; dying for a child might bring twofold experience of immortality through fame and the progeny's survival (208c–e).

The divine element in the soul can manifest itself specifically in a relationship with and the education of a physically beautiful *person*; a beautiful *soul* is optional. The underlying premises are as follows. Beauty encourages procreation or generation: the soul needs a beautiful medium upon which to beget, and only upon seeing a beautiful body will the soul bring forth its beautiful ideas. These ideas are immortal. Somehow there is room for the soul to create without a partner. Presumably the other virtues the soul begets either do not require a beautiful medium in which to manifest themselves or, during the education of a beautiful person, they manifest themselves in a person previously unfit to educate. Diotima speaks of the benefit of having a beloved who is beautiful in both body and soul, claiming that the virtues brought forth by the lover's soul are nurtured through continued discussion; but among these virtues, which are καλλιόνων and ἀθανατωτέρων, she also includes the law codes of Solon and Lycurgus and the great works of Homer and Hesiod: of what use is a beloved who is beautiful merely in body (209a–e)?

The stimulus of beautiful bodies produces the desire to create, but this is only one step in the process of Eros. The proper hierarchy is to love a particular beautiful body, and to use that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Guthrie (1975, 387) is very strict about the role beauty and eros play in the soul's pregnancy: "Pregnancy is not the *result* of love excited by the beautiful, but a universal state which *causes* excitement at an encounter with beauty." Ferrari (1992, 255) is likewise emphatic about the result of Eros: what is created by those who pursue the "Greater Mysteries" is itself *beautiful*. What is key in distinguishing those who pursue the "Lesser Mysteries" from those who pursue the "Greater," Ferrari claims, is that the former "... cannot be said to have examined and understood that connection;" this connection is "between the beautiful and the good," meaning that those who pursue the "Greater Mysteries" produce something beautiful instead of being mere "conduits" for beauty (255). Burnyeat (1977, 8) emphasizes that "the pregnancy is the cause, not the consequence, of love... pregnancy precedes intercourse, because birth and intercourse are imaginatively equated."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Strictly speaking, Diotima describes the soul's creation of virtues as requiring a beautiful medium, but she does not elaborate how beauty is necessary for the birth of other virtues by the souls of poets and craftsmen among others.

body to give birth to the virtues and ideas of the soul. The next step is recognition of the universal or non-particular nature of beauty.<sup>15</sup> What follows is the embracing of Eros directed towards all beautiful bodies and then towards all beautiful souls. Next comes appreciation for the beauty in societal constructs, and then comes pursuit of knowledge. Pursuing the beauty of knowledge is the final break of Eros with the particular. Knowledge is the ultimate end of desire because recognizing universal beauty provides an unlimited scope for the soul to create upon; this process is philosophy. Proper ascent results in true knowledge about beauty. <sup>16</sup> The premises behind this hierarchy of pursuit are as follows. These steps in Eros require relinquishing or subordinating the desire for immortality to the recognition of universal truths. Dissociation from Eros of a particular body or soul is possible for an individual;<sup>17</sup> and replacing desire for beauty with appreciation for it still falls under the term Eros because the association and education is still happening upon bodies, even if in a more general way. Societal constructs, being the manifestation of the soul's divine element, are beautiful. Knowledge is somehow beautiful, if only because it is the manifestation of the soul. The manifestation of the divine element of the soul through philosophy and knowledge results in true knowledge about beauty (the element

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Nussbaum (1986, 179–180) emphasizes that at each stage the lover makes a decision to broaden his spectrum of what is beautiful, a decision made from a sense of obligation. This obligation, Nussbaum argues, greatly reduces the sort of extreme tension usually associated in erotic relationships (see also 181).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> At this stage, Nussbaum explains (1986, 180–181), all beauty is the same in *quality*, removing conflict between pursuit of one beauty over another: "The lover, seeing a flat uniform landscape of value, with no jagged promontories or deep valleys, will have few motivations for moving here rather than there on that landscape. A contemplative life is a natural choice."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Ferrari (1992, 256) explains the mental state of the lover who distances himself from particular objects one step at a time: "The mark of the suitable initiate is that he does not take the nature of the beautiful for granted as would an honor lover, but is prone to become more deeply fascinated by the beauty that first attracted it. This displacement of attention is what motivates his climb to each new level of the upward path." Nussbaum (1986, 182–183) argues that this sort of Eros, once the summit has been achieved, is compatible with normal (erotic) Eros because it fulfills the need for stable love: "It is, we see, the old familiar *eros*, that longing for an end to longing, that motivates us here to ascend to a world in which erotic activity, as we know it, will not exist."

which the soul creates is apparently equivalent with or antecedent to knowledge of beauty) (210a–d).

Beauty in its true nature is eternal, universal, and constant; it takes no one shape nor is it subjective; it is part of everything but never depleted. Eros in those whose souls desire to give birth can lead them to this ultimate truth because they are capable of recognizing the progressively greater scope of beauty. A sort of immortality is possible through pursuit and knowledge of true beauty because knowing the truth allows the soul to beget true virtues. There is a necessary precept that begetting a true virtue is pleasing to the gods, which somehow imbues the creator (or the progeny?) with immortality (210e–212a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> John Dillon (2011, 15–20) provides a comparison of the infinite nature of the ultimate ("One" or "God") in Plotinus and Ficino – in Book II of his *Platonic Theology* not his *Commentary on Plato's* Symposium – who both use concepts similar to those Plato uses to describe the infinite nature of true beauty.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Nussbaum (1986, 183–184) suggests that the satisfied contemplative life of one who has reached the summit can perhaps be seen in the idiosyncrasies of Socrates:

<sup>&</sup>quot;[Socrates] seems at this point in his life to be always remarkably in control of his activities, free from ordinary passions and distractions... Socrates has so dissociated himself from his body that he genuinely does not feel its pain, or regard its sufferings as things genuinely happening to him... We cannot explain all this by supposing his physiology to be unique. We are invited, instead, to look for the explanation in his psychological distance from the world. He really seems to think of himself as a being whose mind is distinct from his body, whose personality in no way identifies itself with the body and the body's adventures... [his] soul, self-absorbed, pursues its self-sufficient contemplation."

## Chapter Two

### The Direct Tradition

## i. Chapter Introduction

In order to have a basis for understanding what Plato's text might have looked like, the primary manuscripts and the papyrus need to be discussed. This discussion will establish a point of comparison for the testimonia, and will shed light on whether and how (and why) the text changed in transmission.

The manuscript tradition of the *Symposium* reflects a stemma consisting of the families  $\beta$ , T, and  $\delta$ . The relationship of the family T, which for the dialogue is represented solely by the MS. T, to the other families is a complicated one. The passage under consideration displays a closer relationship between T and  $\delta$  than between T and  $\beta$ . And while the papyrus shows a closer relationship to T and  $\delta$ , its affiliations vary widely, not just between the families  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  but against both as well. For portions of the passage, the apparatus is taken up more by the variants introduced by the papyrus, the testimonia, and modern conjecture than by disagreement among the primary manuscripts.

## i.1 The manuscripts

For the text of Plato's *Symposium* there are five primary manuscripts: B and D (representatives of the family  $\beta$ ), T (the only representative of its family), and P and W (which are representatives of the family  $\delta$ ).

B (Cod. Bodleianus MS E.D. Clarke 39) is the oldest of the primary manuscripts for the *Symposium*, dating to AD 895, the date provided by its scribe, John the Calligrapher.<sup>20</sup> There are several correcting hands in B, the older identified as B<sup>2</sup> (in the hand of the scribe himself, and some possibly in the hand of the manuscript's owner, Arethas, or other contemporary correctors)<sup>21</sup> and the more recent identified as b.<sup>22</sup> By contrast, D (Cod. Venetus gr. 185) dates to the eleventh or twelfth century.<sup>23</sup> The texts of B and D (especially in the *Symposium*) are very similar, but D does not descend from B; their similarity is likely due to descent from the same hyparchetype.<sup>24</sup> Corrections in D by later hands are identified as d.

T (Cod. Venetus. app. cl. 4.1) dates to about  $950.^{25}$  Of its correcting hands, identified as  $T^2$  and t,  $T^2$  is old, likely dating to the end of the tenth century.  $T^2$  Dodds proposes that the relationship between B and T is close on account of collusion or contamination and not because they share a common ancestor from which P and W do not descend.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Duke et al. (1995, v); Dodds (1959, 35); Bluck (1961, 129).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> For a discussion of the hands in B, and in particular those which date to the time of the manuscript's preparation, see Allen (1898, iv–x).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Bluck (1961, 129); Duke et al. (1995, xi) note that for the first two tetralogies, there is a close relationship between  $B^2$  and the tradition preserved in manuscripts of the family  $\delta$ ; Dodds (1959, 36) notes that some corrections in  $B^2$  are also found in T and W. The preface to the forthcoming second volume of the Oxford Classical Text, which contains the dialogues of the third and fourth tetralogies including the *Symposium*, notes that the close relationship between  $B^2$  and an early member of the family  $\delta$  does not continue in the third and fourth tetralogies.

<sup>23</sup> Duke et al. (1995, v).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Duke et al. (1995, v–vi). See the preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT for a list of those who think D is a derivative of B or who have doubted D's independence from B, and one of those who think D is independent from B. Murphy (1994) is (rightly) critical of Brockmann's decision to view D as a copy of B.

<sup>25</sup> Dodds (1959, 37) dates T to the 'late eleventh or the early twelfth century'; so also Bluck, 1961, 129; Diller (1980, 323) and Boter (1986, 102–103) date T to 950, believing it to be the work of the scribe Ephraim Monachus; Duke et al. (1995, vii) note that the dating of T to the eleventh- and twelfth-centuries is no longer accepted.

<sup>26</sup> Duke et al. (1995, xi – xii) note that (at least for the first two tetralogies) there is a relationship between T<sup>2</sup> and the tradition preserved in the manuscripts of the family δ; Dodds (1959, 38) claims the oldest corrections were made by the scribe himself. The preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT notes that in the third and fourth tetralogies T<sup>2</sup> tends to agree with readings in both families (β and δ) rather than just those preserved in δ.

<sup>27</sup> Dodds (1959, 38–39).

For the family  $\delta$ , P (Cod. Vaticanus Pal. gr. 173) is a manuscript of the tenth or eleventh century. <sup>28</sup> P, however, contains few complete dialogues; rather, it is a manuscript composed partly of excerpts from dialogues, and such is the case for its transmission of the *Symposium*. <sup>29</sup> The relevant portion of our passage which P transmits is 206b7–212b8. W (Cod. Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 7) is of a later date than P, belonging to the eleventh century. <sup>30</sup> While W is younger than P, it does not descend from it; and, by virtue of being older, P cannot be dependent upon W. <sup>31</sup> There are many corrections and additions in W by the hand of the scribe himself; later corrections are identified as W<sup>2</sup>. <sup>32</sup>

### i.2 The papyrus

The only extant papyrus containing the *Symposium* is the Oxyrhynchus papyrus 843 (*P.Oxy* 5.843), which dates to about AD 150–200 and contains the text of the *Symposium* 200b9–213e3, 214b9–c2 (?), 217b2–223d13 (fin.).<sup>33</sup> The papyrus will, of course, be treated throughout as a primary witness. The scribe himself made corrections in the papyrus, as did a later corrector, whose corrections are relatively contemporary with the text itself, making it difficult in some instances to determine the author of the correction;<sup>34</sup> where possible these will be distinguished.

## ii. The family $\delta$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Duke et al. (1995, vii); Dodds (1959, 40); Bluck (1961, 133); for more recent work on the date of P, see the preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT which dates P to the tenth century.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Duke et al. (1995, vii); Dodds (1959, 40).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Duke et al. (1995, vi); Dodds (1959, 39) notes the variety of dates proposed for W; Bluck (1961, 130) notes that W may be older than its previously proposed twelfth century date. On this point, however, Dodds and Bluck are outdated, and the preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT firmly dates W to the eleventh century.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Duke et al. (1995, vii); Dodds (1959, 40) considers P 'roughly coeval' with W, but maintains that they are independent of one another; Bluck (1961, 129, 134).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Duke et al. (1995, xi–xii); Dodds (1959, 39); for a summary of the correcting hands in W, see Bluck (1961, 132–133).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243). This papyrus is also catalogued as LDAB 3768, TM 62584, and MP<sup>3</sup> 1399.0; it has also been reedited by Vendruscuolo in *CPF* IV.2 (pp. 135–148).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243).

## ii.1 The relationship of W and P

The MSS. W and P are held to be closely related but independent of one another.<sup>35</sup> The omissions unique to each are considered a viable proof of their independence from each other.<sup>36</sup> For the passage under consideration P omits at least seven times where W does not:

206b7 τοῦτο om. P : hab. W

207a5-6 ταῦτα τε ... ἤρετο om. P : hab. W

206b9-c3 μαντείας ... ψυχὴν καὶ om. P: hab. W

207c1-7 ἔχεις ... τὰ ἐρωτικά om. P : hab. W

209e5 ἴσως om. P: hab. W

211d1-2 ὧ φίλε ... ξένη om. P : hab. W

212a2 ἔφη om. P: hab. W

The text contained at 206b9–c3 may point to a deliberate omission by the (possibly Christian) scribe: information about the speakers as well as about prophecy and pregnancy of the soul is left out. But the omission may also be unintentional, a case of homeoteleuton where the scribe has omitted everything that occurs between two instances of ψυχήν. The omission in 207c1–7 removes conversational elements, including the question ἔχεις λέγειν; at 207c1, and when the scribe resumes copying the text, he omits ἔφη from the sequence εἰ τοίνυν, ἔφη, πιστεύεις κτλ. The absence of these omissions in W, the later of the two MSS., is surely evidence for W's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Dodds (1959, 40); Bluck (1961, 133–134); Brockmann (1992, 153–55).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Bluck (1961, 134).

independence from P, especially given the length of some of these omissions. In comparison, W makes three omissions which P does not:

208c1 ἔφη om. W: hab. P

208d3-4 ἄν ... προαποθανεῖν om. W : hab. P

209b5-6 ἄτε ... ἀσπάζεται om. W : hab. P

It should be noted, however, that in the portion of the passage where P is not yet a witness, W makes a further two omissions: 202e1 ( $\tau\epsilon$  BD T  $\Pi$ : om. W) and 205c4 (où B T  $\Pi$ : oi D: om. W). For the passage, W and P make no omission in common; in fact, when P does omit, no other primary witness makes the same omission, and the same is true of W. The lack of common omissions does not preclude the possibility of W and P having the same exemplar, and it certainly does not mean they cannot share a common ancestor, because it allows for human error in each copy, but it shows that they do not descend from an exemplar which already contained the unique omissions which appear in these two manuscripts.

In addition to its minimum of seven omissions, P has a reading which differs from those found in the other primary manuscripts four times:

206d3 καλῷ προσπελάζη ] καλὸν προσπελάζη  $P^{37}$ 

206d6 συσπειράται  $TW: ξυ < v > σπειραται <math>\Pi: συνσπείρεται BD$  (sed puncta supra v fecit nesc. in B): συσπείρεται P,  $Wsv: συστρεφεται Pcorr., mg <math>T^2$  vel t, mg W, mg  $d^{38}$ 

208c2 έθέλεις ] έθέλοις Ρ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Vicaire's apparatus misreports P as reading καλῶς πελάζη; the papyrus seems to agree with BD T W κα[λω προσ]πελαζη.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> P is not so unique here: corrections in B and W agree with it, and the variant in P is also found in T, W, and D.

```
211b1 ἔν τω T W Π : ἔν τ\~ωι B : ἔν τ\~ω D : ἐν τινι P, W s.v. ipse
```

The incomplete nature of P helps to explain the relatively small number of discrepancies between it and the other primary witnesses.<sup>39</sup>

In comparison to P, W has far more readings peculiar to it among the primary manuscripts: 18 in addition to the minimum of five omissions mentioned above. These are:

202a5 τὸ BD Τ Π: τὰ W

202b6 γε BD T  $\Pi$  : μοι W

202c10 τοὺς τάγαθὰ BD T Π : τοὺς άγαθοὺς καὶ τὰ άγαθὰ W

202d6 ὥς γ' BD Τ, Π (ὥς γε) : γ' ὡς W

203b2 είστιῶντο b, T ipse, W : ἡστιῶντο BD T, corr. W ipse : ϊστιωντο Π

203c1 δή καὶ BD T Π: δή W

203c6 δεῖ BD T Π : δὴ W

205מ6 οἴει εἶναι ] εἶναι οἴει W

205c6 μόριον BD T, corr. W ipse, Π: μόνον W

205e1 ἑαυτῶν BD T vid. Π: αὐτῶν W

205e6 καλεῖ  $W : καλῆ BD T, cf. Π^{40}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Dodds (1959, 40) characterizes P as "a book of selections," with some complete dialogues. The *Symposium* is one of those dialogues for which P contains only selections, and P does not transcribe our passage prior to 206b7, so the scope of the passage transmitted in P is roughly half that of a full transmission.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> The space in the lacuna after  $\kappa \alpha \lambda$ - could be filled by either ending, so there is no way of knowing if Π agrees with BD T or with W.

206a9 ἆρ' οὖν BD T Π : ἆρ' W

207b3 τούτων καὶ BD T P Π : τούτων W

209b2 δή BD T P Π : δὲ W

210b1 τὸ ἐπὶ BD T P Π : τῷ ἐπὶ W

210b8 τις καὶ ἐὰν σμικρὸν BD T P Π : τις καὶ ἂν σμικρὸν W

210c2 οἵτινες BD T P  $\Pi$  : εἴ τινες W

211d1–2 Μαντινική B T, prD, prW ut vid., Π : μαντική Dpc Wpc<sup>41</sup>

The example at 211d1–2, however, does not present a strong case for a unique reading in W: both D and W originally had the reading found in BD T P and the papyrus, and (in both cases) the correction seems to be in the hand of the original scribe. The example at 210b8 is likewise trivial, but it does reinforce that the scribe, if not the exemplar, of W was prone to small (and mostly stylistic) variants. W has more unique readings than P because this list takes into account the discrepancies of W for the whole of the passage, rather than solely its overlap with P, which is a witness for only the latter half of the passage. For the section where P is also present, W disagrees with P and the other primary manuscripts nine times, including the three omissions P does not make. But where P is present, it diverges from the other primary manuscripts more (11 times) than W (nine times) does in the same section.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> W also differed on the same word at the beginning of the passage, but with the agreement of D rather than d. P has an omission of seven words at this juncture.

It appears that P never agrees with only a single primary witness, apart from a single instance of agreement with only W:<sup>42</sup>

211a6 αὐτῶ BD T Π : αὐτὸ PW

W and P, then, are closely related but do not diverge jointly from the testimony of the other MSS. frequently enough to argue for W's dependence on P.

The fact that P does not agree solely with any witness apart from W could suggest that the exemplar of P was free from contamination with ancestors of other MSS. What is clear, at any rate, is that Brockmann's assertion of a dependent relationship or common immediate ancestor between T and P receives no support from the evidence found in this passage.<sup>43</sup> The evidence from our passage, rather, demonstrates a lack of readings shared solely by W and P: each diverges from the rest of the MS. tradition frequently but separately, supporting the conclusion that W cannot be a copy of P.

### ii.2 The relationship of T and PW

Although W is not dependent on P, they are related MSS. and the closeness of their testimony becomes clearer when the agreement of T, W, and P is considered. The relationship between T and PW is a close one: T and W rarely diverge from the other primary witnesses without the agreement of P.<sup>44</sup>

Modern scholarship is quick to recognize the closeness of the relationship between T and PW, but while W was once thought to be dependent on T, the predominant view at present is that

 $<sup>^{42}</sup>$  212a6 could be considered an example: θεοφιλεῖ t, corr. P (m.1), Π: θεοφιλῆ BD T, Pac ut vid., W. But the correction in P is uncertain, and it could have come from a different exemplar than the one used for copying the text.  $^{43}$  Brockmann (1992, 153–155).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> For the closeness of T to  $\delta$  in the third and fourth tetralogies and the resultant (nearly) bipartite stemma of T  $\delta$  against  $\beta$ , see the preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT.

they are independent witnesses.<sup>45</sup> Where all three MSS. are witnesses, there is frequent agreement of T, W, and P against the other primary witnesses:

206c8 τὰ BD Π : ταῦτα Τ PW

206d1 θείφ T PW : θε $\tilde{\phi}$  BD t  $\Pi$ 

207e5 ἔτι BD Π : ἔστιν Τ PW

208a8 αὐτὸ Τ PW : αὐτὸν BD Π

208c2 ἐπεί γε T PW : ἐπεὶ BD Π

208c7 πάντας BD Π : πάντες Τ PW

209a8 δ'αὖ T PW : αὖ BD Π

209d5 κατελίπετο b Π : κατέλιπε το B κατέλιπε τὸ D : κατελείπετο T PW

209d9 παρ' ὑμῖν Τ PW: παρ' ἡμῖν BD vid. Π

211b2 τρόπον τινα BD Π : τινὰ τρόπον Τ PW

211b4 ἐκεῖνο BD Π : ἐκείνω Τ PW

211d7-8 θεᾶσθαι μόνον Τ PW : θεάσασθαι μόνον BD : μονον θεασασθαι Π

Where P is not a witness, W and T agree against the other primary witnesses a further 10 times:

202c10 τὰ καλὰ BD Π : καλὰ T W

202d5 ἄν BD Π : δ'ἄν T W

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Bluck (1961, 130-131, 134-35); Dodds (1959, 40 – 41).

202e8 καὶ τὰς τελετὰς BD Π : καὶ τελετὰς T W

203b4 προσαιτήσουσα d T W : προσαιτησουσα Π : προσαίτης οὖσα b : προσαιτής οὖσα  $prB \; prD$ 

203e2 τε T W : om. BD  $\Pi$ 

203e5 τε αὖ καὶ TW : τε καὶ BDV : και  $\Pi$  : αυ και  $\Pi$ c

204d4 τε καὶ BD Π : καὶ TW

205a5 δὴ τὴν TW : δὲ τὴν BD Π

206b2 σύντασις BD Π : σύστασις T W

Additionally, T and W agree against the other primary witnesses thrice in the portion of the passage where P is present:

206d6 συσπειράται TW: ξυ<ν>σπειραται  $\Pi:$  συνσπείρεται BD sed puncta supra v fecit nesc. in B): συσπείρεται P, Wsv: συστρεφεται Pcorr.,  $mg\ T^2\ vel\ t$ ,  $mg\ W$ ,  $mg\ d^{46}$  207c2 αὖ ἕλεγον b: ἀνέλεγον BD: ἀν ἕλεγον TW: ελεγον  $\Pi:$  om. P

212a1  $\hat{\omega}$   $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\imath}$  B :  $\tilde{\delta}$   $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\imath}$  D :  $\hat{\sigma}$   $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\imath}$  T W  $\hat{\sigma}$   $\delta \eta$  P :  $\dot{\omega} \delta \iota$  b :  $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota$  def.  $\Pi$ 

The evidence from the passage confirms the consensus that T bears a close relationship to P and W.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> As noted above, there are many corrections across all MSS. The vital point, that T and W agree against the other witnesses, remains the same.

## ii.3 The Papyrus, PW, and T

The closeness between PW and T is also clear when examining their relationship with the papyrus. There are at least 10 instances in the apparatus where the papyrus agrees with PW and T against the other MSS.:<sup>47</sup>

206d8 πτοίησις Τ PW Π : ποίησις BD

206e1 ἀπολύειν Τ PW Π : ἀπολαύειν BD

207d2 καὶ ἀθάνατος Τ PW Π : ἀθάνατος  $BD^{48}$ 

207e2 τρόποι d T PW Π: τόποι BD

208a7 θνητὸν bd T PW  $\Pi$ : ὀνητὸν BD<sup>49</sup>

208c5 ές BD : είς T PW Π<sup>50</sup>

209b3 περιιών Τ PW Π : περί ὧν BD

210a7 αὐτὸν Τ PW Π : αὐτῶν BD

210a9-b1 σώματι τῷ Τ PW Π : σώματι τὸ BD

211b5 δή BD : δὲ δή Τ PW Π

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> There is, additionally, another instance that the papyrus cannot fairly attest to: a second reading at 208a8 (οὐ τῷ b T PW  $\Pi$ : οὕτω BD), which should not count because it deals with word-division and iota adscript (iota adscript is also absent from b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> 207d2 provides (slight) evidence that T and P may have the close relationship that Brockmann postulates (1992, 153–155). The line as a whole reads: ἀεὶ τὸ εἶναι ἀθάνατος BD : ἀεὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀθάνατος W : ἀεὶ τε εἶναι καὶ ἀθάνατος T P Π.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> The reading of D *ante correctionem* may be too unclear to side with either reading.

 $<sup>^{50}</sup>$  D is, again, not clear: ἐς τὸν B : ἐστὶν D ut vid.: εἰς τὸν T WP Π. But the agreement of T, W, P, and the papyrus stands.

For the section of the passage where P is not a witness, there are ten instances of the papyrus agreeing with T and W against the other MSS.:

201d8 δεῖ δὴ T W Π : δείλη Β: δείλην D

202a5 ὀρθὰ δοξάζειν T W Π : ὀρθοδοξάζειν BD

202d5 ὅ γε τῶν d T W Π : ὅ γε γ'ὤν Βρc D : ὅ γεγὤν (sic) prB

202d11 πρότερα ἔφη Τ W Π : πρότερα ἔφην BD

204a5 αύτῷ b T W Π : αὐτὸ  $BD^{51}$ 

204b1 δῆλον δὴ Τ W Π : δῆλονότι Β : δηλονότι D

205c5 έχουσιν T W Π : έξουσιν BD

205e3 ἐπεὶ Τ W Π : ἐπὶ BD

206a11 αύτῷ Τ W Π : αὐτό BD

206c2 καὶ κατὰ τὸ Τ W Π : κατὰ τὸ BD

It is clear that the papyrus agrees often with T, P, and W, and that the agreement is typically with them all as a group.

The frequency of agreement between the papyrus and PW T as a group contrasts starkly with the rarity of agreement between the papyrus and P, W, or T singly. Of the dialogue's six instances of agreement between  $\Pi$  and W against B T, as noted by Grenfell and Hunt, only two occur in the passage. The first of these two (203b2), which occurs at col. iv.183 in the papyrus,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> The breathing in T W  $\Pi$  may be a smooth breathing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243).

may be a mistake on the part of Grenfell and Hunt because modern editors do not find any agreement between W and the papyrus at this juncture. The second (211d3, papyrus col. xv.674) is actually a place where P also agrees with W and the papyrus. W and the papyrus, therefore, do not agree against the other primary witnesses in our passage. Similarly, where P is present, it does not agree with the papyrus against the other MSS.; the reading at 212a6 ( $\theta$ εοφιλεῖ t, corr. P (m.1),  $\Pi$ :  $\theta$ εοφιλῆ BD T, Pac ut vid., W) is the closest the papyrus comes to agreement with P, and the agreement in verb ending may be an instance of the papyrus preserving a good reading where the majority of the MSS. do not. In contrast, there are numerous examples of agreement between the papyrus with T: of the six times  $\Pi$  agrees with T against B in the dialogue, <sup>54</sup> four of them are in this passage:

203α9 τίνος έστι καὶ μητρός BD  $T^2W$ : καὶ μητρός τίνος έστί T  $\Pi$ 

205b4 ἄρα T Π : om. BD W

206b1 τῶν b T, Wsv (m.1 ut vid.),  $\Pi$ : τὸν BD W

211c3 έπαναβασμοῖς Τ Π : ἐπαναβαθμοῖς Β PW : ἐπ' ἀναβαθμοῖς Βρc :

ἀπαναβαθμοῖς D

Agreement with any single MS., then, is infrequent, but the agreement of the papyrus is rather with the MSS. families, particularly with the combined testimony of T and  $\delta$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> Vicaire is wrong in citing the papyrus at 206a1 (ἄνθρωποι BD T : οἱ ἄνθρωποι W Π): there is no οἱ on the papyrus. Even if this were a correct report, the absence of P as a witness for this part of the passage would limit the declaration of a relationship between W and the papyrus. Vicaire's report at 211a8 (που BD T P :  $\pi\omega$  W: def. Π) does not reflect that the text of the papyrus is missing at this point, and that there is room for either  $\pi$ ου or  $\pi\omega$  in the gap.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243).

There is one instance of the papyrus agreeing with T and P at 207d2 ( $\tau\epsilon$  T P  $\Pi$ :  $\tau\delta$  B D W), 55 one instance of it agreeing with P and W at 211d3 ( $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$  id $\eta\varsigma$  PW  $\Pi$ :  $\pi\sigma\tau$  eid $\eta\varsigma$  B:  $\pi\sigma\tau$  eid $\eta\varsigma$  D T), and one instance of it agreeing with T and W at 211b1 ( $\xi\nu$   $\tau\phi$  T W  $\Pi$ :  $\xi\nu$   $\tau\tilde{\omega}\iota$  B:  $\xi\nu$   $\tau\tilde{\omega}\iota$  D:  $\xi\nu$   $\tau\iota\nu\iota$  P, Wsv ipse). It is worth noting that these agreements are not present until nearly halfway through the passage, but of four instances of agreement between T and the papyrus, three are in the early part of the passage:

203a9 τίνος ἐστὶ καὶ μητρός BD  $T^2$  W : καὶ μητρὸς τίνος ἐστί T  $\Pi$ 

205b4 ἄρα T Π : om. BD W

206b1 τῶν b T, W (m.1 ut vid.), Π : τὸν BD W

Only one is in the latter portion of the passage: 211c3 (έπαναβασμοῖς  $T\Pi$ : ἐπαναβαθμοῖς BPW: ἐπ' ἀναβαθμοῖς Bpc: ἀπαναβαθμοῖς D). The relationship of the papyrus to  $\beta$  will be discussed later, but the importance of the relationship of the papyrus with T, W, and P is in its agreement with their combined testimony.

It is clear that these four witnesses have either a common ancestor, or contamination has occurred, which will become a particularly appealing argument when the relationship of the papyrus to B and D is considered. The fact that the papyrus bears the same testimony as T, W, and P as a group may mean that the exemplars of T, W, and P originate from one which was closely related to that of the papyrus. It may be that the hyparchetype of T, W, and P was collated or checked against an exemplar which preserved (at least in part) the testimony of the papyrus: for example, 212a6 shows a later hand of T in agreement with a corrector of P and the

 $<sup>^{55}</sup>$  It is worth noting that T, P, and the papyrus agree across the whole phrase, whereas BD and W do not agree across the whole phrase: ἀεὶ τὸ εἶναι ἀθάνατος BD : ἀεὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀθάνατος W : ἀεὶ τε εἶναι καὶ ἀθάνατος T P Π.

papyrus. It is also worth noting that the division of the primary manuscripts into the bipartite stemma of T PW and BD began at an early date if each group agrees (as a group) separately with the papyrus.

## iii. The family $\beta$

### iii.1 The relationship of B and D

The MS. B is the oldest of the medieval primary witnesses for the *Symposium*, and although it did not make its way into Western scholarship until the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was long considered the *codex optimus*, receiving consideration over other MSS. without regard for their potential value as primary witnesses.<sup>56</sup>

B provides a reading which diverges from the rest of the MSS. several times:

203c6 πένης b D T W Π: πενίης Β

209c6 καλλιόνων b D T PW : καλλίων ὤν B : καλλειονων Π

210c7 ΐνα ἴδηι d T PW : ἵν' ἀιδηι B : ἵν' ἀιδη D : ινα ειδη  $\Pi$ 

211b1 ἔν τ $\omega$  T W  $\Pi$  : ἐν τ $\widetilde{\omega}$ 1 B : ἐν τ $\widetilde{\omega}$  D : ἔν τινι P, Wsv ipse

211c3 ἐπαναβασμοῖς Τ Π : ἐπαναβαθμοῖς Β PW : ἐπ' ἀναβαθμοῖς Βρς : ἀπαναβαθμοῖς D

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Dodds (1959, 35–37).

It is worth noting that the first two discrepancies occur closely together near the start of our passage while the latter four are spaced evenly towards the end of our passage. The difference between B and D in the reading at 210c7 is one of iota adscript which could date back to different readings of a majuscule script: it is, in other words, an important indication of the independence of B and D. For the reading at 211c3 the agreement of B, D, P, and W in reading  $\theta$  rather than  $\sigma$  as T and the papyrus probably dates back to misreading of majuscule script, but the reading in D is singular enough to argue again for independence from B.

B rarely agrees with a single witness except where it agrees solely with D. But in the middle of the passage there is one reading where B agrees solely with the papyrus:

#### 206c7 ἔνεστιν Β Π : ἔστιν D T PW

The only other reading where B agrees with a single witness is at 203b4 where it appears to agree with the indirect tradition, which will be discussed further in the next chapter (see chapter three, iii). The evidence suggests, then, that for the passage, B was little influenced by other traditions except as the  $\beta$  tradition as a whole was influenced. When B was transcribed from a  $\beta$  ancestor it received little outside contamination except from a copy which preserved the readings which are also found in the papyrus tradition (i.e., B often differs from  $\delta$ , but often in conjunction with the other MSS. of the  $\beta$  tradition; when B diverges from the rest of  $\beta$ , the only witness with which it agrees is the papyrus). The secondary witness V and a correcting hand in B both agree with the papyrus at 209d5 (against BD),<sup>57</sup> which shows both that we should give credit to Byzantine and later scribes and scholars for finding the true reading, and that the papyrus, in spite of its many errors, does on occasion preserve the true reading where the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> 209d5 κατελίπετο b V Π : κατέλιπεν τὸ BD : κατελείπετο Τ PW.

medieval MSS. do not. It is safe to say that the reading of the papyrus at 209d5 is correct because the agrist is clearly superior to the imperfect in T PW, and BD have an error which traces back to a misreading of majuscule script; it is surprising that no later scholar corrected the error in D.

The instances of D diverging from the other MSS. are few. There are four places where D provides a unique reading and one place where it omits:

205c4 οὐ B T Π : οἱ D : om. W

211c2 ἐπανιέναι ] ἐπανιτέον D

211c3 ἐπαναβασμοῖς Τ Π : ἐπαναβαθμοῖς Β PW : ἐπ' ἀναβαθμοῖς Βρc : ἀπαναβαθμοῖς D

211c5-6 καὶ ἀπο τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων: om. D

Only once does D agree with a single other witness apart from B: D and W agree at 201d2 (Mavtivik $\tilde{\eta}\zeta$  B T, prD, prW ut vid.,  $\Pi$ : Mavtik $\tilde{\eta}\zeta$  Dpc Wpc), but only after correction, so the example is not a strong one. Like B, the examples of divergence in D do not occur evenly throughout our passage: three are grouped at the end and two appear in the first half of the passage. Given the relatively small number of places where B and D differ, their relationship, at least for our passage, can safely be called a close one. St It is important to note that D does not have a relationship with the papyrus outside of the relationship of the papyrus to the family  $\beta$ : there are no readings in our passage where D alone agrees with the papyrus. This reaffirms the notion that B was influenced by the papyrus tradition outside of the  $\beta$  tradition. Not only does D

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> See the preface to the forthcoming second volume of the OCT for the closeness of B and D.

Chapter Two

33

show no signs of a special relationship to the papyrus, its readings often trace back to misreading

of majuscule script; the reading at 205c4 is another such example, again suggesting that D

descends closely from a manuscript which was written in majuscule script.

iii.2 The relationship of BD and T and of BD T and the papyrus

B and T were once considered descendants of the same exemplar, but the more modern

view is that, in light of the fact that they provide differing testimonies in certain dialogues, they

are actually independent of each other; the conclusion is that their ancestors served as correctors

for one another.<sup>59</sup> For our passage there is some agreement of BD with T, but it is not as ample

as the reportedly close relationship of these MSS. would suggest. There are only four instances

of BD and T agreeing against the other primary witnesses:

202d6 ὡς γ' ΒD Τ, Π (ὥς γε) : γ' ὡς W

203b2 είστιῶντο b, T ipse, W : ἡστιῶντο BD T, corr. W ipse : ϊστιωντο Π

206a1 ἄνθρωποι : ἄνθρωποι BD T : οἱ ἄνθρωποι W Π

211d3 ποτε ίδης PW Π : ποτ' είδηις Β : ποτ' είδῆς D Τ

That is not to dismiss their closeness, however, for there is ample evidence for agreement of BD

T Π. Agreement of BD T and  $\Pi$  occurs 10 times:<sup>60</sup>

202a5 τὸ BD T Π : τὰ W

202b5 γε BD T  $\Pi$  : μοι W

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Bluck (1961, 130); Dodds (1959, 38–39).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> The reading at 211d1–2 (Μαντινική B T, prD, prW ut vid., Π: μαντική Dpc Wpc) should not count because the scribe of D shows clear intent to efface Μαντινική in favour of μαντική.

202c10 τοὺς ΒΟ Τ Π : τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ W

202e1 τε BD T Π : om. W

203c1 δή καὶ BD T Π: δή W

203c6 δεῖ BD T  $\Pi$  : δὴ W

205e1 έαυτῶν BD T, Π ut vid. : αὐτῶν W

205e7 καλεῖ W: καλῆ  $BD T cf. \Pi^{61}$ 

206a9 ἆρ' οὖν BD T Π : ἆρ' W

211a6 αὐτῷ BD T Π : αὐτὸ PW

It needs to be noted that most of these entries are also characterized as unique readings or omissions in W, and that P is a witness for only one of these readings, which makes W (almost exclusively) the sole representative of the  $\delta$  family. The relationship between BD T and  $\Pi$ , then, might be a case of each following the main tradition while W departs. What this means for the usual alignment of the manuscript groupings with the papyrus (recall that BD on the one hand and T PW on the other each agree variously with the papyrus), is that the hyparchetype from which T, P, and W descend was closely related to the papyrus, and the changes found in W occurred later. It may be significant that instances of agreement between BD T and the papyrus are almost non-existent where P is present (i.e., from 206b7 onwards). And it is curious that the examples of agreement of BD T  $\Pi$  occur mainly in the first half of the passage (where the content – daimones – is of particular interest).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Again, the space in the lacuna after  $\kappa\alpha\lambda$ - could be filled by either ending, so there is no way of knowing if Π agrees with BD T or with W.

Chapter Two 35

iii.3 BD and the papyrus

The papyrus does not represent the same tradition as any of the MS. families  $(\beta, T, \text{ or } \delta)$ ,

but agrees now with one, now with the other. 62 Grenfell and Hunt note that the papyrus varies in

agreeing with the  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  families, but that where B agrees with either T or W the papyrus does

not often side with the remaining MS. against that testimony. 63 This suggests a relationship

between the papyrus and B.

The evidence of the passage points to a relationship between β and T when they agree

jointly with the papyrus, but instances of agreement of \( \beta \) T without the additional agreement of

the papyrus are few. And while the preceding discussion could give the impression that the  $\beta$ 

family only has a relationship with the papyrus in conjunction with the agreement of T, it is not

the case. Rather, T does not exhibit a tendency to agree with BD without the agreement of other

witnesses. T agrees separately and variously with both the  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  families. The same is true of

the papyrus: its allegiance varies more than T or any of the other MSS.

While the above discussion looked at the agreement of T with BD  $\Pi$ , there is comparable

evidence for a relationship between BD and  $\Pi$  without the agreement of T. There are 15

instances of agreement of BD  $\Pi$ :<sup>64</sup>

202c10 καὶ τὰ καλὰ BD Π : καὶ καλὰ T W

 $202d5 \text{ av BD }\Pi:\delta' \text{ av }T \text{ W}$ 

62 Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243).

<sup>63</sup> Grenfell and Hunt (1908, 243); they only examine B, T, and W.

<sup>64</sup> Only one of these (203e2) is classified by Vicaire as an omission, but 202d5, 208c2, and 209a8 are also technically omissions. These four omissions are all post-positives which are preserved in the T (P)W tradition. In contrast, BD Π preserve or introduce the definite article at 202d1 and 202e8-203a1 where it is not represented in the

T (P)W tradition.

202e8 τὰς τελετὰς ΒΟ Π : τελετὰς Τ W

203e2 τε T W : om. BD  $\Pi$ 

204d4 τε BD  $\Pi$ : om. T W

205a5 δη T W : δὲ BD Π

206d1 θείφ T PW : θεῷ BD, Tsv ipse, Π

207e5 ἔτι BD Π : ἔστιν Τ PW

208a8 τὸ αὐτὸ Τ PW : τὸ αὐτὸν BD Π

208c2 γε T PW : om. BD Π

208c7 πάντας ΒD Π : πάντες Τ PW

209a8 αὖ BD Π : δ' αὖ T PW

209d7 ὑμῖν T PW : ἡμῖν BD vid. Π

211b2 τρόπον τινα BD Π : τινὰ τρόπον Τ PW

211b4 ἐκεῖνο BD Π : ἐκείνῷ Τ PW

These readings should also count as strong evidence for a bipartite stemma in the *Symposium* because they show how consistently T and (P)W align as a group against the testimony of BD. This bipartite stemma would also explain the paucity of agreement between BD T and the papyrus where P is a witness (see above iii.2): T more often sides with PW than against them.

iii.4 The relationship of BD and W and its implications for T

Agreement of BD with W occurs only a few times:

203α9 τίνος έστι καὶ μητρός BD  $T^2W$ : καὶ μητρός τίνος έστί T  $\Pi$ 

204c5 άβρὸν Τ Πc : ἀβρὸν BD W : αγαθον  $\Pi^{65}$ 

205b4 ἄρα T Π : om. BD W

206b1 τῶν Τ Π : τὸν BD W

207d2 τε Τ Ρ Π : τὸ BD W

This last example does not provide strong evidence for a relationship between BD and W because the line reads  $\dot{\alpha}$ εὶ τὸ εἶναι  $\dot{\alpha}$ θάνατος BD :  $\dot{\alpha}$ εὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ  $\dot{\alpha}$ θάνατος W :  $\dot{\alpha}$ εὶ τε εἶναι καὶ  $\dot{\alpha}$ θάνατος T P Π, so W preserves a conflation of both BD on the one hand and T P Π on the other hand. The close relationship between W and P would suggest that the parameters for the relationship between BD and W should be expanded to include examples of BD PW, but there are only two such examples: 206d6 (ἀνίλλεται νίd. Π : ἀνείλλεται BD, T² vel t, PW : ἀνείλλειται T : ἀνείλεῖται t, Psv, mg W<sup>66</sup>) and 209c3 (παρὼν καὶ ἀπὼν BD PW Πc : παρ[οντ]ων και απων Π: ἀπὼν καὶ παρὼν T). In fact, the examples of BD W agreeing at 206d6 and 207d2 are places where P and W disagree. There is one example of B agreeing with P and W against D at 211c3 (ἐπαναβασμοῖς T Π : ἐπαναβαθμοῖς B PW : ἐπ' ἀναβαθμοῖς Bpc : ἀπαναβαθμοῖς D). None of the examples from the passage are compelling enough to suggest that BD and W have a relationship which T does not share: if BD and W trace back to a common exemplar, then T too must trace back to the same exemplar. The paucity of evidence for agreement between β and δ against T is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> The difference here is one of breathing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> Plotinus agrees with the reading of the papyrus. This is not the only place in Plato where this verb causes confusion: Dillon (1989, 66–70) discusses the variants of it and their possible ideological implications.

important because it shows that T is closely enough related to both that they rarely give joint testimony against it.<sup>67</sup>

## iv. The papyrus (again) and its corrector

While the papyrus tends either to agree with one family, multiple families, or to provide unique (possibly inferior) readings, there are places where it agrees with secondary MSS., 68 such as at 209d5 where it agrees with the secondary MS. V and a later corrector of B: κατελίπετο b V Π: κατέλιπεν τὸ BD: κατελείπετο T PW.69

#### iv.1 The papyrus corrector

The correctors of the individual MSS. usually show allegiance to particular families or to an individual MS., but the corrector of the papyrus is an especially unique case and deserves discussion. Where the medieval MSS. agree with the papyrus corrector, such agreement testifies to the antiquity of that tradition which the medieval MSS. represent. There are at least 22 times where all the primary MSS. agree with the corrector over the papyrus, and one occasion (209c3)

 $<sup>^{67}</sup>$  There are four instances where the papyrus agrees with BD PW against T. Where T departs from the other primary MSS., it is as likely to agree with the papyrus or the papyrus corrector (see above ii.3) as it is to provide a unique reading, but T does not give unique readings as frequently as the  $\delta$  family.

 $<sup>^{68}</sup>$  The papyrus agrees with a secondary witness at least six times. Four of these are instances of agreement with Vaticanus gr. 225: 202e1, 203b5, 209d6, and 211a8. An example at 208e2 shows agreement with the Parisinus gr. 1812; and an example at 201d7 could be considered significant because it shows agreement with two secondary manuscripts, Coislinianus gr. 155 and Parisinus gr. 1642, and it disagrees with the reading in Vaticanus gr. 225. For the instances where Π agrees with Vaticanus gr. 225, 209d6 is the only example where the two witnesses do not have the additional agreement of the primary manuscripts, but they do have the agreement of a correcting hand in B. And it is worth reiterating that the example at 211a8 is a conjecture of what Π might have read, but it could equally share the reading of BD T P.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> Vaticanus gr. 225 dates to the twelfth century and, as a descendent of B, it could have received this reading from b; in any event the variant is an ancient one. The agreement of the papyrus could be an accident stemming from an orthographical error where the scribe has replaced ει with ι, but the point stands that the correct reading was transmitted through the papyrus, even if by accident.

παρών καὶ ἀπών BD PW  $\Pi c: \pi \alpha \rho [ovt]$ ων και απων  $\Pi: ἀπών καὶ παρών T)$  where only T does not agree with the corrector, <sup>70</sup> but it does not agree with the papyrus, either. Four of these are omissions by the papyrus: <sup>71</sup>

201d4 τῆς BD T W  $\Pi$ c : om.  $\Pi$ 

204d2 καὶ οὕτω BD T W Πc: om. Π

205a1 εὐδαίμονες BD T W Πc: om. Π

211a3 ουδὲ (2) BD T PW Πc: om. Π

Differences in case account for:

201e8 αἰσχρὸς Πο αἰσχρὸν Π

205d4 χρηματισμόν BD T W Πc : χρηματισμῷ Π

210c1 αὐτῷ BD T PW Πc : αὐτῷν Π

211a8 έτέρω BD T PW Πς: έτέρου Π

Differences in conjugation account for:

204a6 ἐπιθυμεῖ BD T W  $\Pi$ c : επιθυμει[[ν]]  $\Pi$ 

205d8 κινδυνεύεις BD T W Πc : κινδυνεύουσι Π ut vid.

206c4 ἐπιθυμεῖ BD T W Πc : επιθυμει[[ν]]  $\Pi^{72}$ 

 $<sup>^{70}</sup>$  The only difference between T and BD PW  $\Pi c$  is word order.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> In all four cases it is a later hand which adds the reading found in the *codices*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> The occurrence of the same error in the papyrus twice (at 204a6 and 206c4) is highly interesting: it could be that the papyrus tended to convert the third person singular into an infinitive when recalling recent infinitives (remember at 206c4 the preceding word was an infinitive, and there were multiple infinitives in the preceding lines at 204a6). On the issue of repeated errors, see Janko (2000, 81–82), where he claims that, "this phenomenon of pairs of related

207c4 ἐννόης BD T W Πc : εννοηση Π

Another instance (as at 204a6 and 206c4 above) of a set of repeated errors and corrections occurs at:

206α6 προσθετέον BD T W Πc : προσθεταιον Π

206a8 προσθετέον BD T W Πc: προσθεταιον Π

There is one instance of word order:

206c6 τοῦτο τὸ θεῖον BD T PW  $\Pi c$  : τουτο θειον [[τουτο]] το  $\Pi$ 

There are seven remaining cases which resist classification, but they include clear error by the papyrus (201d2), orthography (203e3), substitution of a word which is, in context, a near synonym (210d3), and an instance of dittography (211c8):

201d2 διοτίμας ή BD T W Πc: διοτιναση vel διοτιπαση Π

202c4 εἷς BD T W Πc : ει (εἷ) Π

203a4 τοιαῦτα σοφὸς BD T W Πc : τοιαυτα σφοδρος Π

203d6 μηχανάς BD T W: μαχα s.v. νας in ras. Πc: sed manet postea βας Π<sup>73</sup>

203e3 ἀναβιώσκεται BD T W Πc : αναβιωσκειται Π

210d3 ἐπιτηδεύματος ἑνὸς BD T PW Πς: επιτηδευματος τινος Π

mistakes is so common that it ought to become a general principle of textual criticism: the mind is at some level aware of the first fault, and tries to remind one by committing another."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> The papyrus originally read αμοιβας and the papyrus corrector has added μαχα above and corrected αμοι into  $v\alpha \zeta$ , but has forgotten to erase  $\beta \alpha \zeta$ , easily an error because the word was divided across two lines (i.e.  $\alpha \mu o \iota |\beta \alpha \zeta$ ). The papyrus corrector, therefore, gives the same reading as the *codices* and Origen.

211c8 τελευτών BD T PW Πc : τελευτων τω Π

These examples of agreement between the primary manuscripts and the papyrus corrector represent the majority of evidence for the papyrus corrector. Outside of agreement with all primary MSS, there are only seven mentions of the papyrus corrector. Four of these are instances of it providing a reading found in none of the primary MSS.:

203e3 πάλιν BD T W  $\Pi$  : πάλιν πάλιν  $\Pi c^{74}$ 

203e5 τε αδ καὶ TW : τε καὶ BDV : και  $\Pi$  : αυ και  $\Pi$ c

205b9 τι BD T W: τω Παc (i.e. vel τῷ vel τῳ) : τῶ Πc (accentum add. m.2) : ὧ Πc mg (m.2) : τοι Vind. Phil. gr. 21, Par. 1811, Coisl. 155, Ven. 184 recte

209a2 κυήσαι BD T PW: κυησεται Π : κυησαι τε Πς

At 203d7 the papyrus corrector agrees with T and W (πόριμος T W Πc: πορισμος B: φορισμὸς D: φρονιμος Π). At 204c5 it agrees with T (άβρὸν T Πc: ἀβρὸν BD W: αγαθον Π), but the only difference between T Πc and BD W is one of breathing. This reading is more useful for comparing the primary manuscripts to the papyrus; at any rate it does show that the exemplar used to correct the papyrus was closely related to an archetype of the primary manuscripts. Finally, as mentioned earlier, at 209c3 the papyrus corrector agrees with BD PW, differing only from T in word order. It may be worth noting that only two of these examples occur in the latter half of the passage. The papyrus corrector, more than the papyrus then, shows a tendency to agree with the primary witnesses; and its divergences, more often than not, are not found elsewhere in the textual tradition. It could be argued that the tendency of the papyrus corrector to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> Here the corrector agrees with the indirect tradition.

agree with all the primary MSS. indicates that the corrections were influenced by the same archetype from which the primary MSS. descend. It is true that the interventions of the papyrus corrector are often corrections of blunders by the original scribe, but nevertheless they tie the text of the medieval MSS. to antiquity, reaffirming that the textual tradition of our passage of the *Symposium* was a fairly stable one.

# Chapter Three

## The Indirect Tradition

This chapter begins with an examination of the relationship between individual testimonia and the primary witnesses (including the papyrus). The evidence for the textual tradition is the focus here, but the value of testimonia in reflecting the ideas of the original Platonic text will be discussed later.

#### i. Stobaeus (fifth century)

In our passage there are three sections for which Stobaeus provides testimonia. The first section (202c10–203a8) is found in (*Anthologion, Book One, Eclogae physicae et ethicae*), of Stobaeus for which there are two MSS.: the Farnesinus (Stob. F) and the Parisinus (Stob. P). For the other two sections (208a3–5), and 208a7–b6), found in (*Anthologion Books Three* and *Four, Florilegium*), there are several manuscripts (A, B, M, S, T).

Where Stobaeus agrees with some primary witnesses against others, the agreement is more frequently with the manuscripts which share the reading of the papyrus. Of the ten occasions where Stobaeus agrees with a particular witness against others, six of these readings are also readings in agreement with the papyrus:

202c10 τοὺς BD T Π Stob. : τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ  $W^{75}$ 

202d5 αν BD  $\Pi$  Stob. : δ' αν  $\Pi$  W

 $<sup>^{75}</sup>$  Vicaire could be more precise here and add that Stob.(P) gives the reading τοὺς ἀγαθὰ where Stob.(F) (the only other MS. of Stobaeus for this section) gives τοὺς τἀγαθὰ. The point remains that Stobaeus agrees with the reading found in the papyrus, and even the variant found in Stob.(P) is closer to the rest of the tradition than the reading in W.

202d5 ὅ γε τῶν d T W Π Stob. : ὅ γεγὢν Bac : ὁ γεγ'ὢν Bpc : ὅ γε γῶν D

202e8 καὶ τὰς τελετὰς BD Π Stob. : καὶ τελετὰς Τ W

208a7 θνητὸν bd T PW Π Stob. : ὀνητὸν BD

208a8 οὐ τῷ b T PW Π Stob. : οὕτω BD<sup>76</sup>

There are four times where Stobaeus does not side with the papyrus in agreement with some manuscripts over others; three of these demonstrate agreement between W and Stobaeus:

202c10 τὰ καλὰ BD Π : καλὰ T W Stob.

202d11 πρότερα ἔφη Τ W Π : πρότερα ἔφην BD Stob.

202e1 τε BD T  $\Pi$ : om. W Stob.

208a8 αὐτὸ Τ PW Stob. : αὐτὸν BD Π

When there is agreement between the primary manuscripts, there are more than 20 instances where Stobaeus omits or otherwise provides a unique reading. There are nine omissions:

202c10 δὲ δὴ : om. Stob.

203a5 σοφός ὤν BD T W Π : σοφός Stob.

203a5 ἢ περὶ τέχνας : om. Stob. $(F)^{77}$ 

203a7 ἐστὶ : om. Stob.

208a4-5 λήθη γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ἔξοδος : om. Stob.(B)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> Lectional marks (smooth breathing and circumflex accent) in the papyrus indicate that it agrees with b T PW Stob.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup> Vicaire fails to record that Stob.(F) omits ἤ in addition to περὶ τέχνας.

208a7 γὰρ: om. Stob.

208b1 τῷ τὸ BD T PW  $\Pi$  : τῷ Stob.(A)

208b1 καὶ παλαιούμενον : om. Stob.(SMA)

208b2-b4 ταύτη ... ἄλλη: om. Stob.

Given the length of the first section, 202c10–203a8, the four omissions do not indicate a particularly faulty text or a tendency to omit: the forthcoming discussion on unique readings in this section will reveal more about the text Stobaeus made use of than his omissions alone tell. But it is clear that, in general, Stobaeus' text is in line with the Platonic tradition. For one thing, the omission at 203a5 is only in one MS. of Stobaeus. For another, in the second section the significant omission at 208a4–5 is found only in one MS. of Stobaeus: Vicaire is reporting evidence from the single outlying MS. here.

The third section, 208a7–b6, is more complicated: the four omissions come from a smaller quotation, but they differ in value. At 208a7, the omission of  $\gamma\dot{\alpha}\rho$  is trivial and commonplace. The first omission at 208b1 is found only in one MS. of Stobaeus, and the second omission at 208b1 belongs to three MSS. of Stobaeus; neither omission is found across the tradition. But the last omission, 208b2–b4 is more significant: not only is it long (a full two lines) but it is also consistent across the entire Stobaeus MSS. tradition. The omissions might suggest that Stobaeus was quoting from memory or deliberately altering his quotation, as opposed to having a text with so many faults; however, the omissions of  $\gamma\dot{\alpha}\rho$  and  $\tau\dot{\alpha}$  are insignificant. To judge from looking at the omissions Stobaeus makes, the first and second sections seem to have made use of a far more pristine text of Plato, unless the omissions in the third section are deliberate.

A larger view of Stobaeus' texts comes from looking at the readings unique to them,<sup>78</sup> at least twelve:

202c10 τοὺς τἀγαθὰ BD T Π Stob. : τοὺς ἀγαθὰ Stob.(P) : τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ W

202d1-2 τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν : τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν Stob.

202d6 ὥς γ' BD T Π : γ' ὡς W : ὥστ' Stob.(F) : ὡς Stob.(P)<sup>79</sup>

202d8 εἴη ὁ Ἔρως : ὁ Ἔρως εἴη Stob.

202e3 θεοῖς τά: θεοῖς τε τὰ Stob.

202e5 τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιῶν Stob.(P): om. Pollux: secl. Schanz

203a3 πρὸς ἀνθρώπους BD T W Π Stob.(F) : πρὸς ἀνθρώποις Stob.(P)

203a4 τοιαῦτα σοφὸς BD T W Πpc : τοιαῦτα σφοδρὸς Πac incert., Stob. 80

208a5 ἔξοδος BD T PW Π Stob.(T) : ἔξοδός ἐστιν Stob.(SMA) $^{81}$ 

208b2 έγκαταλείπειν codd. : ενκαταλιπειν Π : καταλείπειν Stob. 82

208b5 πᾶν BD T PW: ἄπαν Stob.83

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> At 202e2 Vicaire reports that Stobaeus and Gaisford both read τινα δ'  $\tilde{\eta}$ ν. The text of Stobaeus referenced by Vicaire shows that neither manuscript of Stobaeus has that reading, but they instead read τίνα  $\tilde{\eta}$ ν δ' with the rest of the textual tradition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> Stob.(F) does not read ὥστε as Vicaire reports.

 $<sup>^{80}</sup>$  The papyrus appears to read o $\phi$ o $\varsigma$  with a  $\sigma$  added above in a hand that may well be that of the original scribe rather than the later corrector.

 $<sup>^{81}</sup>$  I have tentatively assigned the reading in Stob.(T) as aligning with the *codices* and the papyrus: our concern is with how the MS. tradition of Stobaeus matches that of Plato. Where the Stobaeus MS. tradition is concerned, Stob.(T) omits the verb which is necessary for Stobaeus' passage; it is necessary to bear in mind that Stobaeus ends his quotation of Plato at ἔξοδος. Given that the verb is necessary for Stobaeus' grammar, the reading in Stob.(T) is more likely an omission than an instance of a scribe being influenced by knowledge of the Platonic text.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup> Vicaire could add that the papyrus corrector agrees with the *codices*.

<sup>83</sup> There is a lacuna in the papyrus at this point.

208b5 γὰρ χάριν παντὶ BD T PW  $\Pi$  : γὰρ ἅμα καὶ εὐδαιμονίας εἰς τὸν $^{84}$  ἀεὶ χρόνον παντὶ Stob.

The majority (eight) of these unique readings are found in the first section, 202c10–203a8, including four instances of variation within the Stobaeus MSS. tradition. Many of the readings from the first section involve the addition or omission of articles and particles, or changes in word order. The frequency of even such small errors could point to use of an inferior text or a casual approach to quotation. In the second section, 208a3–5, the only point of difference between Stobaeus and Plato is the addition of a single word. The absence of errors may be due to the small size of the quotation, and the addition of ἐστίν was for the grammar of his sentence. In the third section, 208a7-b6, the number of unique readings is nearly equal to the number of omissions, 85 and just as there is one large omission, there is one large interpolation. For the third section there is evident tampering with the text of Plato as we have it from the rest of the textual tradition, either by Stobaeus himself, in the text he used (it seems unlikely that he would use so corrupt a text), or in the later transmission of Stobaeus' text. Taking the three sections together, Stobaeus was either a careless transcriber or his text was inferior, especially in the first section. It could be that his text was itself subject to corruption in its transmission, as the discrepancies between Stobaeus MSS. reveal.

There are only two instances where Stobaeus and the papyrus agree against the other primary witnesses: 203a6 ἤ χειρουργίας BD T W : ἤ περὶ χειρουργίας Π Stob., and 203a7 καὶ BD T W : τε καὶ Π Stob. Both readings are in the first section and in subsequent lines, so they do not demonstrate a relationship between Stobaeus and the papyrus for that section, and there are

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> Vicaire misreports τὸν as τὸ.

<sup>85</sup> A fourth reading, commonplace in nature but unique to Stobaeus, can be found at 208b5 αὐτοῦ: αὐτοῦ Stob.(SMA), but the other MSS. of Stobaeus do share the reading found in the rest of the Platonic tradition.

no readings in the other two sections to suggest a relationship. The two readings probably demonstrate an accidental coincidence: the  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i was understandably repeated from earlier in the line, and the insertion of a  $\tau\epsilon$  before  $\kappa\alpha$ i is by no means an uncommon occurrence. Neither points to Stobaeus using a text influenced by that of the papyrus.

There are also three instances of agreement of the papyrus, primary manuscripts, and Stobaeus where modern editors have taken issue with the text:

 $202e2^{86}$  τίνα ην δ' BD T W Π Stob. : τινα δ' ην Gaisford

202e5<sup>87</sup> τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιῶν Stob.(P): om. Pollux: secl. Schanz

203a1 μαντείαν BD T W Π Stob. : μαγείαν Badham : μαγγανείαν Geel

The proximity of these three readings suggests that modern editors are unhappy with this portion of the text.

Overall, Stobaeus does not demonstrate allegiance to any particular manuscript tradition. In the first section (202c10–203a8) no decisive conclusions can be drawn as to the descent or ancestry of the text to which Stobaeus had access. The second section (208a3–a5) is too short to provide meaningful data. But it may be worth noting that the textual tradition for the section is unanimous apart from the unique reading of Stobaeus. The section is therefore not one in which Stobaeus shows allegiance to a particular tradition. The third section (208a7–208b6) is worth discussing. From 208a7 to 208a8 Stobaeus follows the  $\delta$  and T tradition against  $\beta$ . This is the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> Vicaire is wrong to say that Gaisford's reading appears in Stobaeus: see note 78 above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> Vicaire notes only that Stobaeus reads θυσιῶν, but that reading is only ascribed to Stob. *Par*. From the text of Stobaeus I am left to conclude that Stobaeus gives the article elsewhere.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> I am not classifying the omission found only in Stob.(B) as a unique reading: it is an omission by one MS. of Stobaeus, but the other MSS. follow the transmission of the primary MSS. The other unique reading from the second section is a true variant from the Platonic text, and even though one MS. (Stob.T) does not give the reading, that MS. is probably the outlier in the Stobaeus MS. tradition.

only display of allegiance, but it could suggest that the text Stobaeus made use of did not receive influence from the three errors of  $\beta$ . From 208b1 to the end of the section (208b6), Stobaeus provides readings which differ from the textual tradition as a whole, so there is no evidence for the state or ancestry of the text he was using.

## ii. Proclus (fifth century)

In our passage there are seven sections for which Proclus provides testimonia: 202a6–7 (in Timaeum), 203a7 (in Alcibiadem), 204a1–2 (Theologia Platonica), 204b3 (Theologia Platonica), 204c4–5 (Theologia Platonica), 209d1–4 (in Rem Publicam), and 212b3–4 (Theologia Platonica).

For the first section, 202a6–7, Proclus provides the same text given by the rest of the textual tradition.

The second section, 203a7, is a paraphrase rather than a direct quotation: πολλοὶ καὶ παντοδαποἱ εἰσιν BD T W: πολλοῖς δή τισι καὶ παντοδαποῖς Proclus. It may, then, be accident that Proclus agrees with the *codices* rather than with the papyrus and Stobaeus in the reading of καὶ rather than τε καὶ; the textual traditions do not otherwise differ.

In the third section, 204a1–2, Proclus follows the primary manuscripts and the papyrus, reading οὐδεὶς φιλοσοφεῖ against the reading of Hermias οὐδεὶς φιλόσοφος. Vicaire does not note that Proclus reads οὐδὲ at 204a1–2 instead of οὐδ' with the rest of the tradition, but the difference is trivial. This is the only point of difference with the *codices*, and Proclus agrees with

 $<sup>^{89}</sup>$  208a7 θνητὸν bd T PW Π Stob. : ὀνητὸν BD; 208a8 οὐ τῷ  $B^2$  T PW Π Stob. : οὕτω BD; 208a8 αὐτὸ V T PW Stob. : αὐτὸν BD Π. The first two of these examples demonstrate activity of later correctors to rectify the errors in B and D; the last example shows a descendent of B, V, in agreement with Stobaeus and T PW, so clearly the errors in B and D were obvious enough to either be corrected or not corrupt later descendants.

them in reading σοφὸς γενέσθαι against the unique reading of the papyrus at 204a1 σοφοῖς γενέσθαι. The text Proclus was following for this quotation, then, was very close to the text transmitted by the *codices*.

For the fourth section, 204b3, the text of Proclus is very close to that of the main tradition. Proclus differs only in giving  $\gamma\acute{a}\rho$   $\acute{e}\sigma\iota$  instead of  $\delta$ '  $\acute{e}\sigma\iota\acute{v}$ . The main tradition is otherwise unanimous at this point.

The fifth section, 204c4–5, provides more fodder for discussion. In addition to agreeing with the papyrus in reading τελειον instead of τέλεον at 204c5, there is another reading of value. At 204c5 Proclus provides testimony (unreported by Vicaire) for a reading disputed by the rest of the tradition: ἀβρὸν Τ, Πpc (m.2) Proclus: ἀβρὸν BD W: αγαθον Πac. For this section, then, Proclus may have had access to a manuscript which preserved the tradition found in the papyrus and its corrector.

The sixth section, 209d1–4, is the longest. As with the fifth section, Proclus' testimony generally agrees with the *codices* and the papyrus even where modern editors take issue with the text: 209d2 ζηλῶν BD T PW Π Procl. : ζηλοίη Ast. In this section there are only two places where Proclus departs from the otherwise unanimous MSS. tradition. The first departure is at 209d2: ποιητὰς τοὺς ἀγαθούς BD T PW Π : ἀγαθοὺς ποιητὰς Procl. Proclus then provides another unique reading at 209d2–3: οἶα ἔκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν BD T PW Π : ὅσα ἔκγονα καταλείπουσιν Procl. : οἶα καταλελοίπασιν ἑαυτῶν ἔκγονα Method. Here Proclus may be

 $<sup>^{90}</sup>$  Proclus gives γάρ ἐστι instead of δ' ἐστὶν, but the lack of a v in Proclus is because his sentence structure inserts a φησιν after ἐστι, whereas Plato needs ἐστὶν because it is followed by ἔρως. The real focus of the discussion should be on the γάρ and the δ'. Proclus may be deliberately choosing γάρ to make explicit the explanatory force implicit in δέ. For δέ with explanatory force, see Denniston (1950, 169–170).

choosing a quantitative ( $\delta \sigma \alpha$ ) on purpose or he may be thinking of the phrase  $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta$ '  $\delta \sigma \alpha$ . Proclus continues to agree with the codices against the unique reading of the papyrus at 209d1:  $\kappa \alpha$ i H $\sigma$ io $\delta$ ov BD T PW Proc. :  $\kappa \alpha$ i  $\epsilon$ i $\epsilon$  'H $\sigma$ io $\delta$ ov  $\Pi$ . Because the readings of the *codices* and the papyrus differ only in this last example, it is likely that the text Proclus had access to in quoting this section differed little from the textual tradition as a whole, and that the divergence of the papyrus at 209d1 represents (an error) made by its scribe.

Word order is the only difference in the seventh section, 212b3–4: συνεργὸν ἀμείνω μείνω ερωτος: συνεργὸν ἔρωτος ἀμείνω Procl. The different word order hardly seems an example of Proclus having a manuscript (or knowledge of a manuscript) with a different tradition, but a common mistake in reporting or a deliberate alteration for his own purposes.

## iii. Eusebius (c. AD 260–339)

In his *Praeparatio Evangelica* Eusebius quotes a single long section from the passage: 203b2–c1; this section is preserved in four MSS. of Eusebius: I, O, N, and D. In this section there are only three places where Eusebius departs from the *codices*:

203b2 είστιῶντο b, T ipse, W Hermog. Orig. Eus.: ἡστιῶντο BD T, corr. W ipse : ϊστιωντο Π

203b4 προσαιτήσουσα d T W : προσαιτησουσα Π : προσαίτης οὖσα b Eus.(ND) :  $\pi \text{ροσαιτὴς οὖσα prB prD} : \pi \text{ροσαῖτις οὖσα Orig. Eus.(IO)}^{91}$ 

203b4 ołov BD T W  $\Pi$  Orig. : oła Eus.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>91</sup> The papyrus provides no evidence one way or the other for the true reading because the evidence it presents is in *scriptio continua*, nor are there any of the lectional marks which occasionally appear in the papyrus.

The first reading is interesting for the widespread activity of correctors, and for the fact that three authors of the indirect tradition agree with the reading given by two of the correctors. Chapter two also mentioned the second example (see iii.1) because this is the only reading where B appears to agree with a single source that is not D or the papyrus. Vicaire, however, is misleading and the point can be made more clearly: B does not in fact agree with Eusebius here, rather, B and D shared a reading before each was corrected. The fact that B is alone in its mistake only reinforces that B is an inferior witness to the text here. The third reading, however, is more nuanced than Vicaire's apparatus suggests. Eusebius I and O have the same reading as the *codices*, the papyrus, and Origen, while the second reading is found only in Eusebius N and D.

In addition to these three readings, there are two readings where Eusebius agrees with the *codices* against other testimony:

203b2: οἴ τε ἄλλοι codd. Π Orig. Eus. : οἴ τε ἄλλοι θεοὶ Hermog.

203b6: εἰσελθών codd. Orig. Eus. : εξελθων Π

Given that the text of Eusebius agrees with the rest of the textual tradition for the remainder of the section, and that the only other variant in the section is the orthographic variant κατακλεινεται (203b8–c1) of the papyrus, it seems that the text for this section must have been stable.

The closeness of Origen to Eusebius in this section is interesting. The only places where Eusebius and Origen disagree are actually places where Origen agrees with Eusebius I and O and disagrees with Eusebius N and D (see next section): so, for example, at 203b4 Origen and Eusebius I and O share the same error in word division and spelling; however, the MSS. tradition

in Origen is complicated at this point, and will be discussed below. The fact that Eusebius and Origen share another contested reading at 203b2 (the reading they transmit is also found in the primary MS. W and in the early correctors of B and T) suggests that they must have had access to very similar texts, if not the same one.

## iv. Origen (third century)

In his *Contra Celsum*, Origen quotes one long section from our passage: 203b2–e5. The possibility of a relationship with Eusebius IO has already been mentioned, but Origen also shows an affinity with the readings of the papyrus corrector:

203d6 μηχανάς BD T W Orig. : μαχα s.v., νας in ras.  $\Pi$ c, sed manet postea  $\theta$ ας  $\Pi$ <sup>92</sup>

203d7 πόριμος φιλοσοφῶν T W Πc Orig. : πορισμός φιλοσόφων B : φορισμός

φιλοσόφων D : φρονιμος φιλοσοφων sic  $\Pi$ 

203e3 πάλιν BD T W : πάλιν πάλιν Πc Orig.

203e3 ἀναβιώσκεται BD T W Πc Orig. : αναβιωσκειται Π

Of these four readings only one is an example of the papyrus corrector and Origen agreeing against the other witnesses. The coincidence of these two early sources for  $\pi \acute{a} \lambda \imath \nu \pi \acute{a$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> The papyrus originally read αμοιβας and the papyrus corrector has added μαχα above and corrected αμοι into  $v\alpha \zeta$ , but has forgotten to erase  $\beta \alpha \zeta$ , an easy error because the word was divided across two lines (i.e.  $\alpha \mu o \iota | \beta \alpha \zeta$ ). The papyrus corrector, therefore, gives the same reading as the *codices* and Origen.

Chapter Three

54

haplography. 93 But there is another reading where Origen is quite similar to the papyrus

corrector:

203e5 τε αδ καὶ TW: τε καὶ BD: και  $\Pi$ : αυ και  $\Pi c$ : δ' αδ καὶ Orig.

It might be added that in both this reading and the reading at 203d7, T and W either agree with

the papyrus corrector and Origen or have a similar reading. The papyrus corrector is active

during the latter lines of the section but silent before line 203d6. The correcting hand(s) in the

papyrus are all quite old, and even though the corrections at 203e3 and 203e5 were made in a

later hand, they still indicate that the readings found in Origen are early. Because the papyrus

corrector tends to agree with the MS. tradition, its divergence at 203e3 and 203e5, where it

agrees with Origen, may be significant.

In the section he quotes in *Contra Celsum*, Origen agrees with most of the witnesses

against a single divergent reading at least a dozen times. In stark contrast, he gives only four

unique readings:

203c2 καὶ θεράπων BD T W Π : θεράπων Orig.

203c3 ἐκείνης BD T W Π : ἐκείνων Orig.

203d6 πλέκων BD T W Π : προσπλέκων Orig.

203e5 τε α καὶ T W : τε καὶ BDV : και  $\Pi$  : αυ και  $\Pi$  C : δ' α καὶ Orig.

<sup>93</sup> Vicaire made use of an edition of Origen's Contra Celsum whose editor did not have access to the papyrus of Plato's Symposium, so the transmission of πάλιν by the papyrus corrector was unknown to him (P. Koetschau's edition of Contra Celsum was published in 1899, whereas the papyrus was published in 1908). The possibility that πάλιν πάλιν is a legitimate reading rather than a dittography may not have presented itself as an option to the editor of Origen, and Vicaire might likewise have been influenced by the conclusions drawn in that edition of the Contra Celsum.

The reading at 203c3 is less unique than Vicaire suggests: ἐκείνων only appears in one MS of Origen. 94 None of these readings significantly alters the sense of the Platonic dialogue, which suggests that Origen not only had a well-transcribed text but that he himself took great care in transcribing Plato, perhaps making small alterations to suit his own text. This point is reinforced by the small number of omissions. 95 Two readings do need to be added to the discussion:

203b2 είστιῶντο b, T ipse, W Hermog. Orig. Eus. : ἡστιῶντο BD T, corr. W ipse : ϊστιωντο Π<sup>96</sup>

203b4 προσαιτήσουσα d T W : προσαιτησουσα Π : προσαίτης οὖσα b Eus.(ND) : προσαιτής οὖσα prB prD : προσαῖτις οὖσα Orig. Eus.(IO)

Both readings show Origen in agreement with the indirect tradition, but 203b2 is of particular interest. The reading common to most of the primary tradition likely crept in due to normal phonological errors in copying. But the correct reading was introduced by the correcting hands represented by b and T ipse, and it was likewise preserved by the testimonia. It is possible that these testimonia are the medium through which the variant was known to the correctors. 203b2 also reinforces the connection between W and Origen, which is otherwise limited to their joint agreement with T and the papyrus corrector; the scribe of W himself did transmit the alternate, inferior reading. In 203b4, Origen and Eusebius both divide the Platonic participle into two words, but three separate MSS. of Origen each record a different version. The MS. A only separates προσαίτησ-οὖσα, the MS. P separates προσαιτήσ-οὖσα and corrects -ης to -ισ, and the MS. M reads προσαίτης οὖσα before correcting -ης to -ις. What is clear is that all three

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> MS A. The precedence given by Vicaire to ἐκείνων might reflect the fact that Hoeschelius selected it for his *editio* princeps of 1605.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup> None of these omissions is reported in the *apparatus criticus* of Vicaire.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> B had a smooth breathing, but the temporal augment – the real issue at hand – agrees with D T, corr. Wipse.

Chapter Three

56

manuscripts trace back to an archetype which preserved the Platonic reading, and, more

precisely, to one which erroneously broke the participle, necessitating the corrections variously

undertaken in each manuscript; this likely means that the exemplar dates to shortly after the

introduction of miniscule around AD 800. That Eusebius echoes the error could point to his use

of a text which also contained this word-division, suggesting that it, too, was written at a period

where Plato's participle was no longer understood as such. The agreement between Eusebius IO

and Origen proposed earlier is specifically an agreement with Origen M at 203b4, and the

corrector of M, in particular. It may be a stretch to suggest that the exemplars used by the

primary MSS. of Plato were much older; they may simply have been written by scribes whose

understanding of Greek was not troubled by the participle.

Origen also makes omissions at:

203b2 ὅτε γὰρ ἐγένετο: ὅτ'ἐγένετο Origen

203c2 καὶ : om. Origen

203d6 ἀεί τινας : ἀεὶ Origen

A fourth omission, inaccurately reported by Vicaire, needs to be added:

203e2 τε T W: om. BD Π Origen

The omissions at 203b2, 203c2, and 203e2 are not significant, but the omission of τινας at 203d6

is serious, especially when combined with the alteration of the following word from  $\pi \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \nu$  to

προσπλέκων.

Overall the text of Origen remains very close to the Platonic text in this section. With the

exception of the omission of τινας at 203d6, the changes Origen introduces are slight and mainly

of a stylistic nature. A slight relationship between Origen and Eusebius IO is possible, as is a relationship with the papyrus corrector, and one with W (possibly T as well, but it is more likely that BD strayed from the rest of the tradition; Origen nowhere demonstrates a special relationship with BD).

## v. Hermias (fifth century)

In our passage Hermias (*in Phaedrum*) quotes five sections: 201d5, 202d13, 202d13–e4, 203d7–8, and 204a1.

In his first section (201d5) Hermias gives ἥτις με ἐδίδαξε τὰ ἐρωτικὰ instead of ἣ δὴ καὶ ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ ἐδίδαξεν which appears in the main tradition. He has changed the presentation of the subject and he has rearranged the word order. The spirit of his quotation remains the same, but he has made the text his own.

For the second section (202d13), Hermias quotes only the words  $\delta\alpha$ i $\mu\omega\nu$   $\mu$ é $\gamma\alpha\zeta$ , but he does so in several places. While the phrase is an important one, his use of it has little to add to a discussion on the transmission of the text.

The third section Hermias quotes is a longer one (202d13–e4). Hermias makes use of this section more than once, but even though he retains some of the original phraseology, these quotations are better described as paraphrases. While they are not important for the current discussion, they will be addressed in chapter four (ii.2).

The fourth section (203d7–8) is, again, a paraphrase or a complete rearrangement of the original, but none of the important elements are left out, replaced, or augmented: Hermias provides:

εἶπε γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν Συμποσίῷ τὸν ἔρωτα φιλόσοφον καὶ δεινὸν γόητα καὶ φαρμακέα καὶ σοφιστήν.

Plato reads

φιλοσοφῶν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου, δεινὸς γόης καὶ φαρμακεὺς καὶ σοφιστής.

The presentation of Plato's text in indirect statement accounts for the difference.

In the fifth section Hermias quotes (204a1), his grammar is, once again, different, meaning that the snippet quotation of Plato cannot be given verbatim: θεῶν οὐδεὶς φιλοσοφεῖ ] θεῶν γάρ, φησίν, οὐδεὶς φιλόσοφος Hermias.

The quotations Hermias makes from our passage are seldom verbatim and often appear in paraphrase. It is important that he retains the phraseology of Plato, and his testimony might even be an ideal check for situations involving a choice between synonyms. For our passage, Hermias provides slim evidence for the transmission of the text, and the piecemeal nature of his quotations means that he does not show allegiance to any of the medieval MSS. families.

vi. Clement of Alexandria (c. AD 150–211)

Clement provides testimonia in his *Stromata* for two sections in our passage: 201d2–d5 and 209d7–e4.<sup>97</sup>

The first section is clearly a paraphrase and differs from the Platonic text in several ways.

There is a change of case, two omissions (one of them sizable – nine words), a change of word

 $<sup>^{97}</sup>$  Vicaire claims that Clement also quotes τοιούτους παῖδας at 209c8, but he is in fact quoting those words from the end of the following section (209d7–e4).

Chapter Three

59

order, a different word division which results in a different part of speech, and a change in verb

voice.

201d2 Μαντινικής Διοτίμας: Μαντινική Διοτίμα Clem. 98

201d2-3 ή ταῦτά τε σοφή ἦν καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ : om. Clem.

201d3-4 Άθηναίοις ποτὲ θυσαμένοις: θυσαμένοις Άθηναίοις Clem.

201d4 δέκα ἔτη : δεκαετῆ Clem.

201d4 ἐποίησε BD T W : ἐποιήσατο Π Clem. 99

Some of these changes reflect the grammar of Clement's sentence, which is a paraphrase rather

than a quotation, a fact which accounts for the deliberate changes. It does appear that Clement's

source material was a good text of Plato. The choice of the middle voice at 201d4 is interesting,

as is the fact that the papyrus supports the reading.

The second section is longer: 209d7–e4. Clement does not provide unique readings; here,

he is instead conspicuous for his omissions.

209d7 ἄλλοι : om. Clem.

209e1 ἄνδρες : om. Clem.

209e1 καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις BD T PW Π : καὶ βαρβάροις Clem.

209e2-3 πολλά ... ἀρετήν : om. Clem.

98 Vicaire simplifies the reading of Clement at this juncture, I believe because he considers the disagreement over the stem of the word, rather than case, to be the issue at hand. Μαντινικής B T Π: Μαντικής D W. But Clement

provides Μαντινική. <sup>99</sup> Vicaire could add that Clement reads τῆς with the *codices* and the papyrus corrector against the omission of the papyrus. 201d3–5 καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ποτὲ θυσαμένοις πρὸ τοῦ λοιμοῦ δέκα ἔτη ἀναβολὴν ἐποίησε τῆς νόσου.

Apart from his omissions Clement agrees with the *codices* and the papyrus, except where the papyrus provides a unique reading at 209e1.<sup>100</sup> The omissions seem to be deliberate, especially given the length of the last one, and could perhaps point to an effort to generalize. But the overall impression is that Clement knew the Platonic text well or was working with a sound text of Plato, but that he had a rather loose approach to the text of Plato.

Where Clement departs from the main tradition, the changes appear to be (almost entirely) Clement's own. Clement's testimonia do not align with any particular family or shed light on the ancestry of the text to which he had access.

vii. Hermogenes (second century)

Hermogenes quotes one section from our passage: 203b2–b3. The question is, given that he manipulates one portion of the text by conflating the subjects of the sentence, of how much value is his testimony for a (hotly contested) reading elsewhere in the section?

203b2 οἱ θεοὶ οἴ τε ἄλλοι BD T W Π Orig. Eus. : οἴ τε ἄλλοι θεοὶ Hermog.

If Hermogenes deliberately conflates two of the subjects within the sentence, the meaning is not much changed from Plato (but perhaps the syntax is simpler). The new word order does, however, retain the emphasis on Poros: both versions contain the vital elements of the phrase ἄλλ- ... τε ... καί which gives special emphasis to what follows, in both cases Poros. If this subtle shift in the presentation of the subjects suits Hermogenes' purpose in quoting this passage in a long line of other quotations, then it might be considered a deliberate change, but the difference between his text and Plato's is so little that intent is not likely the cause. An argument

 $<sup>^{100}</sup>$  καὶ ἐν Ἑλλησι BD T PW Clem. : και Ελλησι Π. Interestingly, the papyrus omits this ἐν but incorporates the second, whereas Clement includes the first and omits the second (καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις BD T PW Π : καὶ βαρβάροις Clem.).

for careless transcription, even transcription from memory, should also be kept in mind (and it could still be a happy coincidence if an error in quotation benefits his purpose, but the decision to quote several passages seems to call for careful quotation).

Of course, it is not entirely necessary to determine whether there was intent in his transposition, because in the second part of our question Hermogenes does follow a tradition for one reading. But if Hermogenes was quoting from memory or carelessly transcribing the text, then it may be accident that he agrees with other sources at 203b2: είστιῶντο b, T ipse, W Hermog. Orig. Eus.: ἡστιῶντο BD T, corr. W ipse: ϊστιῶντο Π. The multitude of sources for είστιῶντο shows that Hermogenes could easily have had a text which had this reading. The fact that Hermogenes and the other testimonia preserve the correct reading against several primary manuscripts shows the later corruption of the text, a point made even more clear by the correction attributed to the scribe of W. The corrections in B and T show that the true reading was still known in the early medieval period, either preserved in more rigidly copied texts, through testimonia, or through the very exemplars they were copying (given how common the variants are, it is not impossible that three manuscripts independently made the identical error).

The section that Hermogenes quotes is too short for him to demonstrate allegiance to a particular family, but he does provide testimony which aligns with that of other testimonia. viii. Pollux (second century)

Pollux quotes a single word from 202e5 ἀμοιβή. He is talking about a concept found in several authors, and is therefore not attempting to transmit the text of Plato. <sup>101</sup> Given the fact that

<sup>101</sup> The text of Pollux reads: λέγοιτο δ' αν ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ τὸ ἀμείβεσθαι. ἀμφίβολος δ' ἡ ἀμοιβή· ἔστι μὲν γὰρ παρ' Αρχιλόχω καὶ παρ' Εὐριπίδη ἐν Ὀρέστη, τὸ δὲ παρ' Ὁμήρω 'σοὶ δ' ἄξιον ἔσται ἀμοιβῆς' καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐν Συμποσίω οὐ σαφές.

Pollux is a lexicographer who often only cites single words, how is it fair to say that Pollux transmits the text of Plato, let alone cite him for omitting τῶν θυσιῶν? An argument which attributes the correct reading to Pollux is that of Th. Bergk, who argued that Pollux's classification of ἀμοιβῆς as οὐ σαφές "not clear" only makes sense if Pollux was consulting a text without τῶν θυσιῶν, which he felt must be a gloss added to explain ἀμοιβῆς.  $^{102}$  If Bergk is correct in assuming τῶν θυσιῶν to be a gloss, these words made their way into the textual tradition in antiquity because they are present in the papyrus. While Bergk and Pollux are correct that the meaning of ἀμοιβάς needs to be clarified, it is interesting that τῶν θυσιῶν makes its way into the texts of all primary witnesses; if τῶν θυσιῶν is a gloss, our primary MSS. and the papyrus descend closely from an archetype which incorporated this gloss at a very early date. If these words are not a gloss, then it shows that Plato understood that the meaning of his text needed to be made explicit. The omission of τῶν θυσιῶν is compelling for editors who seek nearperfect symmetry in the τῶν μὲν ... τῶν δέ clauses: τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς έπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν. With the removal of τῶν θυσιῶν, only the presence of τε in the second clause prevents exact symmetry for those who think Plato the sort of author to pursue such symmetry. In his commentary on the Gorgias, however, E.R. Dodds repeatedly points out Plato's neglect and avoidance of symmetry. 103

#### ix. Methodius (third century)

Methodius quotes three sections (three lines, really) from our passage: 209d2–3, 210d6, and 212b5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup> Bergk (1870, 678).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> See Dodds (1959, 403) under "symmetry, neglect of."

In the first section, 209d2–3, apart from changing the verb tense, the text resembles that of Plato. 209d2–3: οἶα ἔκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν BD T PW Π: ὅσα ἔκγονα καταλείπουσιν Procl. : οἶα καταλελοίπασιν ἑαυτῶν ἔκγονα Method. The section is either an instance of careless reporting, changing word order and tense for his own purposes, or (more likely) reporting from memory.

The second section, 210d6, is more complicated. Plato reads φιλοσοφία ἀφθόνφ while Methodius gives ἐν ἀφθόνφ καὶ καθαρᾶ φιλοσοφία. Whether this should be considered evidence for textual transmission is debatable. Methodius is undoubtedly giving a direct reference to this very passage of Plato because shortly afterwards he quotes the first section, 209d2–3. The classification of philosophy as καθαρᾶ reflects the theme (chastity) of his work (συμπόσιον ἢ περὶ ἀγνείας, in contrast to Plato's περὶ ἔρωτος), so with his rephrasing and introduction of a new adjective, Methodius both makes the text his own and alters the meaning to suit his needs.

The third section is also short: 212b5: ἔγωγέ φημι χρῆναι BD T PW Π : ἔγω χρῆναί φημι Method. The difference to the Platonic text is slight.

Given the changes we see in each section Methodius quotes, it seems that he deliberately references the Platonic text while changing it to suit his purpose. Where discussion of the textual tradition is concerned, the changes introduced by Methodius discourage serious consideration of any alternatives he introduces, particularly that of verb tense at 209d2–3.

## Chapter Four

## Influencing the text and the influence of the text

#### i. Part One

#### Introduction

In trying to ascertain the state or ancestry of the texts of *Smp*. 202d1–212c3 used by ancient authors, chapter three made some preliminary assumptions. But assigning inferior readings only to lapses in memory or careless copying is unsound and, as stressed in Whittaker's influential paper, <sup>104</sup> does not take into account intentional tampering. <sup>105</sup> This chapter will take a second look at the *testimonia* to see how they fall into categories suggested by Whittaker, and will discuss both the importance of different types of variants and the possibility that variants have been introduced intentionally. The discussion may reveal the habits and tendencies of the authors of the indirect tradition. The thrust of Whittaker's argument is that authors of the indirect tradition saw it of limited consequence to introduce additions, subtractions, changes in word order (i.e., transposition), and substitutions, believing that preserving the meaning or "sentiment," and perhaps improving clarity, was of more importance than an exact reproduction. <sup>106</sup> In our passage certain types of words, particularly articles, seem to incur more tampering than others, and it is necessary to look at the possible implications of changing the text in such a way.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>104</sup> Whittaker (1989, 63–95).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>105</sup> Whittaker (1989, 63–64).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup> Whittaker (1989, 69ff).

Determining the ways in which ancient sources understood the contemporary text of Plato may shed light on that text, and determining how ancient authors transmitted the text may add to or reduce their value in establishing the text of Plato. The latter does not detract from their value for the history of ideas.

#### i.1 Additions

The presence of additions in testimonia is not such a troubling phenomenon for the textual tradition because, as Whittaker says, "nothing of the original has necessarily been lost." Clarity seems to have been the motivation. In our passage, additions do not make up a significant portion of the variants in the indirect tradition, and several authors do not make any additions at all.

Stobaeus makes several (six) additions including additions of two particles, one definite article, one preposition, one verb (which is necessary for the grammar of his sentence), and one long interpolation:

202d1-2 τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν ] τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν Stob.

202e3 θεοῖς τὰ ] θεοῖς τε τὰ Stob.

203a6 ἢ γειρουργίας BD T W : ἢ περὶ γειρουργίας Π Stob.

203a7 καὶ BD T W Procl. : τε καὶ Π Stob.

208a4 ἔξοδος BD T WP Π (Stob. Tr.) : ἔξοδός ἐστιν Stob.(SMA)

208b5 ἀθανασίας γὰρ χάριν παντὶ BD T WP Π ἀθανασίας γὰρ ἅμα καὶ εὐδαιμονίας εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ γρόνον παντὶ Stob.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> Whittaker (1989, 76).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>108</sup> Whittaker (1989, 80).

Most of these additions are of little account, but the addition of the article at 202d1–2 needs to be compared to the behaviour of Stobaeus (and other authors) towards definite articles (see below, i.5), and the large interpolation at 208b5 seems deliberate

The additions made by Origen are few (see below). As discussed in the third chapter, the "addition" at 203e3 may in fact be the original reading. The text at 203e5 is problematic, containing several variant postpositives and enclitics. What may be happening is an elaborate case of contamination  $^{109}$ : the oldest readings (the papyrus, the papyrus corrector, and Origen) show that  $\alpha \nu$   $\kappa \alpha \nu$  was a reading from an early date. The reading found in T and W shows a possible conflation of the early reading and the reading of the  $\beta$  family. The reading that Origen provides differs from the oldest reading only by the addition of a postpositive.

203e3 πάλιν BD T W Π : πάλιν πάλιν Πc Orig.

203e5 τε αδ καὶ TW: τε καὶ BD: και  $\Pi$ : αυ και  $\Pi$ c: δ' αδ καὶ Orig.

Hermogenes makes one addition which is tied to an omission he makes earlier in the same line, and it is rightly classified as a transposition (or conflation as suggested in chapter two) and will be discussed further under the heading of word order.

203b2 οἱ θεοὶ οἴ τε ἄλλοι BD T W Π Orig. Eus. : οἴ τε ἄλλοι θεοὶ Hermog.

Plotinus possibly makes two additions. The addition of a preposition (206e8) is unremarkable, but the addition of the definite article (206c5) is only an addition if we accept the reading of the papyrus which is favoured by modern editors against that of the *codices* and Plotinus.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup> For similar examples of contamination in dialogues of the first two tetralogies, see Joyal (1996, 122); West (1973, 12–14, 35–36), provides a succinct explanation on contamination. See, also Dodds (1959, 38–39, 50 n.4, 64). <sup>110</sup> The manuscript tradition of Plotinus is divided here: those without the article are BRJUSCQ, and only Aac and E have it, so (depending on the value attached to the various MSS. by scholars of the Plotinus MS tradition) Vicaire

Chapter Four

67

206c5 καλῶ Π : τῶ καλῶ BD T W Plotin.

206e8 ώς θνητῷ ] ώς ἐν θνητῷ Plotin.

The additions in our passage seem to have little bearing on the meaning of the text and,

apart from Stobaeus' large interpolation at 208b5, the purpose behind most of these additions is

unclear. Plotinus' insertion of an article suits his purpose in discussing philosophical beauty and

forms, allowing him to discuss beauty as the beautiful. Addition of particles and conjunctions

could be attributed to style, and insertion of prepositions is clear evidence that additions serve to

enhance clarity. The addition of definite articles is interesting, even significant, for its possible

effect on meaning and for what it reveals about how authors of the indirect tradition understood

Plato; the phenomenon of articles will be examined once the scope of their manipulation is clear.

i.2 Subtractions

Subtractions or omissions are, like additions, more prevalent in some authors than others,

and in our passage, Stobaeus is the only author with more than three omissions. Omissions can

be accidental but are often intentional.<sup>111</sup>

Clement omits both a subject and the adjective which modifies it, and he omits a

(repeated) preposition later in the same sentence: three omissions in one sentence could suggest

intentional omission. The direct tradition 112 reads: καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλοθι πολλαγοῦ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἐν

Έλλησι καὶ ἐν Βαρβάροις, but in Clement the subject is completely removed.

209d7 ἄλλοι: om. Clem.

209e1 ἄνδρες : om. Clem.

may be giving the wrong impression in this presentation. For an outline of the MS tradition of Plotinus, see Henry and Schwyzer (1964, v-ix).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>111</sup> Whittaker (1989, 76–77).

<sup>112</sup> With the exception of the papyrus, which reads καὶ Ἑλλησι.

209e1-2 καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις BD T PW Π : καὶ βαρβάροις Clem.

In the following lines, Clement makes a third omission:

209e2–3 πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἀποφηνάμενοι ἔργα γεννήσαντες παντοίαν ἀρετήν: om. Clem. An omission of such length argues for intention, and it is not Clement's purpose to reproduce large tracts of the *Symposium*; rather he is incorporating a brief quotation into his own work: by making this quotation concise (including the omissions earlier in the section) it better fits his discussion. The text which Clement does reproduce is quite close to Plato, which suggests that he had a well-transcribed exemplar.<sup>113</sup>

The 13 omissions of Stobaeus fall into several categories: particles, conjunctions, definite articles, verb forms, and phrases of two or more words.

202c10 δὲ δὴ : om. Stob.

202c10 τάγαθὰ BD T W Π Stob. : ἀγαθὰ Stob.(P)

202c10 τὰ καλὰ BD Π: καλὰ T W Stob.

202e1 τε BD T Π: om. W Stob.

202e5 τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιων Stob.(P): om. Pollux

203a5 σοφὸς ὢν BD T W Π : σοφὸς Stob.

203a5 ή περὶ τέχνας: om. Stob.(F)

Outler (1940, 121–123) emphasizes that while Clement must have made use of anthologies, he had firsthand knowledge of Plato, making only occasional errors: "Clement's readings are, in the main, faithful; their deviations can be explained as signs of carelessness rather than as proofs of ignorance. As a matter of fact, his citations of Plato are quite as faithful as is his use of Scripture." But, Outler notes, Clement is not free from mistakes in reporting Plato, leading him to conclude that "In the first place, he often quotes them from memory; in the second place, his cavalier handling of them does not indicate the disciple, treating the master's sayings with loving care, but rather the use of proof-texts to confirm views already held on other authority" (1940, 124); see also 127 for Clement's habit of taking "from Plato only that which he wishes to find, that which is in accord with a position derived in part from his Hellenistic education and in part from his Christian convictions." Outler also emphasizes that Clement was not alone in his Christian appropriation and use of Plato – it was somewhat the norm (1940, 236–239). From Outler, then, we expect that Clement quotes Plato where the content provides what he needs, but that some errors will occur because the meaning inherent in Plato is not what interests Clement, but rather a precedent for ideas he wishes to express. Van Den Hoek's article is also useful for understanding the methods of gathering and using material contemporary to Clement, as well as his idiosyncrasies in using that material (1996, 223–243).

203a7 ἐστὶ : om. Stob.

208a4-5 λήθη γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ἔξοδος : om. Stob.(B)

208a7 γὰρ : om. Stob.

208b1 τῷ τὸ BD T WP Π: τῷ Stob.(A)

208b1 καὶ παλαιούμενον BD T WP Π : om. Stob.(SMA)

208b2-b4 ταύτη ... ἄλλη : om. Stob.

Seven of these examples are omissions unanimous across the Stobaeus MS. tradition. Only one of these unanimous omissions (202c10) is an omission of the definite article. Two are omissions of copulative (or linking) verb forms (203a5 and 203a7). The length of the unanimous omission at 208b2–b4 suggests that it was undertaken for a particular reason: the omission removes a vocative and a contextualizing verb of speech (ἔφη), resulting in a quotation less tied to place and speaker. A desire to generalize or modify the grammar to suit a new sentence may be behind the omissions of postpositives, enclitics, and particles in 202c10, 202e1, and 208a7.

The manuscript tradition of Stobaeus, however, is complicated. Of particular interest is the inconsistency within the Stobaeus MS. tradition: five omissions occur in only one Stobaeus MS, while a sixth example (208b1) appears in three MSS. Half of these unique omissions consist of omissions of the definite article. Twice the MS. Stob.P omits the article where Stob.F does not (202c10 and 202e5). The remaining unique omission of a definite article by a Stobaeus MS. is the omission at 208b1 of  $\tau \acute{o}$  by Stob.A. Discrepancies in the application of the definite article seem to belong mostly to the first section Stobaeus quotes and to the two MSS. (Stob.P and Stob.F) which transmit that portion of Stobaeus. The three remaining examples of omissions not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>114</sup> Both MSS. (F and P) omit the article at 202c10, making that omission unanimous among the MSS. which transmit this portion of Stobaeus.

universal to the Stobaeus tradition are all phrases of two to four words in length (203a5, 208a4–5, and 208b1). The question is whether the omissions, in these cases, were Stobaeus' own and were subsequently corrected in individual MSS. (by comparison with Platonic texts), or whether Stobaeus followed the Plato tradition and a later copyist made the omissions. Where the Stobaeus MS. tradition varies it is important to note that one reading may be right, or both readings may be wrong, but both cannot be correct. These questions do not, for the most part, have a bearing on the (mostly) secure Plato text, but they do have a bearing on the Stobaeus MS. tradition: the question is whether Stobaeus originally transmitted a text different from Plato's. Unfortunately, there is no way to demonstrate conclusively that, where the Stobaeus MSS. disagree, the copyist of one MS. was not using Plato to correct the text of Stobaeus. The discussion on definite articles will seek to resolve (below, i.5), or at least simplify, this dilemma, but it is helpful to lay out the scope of the problem here.

Consider the case of 202e5: Stobaeus suddenly appears to favour inclusion of the article after previously omitting it – who is to say Stob.P is not the correct *Stobaeus* reading (even if it is not the Plato reading)? The same argument in favour of Stob.P could be made for the reading at 202c10. And who decides that T W and Stobaeus are wrong at 202c10? Calling something an omission seems to assume that there is a secure text. The omission at 208a4–5 should not be considered deliberate on Stobaeus' part because a later scribe may have intentionally excised

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>115</sup> Whittaker (1989, 76–78) allows for the possibility that scribes of the indirect tradition made omissions, but replacement of omitted content does not fall within the scope of his work; Whittaker also notes the possibility of accident or faulty memory, but he further demonstrates the possibility of an omission having its root in the scholarship through which ancient authors were familiar with the text. Such an outlook should be kept in mind when looking at omissions as a whole, but because we are dealing with issues of variants within the Stobaeus tradition, our concern is with whether Stobaeus made a conscious decision to omit or whether the omission came later. West (1973, 10–11) provides some examples of such interference by later copyists.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>116</sup> As we have seen, the omission of the article at 202c10 τὰ καλὰ BD  $\Pi$ : καλὰ T W Stob is unanimous to the Stobaeus MSS. but there is discrepancy among the Plato MSS.

it,<sup>117</sup> and because only one MS. omits it. Because the omissions of the definite article occur mostly in the first section, their omission could be deliberate (for the sake of style or to generalize the meaning), but the fact that two of those omissions are only in Stob.P limits this conclusion. To say that Stobaeus demonstrates a tendency to omit definite articles (more often than he adds them) requires unanimous omissions. It is remarkable that a pattern of omitting articles can be ascribed to Stobaeus (or to the scribe of Stob.P) when the omission of small words, including articles, was common.

Four other authors make subtractions, and three of them join Stobaeus in omitting definite articles. Origen omits a conjunction, an indefinite adjective, and an enclitic:

203c2 καὶ θεράπων BD T W Π : θεράπων Orig.

203d6 ἀεί τινας : ἀεὶ Orig.

203e2 τε καὶ : καὶ Orig.

Proclus omits a definite article and an adjective:

209d2 ποιητάς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς BD T WP Π : ἀγαθοὺς ποιητάς Procl.

209d2-3 οἷα ἔκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν BD T WP Π : ὅσα ἔκγονα καταλείπουσιν

Procl. : οἷα καταλελοίπασιν έαυτῶν έκγονα Method.

Both Hermogenes and Pollux omit a noun and its definite article:

203b2 οἱ θεοὶ : om. Hermog.

202e5 τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιῶν Stob(P).: om. Pollux

It is tempting to make much of the omission of definite articles: first, four of the six authors who make omissions are subtracting the article; second, three of these authors do not make many omissions. The omission by Hermogenes, however, as already discussed, is a transposition and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>117</sup> See Whittaker (1989, 76–77).

belongs to the category of changes in word order. If the omission by Pollux is in fact the original reading, in spite of the fact that it occurs in a reference to Plato among other authors (meaning it is hardly a verbatim quotation), then it would be an instance of five primary witnesses and an indirect witness all adding in the same gloss. Still, the fact that authors are independently altering an element (definite articles) which affects meaning justifies a larger discussion once the data are compiled.

#### i.3 Word order

Changes to word order (transposition) are perhaps not a significant category when trying to determine the original state of the text: the words (theoretically) remain the same. Whittaker argues that ancient authors might not have considered changes to word order to be actual emendations of the text, but when they consistently alter the word order the changes might well be deliberate. The intention behind rearranging the sequence of words seems to have been to present something new (while retaining the original meaning). 120

Changes to word order in our passage are fewer than additions or omissions, but three of the five ancient authors who make changes in word order do so more than once, which, given the (small) scale of the sections they quote, might indicate deliberate rearrangement. Several of these transpositions are coupled with addition or omission of the definite article.

Stobaeus makes two changes to word order, both in the first section he quotes.

202d1-2 τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν : τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν Stob.

202d8 εἴη ὁ Ἔρως : ὁ Ἔρως εἴη Stob.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup> Whittaker (1989, 73).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>119</sup> Whittaker (1989, 72).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>120</sup> Whittaker (1989, 73).

Proclus also makes two changes to word order, but unlike Stobaeus he omits rather than adds the definite article.

209d2 ποιητάς τοὺς ἀγαθούς BD T WP Π : ἀγαθοὺς ποιητάς Procl.

212b3-4 συνεργὸν ἀμείνω Ἔρωτος : συνεργὸν ἔρωτος ἀμείνω Procl.

The one change Hermias makes is simply of word order.

201d5 τὰ ἐρωτικὰ ἐδίδαξεν : ἐδίδαξε τὰ ἐρωτικά Hermias

Hermogenes makes a transposition, leaving out the article in the process, because the new word order renders it unnecessary.

203b2 οἱ θεοὶ οἵ τε ἄλλοι BD T W Π Orig. Eus. : οἵ τε ἄλλοι θεοὶ Hermog. Methodius makes two changes to word order.

209d2–3 οἶα ἔκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν BD T WP Π : ὅσα ἔκγονα καταλείπουσιν Procl. : οἶα καταλελοίπασιν ἑαυτῶν ἑκγονα Method.

212b5 ἔγωγέ φημι χρῆναι BD T WP Π : ἔγω χρῆναί φημι Method.

Aside from changing the word order Methodius eschews the qualified form of the personal pronoun, perhaps in an effort to generalize the quotation (by removing the less emphatic element).

Changes to word order, then, are not common among the ancient authors who quote our passage verbatim or nearly verbatim. And even though several authors make more than one change to word order, no one makes more than two such changes. Whether or not one considers changes to word order as deliberate (at least as a stylistic tool) requires a few observations. First, only half of the ancient authors quoting from our passage make changes to word order; a noticeable absentee is Origen, who quotes from our passage at length. Second, the case of Stobaeus, who quotes three sections from our passage, illustrates that changes in word order do

not necessarily go hand in hand with long quotations: across his three quotations he makes only two changes to word order, both in the same quotation. Third, rearrangement of word order is sometimes accompanied by addition or subtraction of the definite article or other emphatic elements, suggesting a desire to alter the emphasis of the quotation.

#### i.4 Substitutions

Substitutions are common and take many forms.<sup>121</sup> In our passage there are some examples of replacing one word with a similar (in some cases cognate) word, and some examples of changing the number or grammatical form. The most common instances of substitution in our passage involve verb forms, which can vary in several ways.

Where simple substitutions are concerned, six authors provide evidence. Stobaeus twice replaces adjectives: in the first section he replaces one adjective with a non-cognate adjective, and in the second he replaces an adjective with an emphatic form.

203a4 τοιαῦτα σοφὸς BD T W Πc: τοιαῦτα σφοδρὸς Stob.

208b5 πᾶν BD T WP : ἄπαν Stob.

Proclus substitutes the more common form of an adjective for the less common one, provided we assume that the *codices* have the original reading. And, given the common nature of the change (itacism), the reading of the papyrus and Proclus is likely an orthographical variant.

204c5 τέλεον ] τέλειον Π Procl.

Two MSS. of Eusebius replace a singular with a plural but retain the case and gender. The discrepancy either reflects a change which Eusebius made, but which later copyists corrected on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>121</sup> For a list of some common categories of substitutions, see Whittaker (1989, 83–84).

the basis of Plato, or a change which occurred when later scribes introduced a variant into their texts of Eusebius.

203b4 οἷον BD T W Π Orig. Eus.IO : οἷα Eus.ND

Origen likewise replaces a singular form with the plural, while retaining the case.

203c3 ἐκείνης BD T W Π : ἐκείνων Orig. 122

Hermias makes two substitutions, one a replacement of a verb with a cognate noun, the other a simplifying substitution which replaces particularizing grammatical elements with generalizing ones.

201d5 ἥ δὴ καὶ ἐμὲ BD T W Π : ἥτις με Hermias

204a1 οὐδεὶς φιλοσοφεῖ BD T W Π Procl. : οὐδεὶς φιλόσοφος Hermias

At 201d5 Hermias replaces a relative pronoun and an emphatic particle with an indefinite relative. The context of the section in each author dictates his choice of relative: Plato needs the relative and emphatic particle to emphasize the final point in his long introduction to Diotima; Hermias, in contrast, names Diotima, then quotes only this portion of the sentence and has no need for the specific language Plato employs.

Themistius makes two simple substitutions: the first replaces an adjective with a cognate adverb, the second replaces a postpositive conjunctive particle with a different conjunction.

203d6 δεινός BD T W Π Orig. : δεινῶς Themist. : om. Paris. 1810

210a8 δè codd. Π : καὶ Themist.

<sup>122</sup> Origen (or a later scribe) might have thought that τοῖς γενεθλίος referred to the birthdays (understanding it as a plural of ή γενεθλία instead of the dative of the plural noun τὰ γενεθλία) of multiple entities, requiring the genitive plural ἐκείνων instead of the singular ἐκείνης.

There are many examples of substitutions involving verb forms. <sup>123</sup> Whittaker's examination of an entire text, in which he collects a large number of changes to verb forms, is able to demonstrate convincingly that these changes are deliberate. <sup>124</sup> In contrast, an examination of our passage (201d1–212c3) does not reveal data on a comparable scale: there is no ancient author who consistently alters verb forms, even among the authors who quote significantly from our passage. While the purpose and method of quoting differ from author to author (and they differ from Whittaker's author Alcinous), no one author demonstrates the same set of habits.

Whittaker notes the common phenomenon of interchanging compound and simple verbs. 125 In our passage there are two examples of this:

203d6 πλέκων BD T W Π : προσπλέκων Orig.

208b2 ἐγκαταλείπειν BD T WP  $\Pi c$ : ἐνκαταλιπειν  $\Pi$ : καταλείπειν Stob.  $^{126}$ 

Change of person/subject occurs once:

202d11 πρότερα ἔφη T W Π : πρότερα ἔφην BD Stob.  $^{127}$ 

Change of voice occurs once:

201d4 ἐποίησε BD T W : ἐποιήσατο Π Clem.

Change in tense occurs twice:

208b2 έγκαταλείπειν BD T WP Πc: ένκαταλιπειν Π : καταλείπειν Stob.

209d2-3 οἷα ἔκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν BD T WP Π : ὅσα ἔκγονα καταλείπουσιν

Procl. : οἷα καταλελοίπασιν έαυτῶν έκγονα Method.

 $<sup>^{123}</sup>$  Several of these are examples of movable nu which do not add anything to the discussion: 203c6 καθέστηκεν: καθέστηκε Orig.; ἐστιν: ἐστι Orig.; δ' ἐστιν ε. : γὰρ ἐστι φ. Procl.; 201d5 τὰ ἐρωτικὰ ἐδίδαξεν: ἐδίδαξε τὰ ἐρωτικά Hermias.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>124</sup> Whittaker (1989, 84).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>125</sup> Whittaker (1989, 83).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>126</sup> The papyrus corrector does not change the form of the verbal prefix from εν- to εγ- but the important detail here is that he corrects the tense to agree with that of the *codices*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>127</sup> While the change Stobaeus makes reflects the form found in BD, making the switch to a first-person singular verb enables Stobaeus to dissociate his quotation from its context: Stobaeus likely made this change consciously.

A common form of substitution involves replacing a verb form with a cognate noun. <sup>128</sup> In our passage there is one example of this:

204a1 οὐδεὶς φιλοσοφεῖ BD T W Π Procl. : οὐδεὶς φιλόσοφος Hermias Where the participle is concerned, only the example at 203d6 counts as a substitution (see above). The transmission of much-discussed προσαιτήσουσα (203b4) is too convoluted to be the result of deliberate change. <sup>129</sup>

#### i.5 The definite article

This chapter has drawn repeated notice to the addition and subtraction of definite articles. Most of the authors who quote our passage do not provide more than one example of alterations of the article. In stark contrast, Stobaeus provides more examples than all the other authors combined.

Proclus and Pollux both omit the article: Proclus also changes the word order (so perhaps he sought to introduce variety), but Pollux also omits the accompanying noun, although this is either a paraphrase or the only transmission of the true reading (see above chapter three, vii).

209d2 ποιητάς τοὺς ἀγαθούς BD T WP Π : ἀγαθοὺς ποιητάς Procl.

202e5 τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιῶν Stob.(P): om. Pollux

Hermogenes does not technically do anything to the article: he, like Pollux, omits a nounarticle pair, but Hermogenes then transposes the noun, rearranging the sentence without changing the meaning. Strictly speaking, Hermogenes does omit the article upon transposition, but the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>128</sup> Whittaker (1989, 84).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>129</sup> As previous discussions have noted, while Eusebius and Origen both ultimately have the same reading, Origen initially (probably) had the correct reading because the final readings in multiple manuscripts of Origen are the result of correction from a form or forms which retained the root ( $\pi$ ροσαιτησ-) found in most Plato MSS. (all when the evidence of Bpr. joins the discussion). See above, chapter three, iv.

article could not sit in its new home. The context, then, necessitates the omission of the article, and the omission does not reflect a desire to influence the meaning of the section.

203b2 οἱ θεοὶ οἵ τε ἄλλοι BD T W Π Orig. Eus. : οἵ τε ἄλλοι θεοὶ Hermog. In contrast to the other authors, and perhaps more interestingly, Plotinus adds an article.

206c5 ἐν δὲ καλῷ Π: ἐν δὲ τῷ καλῷ BD T WP Plotin.

Unlike the previous examples (but perhaps indicative of the discussion still to come of Stobaeus), which showcased variant readings unique to the testimonia, Plotinus is not alone in his reading. The *codices* provide the same reading as Plotinus, and it is in fact only the papyrus which does not have the article. Only the decision of modern editors to favour the reading of the papyrus relegates Plotinus' reading to the category of 'addition.' If the earliest reading, that of the papyrus, is the original reading, our passage may have originally been free from the philosophical overtones found in the medieval tradition. The evidence from Plotinus, intriguingly, demonstrates that the philosophical desire to link this passage to Plato's forms was present from an early date. The presence of this article in both Plotinus and the medieval MSS. may lend further support to the proposal that these MSS. trace their origin to the philosophical environment of fifth- and sixth-century Alexandria. 130

Stobaeus presents several variant readings of the article, many of which also reflect discrepancy among the Plato MSS. Some examples also reflect disagreement among the Stobaeus MS. tradition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>130</sup> Even taking into account the discrepancy among the Plotinus MS. tradition here (see i.1), the point stands that a variant with philosophical overtones crept into the tradition at an early date. For convincing discussions linking the Paris manuscript of Plato (and therefore its immediate descendant T) to fifth- or sixth-century Alexandria, see Whittaker (1987, 280–282), (1991 513–521), and Westerink (1981, 112–115).

Twice Stobaeus agrees with T  $\delta$  (PW, or W alone) and the papyrus in recognizing a definite article where  $\beta$  does not:

202d5 ὅ γε τῶν d T W Π Stob. : ὁ γε γ'ὤν Βρc D : ὅ γεγὢν (sic) prB

208a8 οὐ τῷ b T PW Π Stob. : οὕτω BD

These examples probably suggest a miscopying at the time the archetype of B and D was copied into miniscule from majuscule, rather than anything about the relationship of Stobaeus to other Plato MSS., and there is nothing 'deliberate' in Stobaeus preserving the text of the main tradition. There are three further examples where some MSS. of Stobaeus preserve the Platonic reading but others do not:

202c10 τοὺς τάγαθὰ BD T Π Stob.(F): τοὺς άγαθὰ Stob.(P): τοὺς άγαθοὺς καὶ τὰ άγαθὰ

W

202e5 τῶν θυσιῶν BD T W Π Stob.(F): θυσιῶν Stob.(P): om. Pollux

208b1 τῷ τὸ BD T WP Π : τῷ Stob.A

The earlier discussion on omissions in Stobaeus highlighted the importance of knowing whether a copyist corrected Stobaeus from Plato or whether Stobaeus was faithful to the Platonic text: how far can the divergences of Stobaeus from Plato be attributed to Stobaeus? A few more examples will go some way to clarifying the issue. There are two more readings where Stobaeus agrees with some of the Plato MSS. against others:

202c10 τὰ καλὰ BD Π : καλὰ T W Stob.

202e8 καὶ τὰς τελετὰς BD Π Stob. : καὶ τελετὰς Τ W

The latter example is the only place (in this discussion on articles) where Stobaeus agrees with BD against T and W. These two examples demonstrate that Stobaeus both omits and preserves the article. The Plato MSS. are varied in their approach to the article, as is Stobaeus: what is

interesting is that, where the article is concerned, Stobaeus never provides a reading that is not also found in the manuscript tradition of Plato. This agreement may be coincidence, since articles are such small words, rather than firm evidence for a relationship between the Plato MSS. tradition and Stobaeus. Only one reading provides evidence for the MSS. of Stobaeus departing unanimously from all the Plato MSS. (in an instance of the article):

202d1–2 τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν BD T W : τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν Stob. Even here, however, the addition of a definite article is perhaps less significant, at least where a desire to discover an author shaping the material he quotes is concerned, because its conjunction with a change in word order results in a variation on the stock phrase καλὸς κἀγαθός while preserving the meaning of the Platonic text.

Stobaeus, then, unanimously departs from the whole Plato MS. tradition only once (202d1–2), and then perhaps under the influence of a stock phrase. Most of the evidence points to Stobaeus trying to preserve a tradition also preserved by some Plato MSS. (T and W in particular). The evidence of Stob.P still holds value until someone proves that Stob.F preserves the original text of Stobaeus. While there is no definitive proof that Stobaeus did not seek to shape his quotation of Plato by his own use of definite articles (though certainly the copyist of Stob.P seems to have done this!), the evidence from multiple examples is more than enough to suggest that Stobaeus attempted to be faithful to Plato.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>131</sup> This examination of definite articles within Stobaeus' quotations highlights a few themes within the Plato MSS. First, where the article is concerned, there is a definite dichotomy between T W and BD. Second, and rather interestingly, the papyrus seems to favour the definite article regardless of a relationship with any MS. family.

## ii. Part two

# ii.1 The influence of Symposium 202d1–203a8

[Plato's] precise definition of the vague terms 'daemon' and 'daimonios' was something of a novelty in Plato's day, but in the second century after Christ it was the expression of a truism. Virtually every one, pagan, Jewish, Christian or Gnostic, believed in the existence of these beings and in their function as mediators, whether he called them daemons or angels or aions or simply 'spirits' (πνεύματα). 132

So comments E.R. Dodds on Plato's description of  $\delta\alpha\mu\nu\epsilon$  at Smp. 202d1–203a8. While Dodds notes the enduring influence of our passage, Plato's contemporaries and near-contemporaries already took inspiration from the passage. Xenocrates, head of the Academy from 339 B.C., adopted the intermediary nature of Plato's  $\delta\alpha\mu\nu\epsilon$ , using a comparison with triangles to demonstrate his point. This thesis has thus far concerned itself strictly with the textual tradition, both direct and indirect. The examination of the indirect tradition has dealt solely with testimonia which are intended to be relatively precise quotations. The effort to establish the state of the text and to determine how the testimonia agree with or differ from it is necessary to provide a comparison for those authors who do not quote Plato verbatim.

The influence of *Symposium* 201d1–212c3 extends so far, from antiquity through the Renaissance and beyond, that there is neither space nor time to examine the total extent. Some

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>132</sup> Dodds (1965, 37–38).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>133</sup> Dillon (1977, 31–32); it is Plutarch (*Obsolescence of Oracles* 416C–D) who preserves this theory of Xenocrates. Dillon also mentions that 'Xenocrates makes a point of declaring a man's soul to be his daemon (Fr. 81),' a sentiment which may have been influenced by Plato's *Timaeus* 90a (1977, 30).

examples which reveal the influence of *Symposium* 202d1–203a8 will be discussed here to demonstrate the particular interest which this section long held for authors.<sup>134</sup>

#### ii.2 Alcinous and others

Alcinous' work *Didaskalikos*, a Middle-Platonic introduction to Plato's philosophy, dates to the second century A.D. In it Alcinous paraphrases *Symposium* 202d1–203a8 twice, once very closely (68.34–37 W), and once in very different language (35.23–26 W). The first of these passages is particularly interesting:

όθεν καὶ τὸν σωματοποιούμενον Ἐρωτα δαίμονά τινα μᾶλλον φατέον ἤπερ θεὸν μηδέποτε ἐν γηίνῳ σώματι γεγενημένον, διαπορθμεύοντα τὰ παρὰ θεῶν ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἀνάπαλιν. 136

Αλλὰ μὴν Ἔρωτά γε ὡμολόγηκας δι' ἔνδειαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν ἐπιθυμεῖν αὐτῶν τούτων ὧν ἐνδεής ἐστιν. Ὠμολόγηκα γάρ. Πῶς ἄν οὖν θεὸς εἴη ὅ γε τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἄμοιρος; Οὐδαμῶς, ὥς γ' ἔοικεν. Ὁρᾶς οὖν, ἔφη, ὅτι καὶ σὸ Ἔρωτα οὐ θεὸν νομίζεις; Τί οὖν ἄν, ἔφην, εἴη ὁ Ἔρως; θνητός; Ἡκιστά γε. Ἀλλὰ τί μήν; Ὠσπερ τὰ πρότερα, ἔφη, μεταξὺ θνητοῦ καὶ ἀθανάτου. Τί οὖν, ὧ Διοτίμα; Δαίμων μέγας, ὧ Σώκρατες· καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ. Τίνα, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, δύναμιν ἔχον; Ἐρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν, ἐν μέσφ δὲ ὂν ἀμφοτέρων συμπληροῖ, ὥστε τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸ αὐτῷ συνδεδέσθαι. διὰ τούτου καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τελετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπφδὰς καὶ τὴν μαντείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν. θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπω οὐ μείγνυται, ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτου πᾶσά ἐστιν ἡ ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος θεοῖς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἐγρηγορόσι καὶ καθεύδουσι· καὶ ὁ μὲν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα σοφὸς δαιμόνιος ἀνήρ, ὁ δὲ ἄλλο τι σοφὸς ὢν ἢ περὶ τέχνας ἢ χειρουργίας τινὰς βάναυσος. οὖτοι δὴ οἱ δαίμονες πολλοὶ καὶ παντοδαποί εἰσιν, εἶς δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Ἔρως.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup> Smp. 202d1–203a8:

<sup>135</sup> The second of Alcinous' passages shows the influence of Symposium 202e3–203a4:
Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων οἱ ἐκείνου [sc. τοῦ θεοῦ] παῖδες ἡγοῦνται, κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου ἐντολὴν καὶ μίμησιν πράττοντες ὅσα πράττουσιν, ἀφ' ὧν κληδόνες καὶ ὀττεῖαι καὶ ὀνείρατα καὶ χρησμοὶ καὶ ὅσα κατὰ μαντείαν ὑπὸ θνητῶν τεχνιτεύεται.

This passage is not a quotation or even paraphrase, but rather an interpretation and description of what is latent in Plato.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup> The text given is Whittaker's.

Alcinous expresses the idea found in *Smp*. 202e1 in different phraseology. But his expression of the important words from *Smp*. 202e3–4 retains much of the same phraseology: he keeps one of the two participles, moves the second object clause forward, and reduces the first object clause to an adverb (ἀνάπαλιν, "vice versa") in a kind of shorthand. Clearly Alcinous is not quoting verbatim; rather, he produces a rephrased and rearranged version of Plato. Given the freedom with which Alcinous alters the early part of the section, it is interesting that he takes such care to preserve the participle and object clause, but keeping these provides a "hook" for his readers because they recall Plato's text instantly. It seems that even by the second century, use of forms of διαπορθμεύω, drawn from *Smp*. 202e3, is already commonplace. <sup>137</sup> The participle Alcinous omits is έρμηνεῦον, but he has compacted such a large section of Plato (202d7–e4) that it is unsurprising that he has not transmitted this participle. Not only does this passage of Alcinous preserve the phrasing of Plato's *Symposium*, it also accepts the belief introduced in the *Symposium* that Eros is a δαίμων not a θεός.

Alcinous was one of many authors to find *Symposium* 202d7–e4 worth transmitting. The second-century A.D. sophist Maximus of Tyre (*Dissertationes* 8.8) shows the influence of this section of the *Symposium*:

καθάπερ γάρ, οἶμαι, τὸ βαρβαρικὸν τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ διήρηται φωνῆς συνέσει, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν ἐρμηνέων γένος τὰς παρ' ἑκατέρων φωνὰς ὑποδεχόμενον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον πρὸς ἑκατέρους, συνῆψεν αὐτῶν καὶ συνεκέρασεν τὰς ὁμιλίας· οὕτω δ' ἄν καὶ τὸ δαιμόνων γένος ἐπίμικτον νοεῖται καὶ θεοῖς τε καὶ ἀνθρώποις. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ ἀνθρώποις προσφθεγγόμενον καὶ φανταζόμενον καὶ

 $<sup>^{137}</sup>$  Whittaker (1990, 68 n.551) notes that the use of διαπορθμεύω to describe intermediacy in Patristic texts stems directly from *Smp*. 202e3 (see below for further discussion).

είλούμενον ἐν μέση τῆ θνητῆ φύσει καὶ ἐπωφελοῦν ὅσα ἀνάγκη δεῖσθαι θεῶν τὸ θνητῶν γένος. πολλὴ δὲ ἡ δαιμόνων ἀγέλη·

While Maximus does not preserve Plato's phrasing, the verbal stems of the two participles  $(\delta \iota \alpha \pi o \rho \theta \mu \epsilon \tilde{\upsilon} o v)$  and  $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu \eta \nu \epsilon \tilde{\upsilon} o v)$  are both present in Maximus; the latter is in the form of a cognate noun. More interestingly, these retained elements are present in a simile, which Maximus introduces by  $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \dots o \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \omega \kappa \alpha \tilde{\iota}$  ("just as ... so also"). Maximus does not say that  $\delta \alpha \dot{\iota} \mu o \nu \epsilon c$  are a race of linguistic interpreters who convey, he says they are like that. Maximus uses  $\dot{\epsilon} v \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \eta$ , which he draws from Smp. 202e6, to express the intermediate place rather than the thematic  $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \dot{\upsilon}$  which Plato uses throughout the dialogue (even as early as 202a3), and which other authors employ to invoke the passage. Two other patterns which we shall see again are present in this section of Maximus: the classification of  $\delta \alpha \dot{\iota} \mu o \nu \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} a$  and  $\dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} a$  or "herd."

Proclus makes a clear reference to our passage in his commentary on the *Timaeus* (1.341.16–18):

έν δὲ τοῖς κρείττοσιν ἡμῶν γένεσιν ἡ ἀγγελικὴ τάξις ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ὑποστᾶσα συνεχῶς ἐρμηνεύει καὶ διαπορθμεύει τὸ ἄρρητον τῶν θεῶν.

Here Proclus converts both participles to finite verbs, the forms that suit his grammar, but he talks of an 'angelic order or company,' and what they interpret and convey are things that are 'secrets of the gods.' The adverb  $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \chi \tilde{\omega} \zeta$  denotes that these actions are done "constantly" or "continuously," as one would expect from personal guardian spirits. The role of  $\delta \alpha i \mu \nu \nu \epsilon \zeta$  as

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>138</sup> Maximus may have been inspired by Plato's *Phaedrus* 246a3–7 to refrain from a *definition* of divinity in favour of a *simile*.

<sup>139</sup> Of the eight times μεταξύ occurs in the *Symposium*, seven of those are in our passage.

guardian spirits watching over their charges is one which prevails even in modern Catholicism (see below, ii.4). While the language Proclus uses is different from Maximus and others, there remains a tendency to describe intermediaries as a group (Proclus does not use the term δαίμονες here). Instead of an adverb or adverbial phrase to express the intermediate nature of his ἀγγελικὴ τάξις, Proclus uses the more descriptive phrase ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ὑποστᾶσα.

Elsewhere (*in Timaeum* 3.165.22–27) Proclus again employs the two participles, and again he retains little else of Plato's text:

ἔτι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἀγγελικὸν κατὰ τὴν νοερὰν τοῦ δημιουργοῦ προέρχεται ζωήν, διὸ καὶ αὐτὸ νοερόν ἐστι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ ἐρμηνεύει καὶ διαπορθμεύει τὸν θεῖον νοῦν εἰς τὰ δεύτερα. τὸ δὲ δαιμόνιον κατὰ τὴν δημιουργικὴν τῶν ὅλων πρόνοιαν καὶ τὴν φύσιν κατευθύνει καὶ τὴν τάξιν ὀρθῶς συμπληροῖ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου.

His use of ἑρμηνεύειν and διαπορθμεύειν must have been strong enough markers to induce readers to think of Plato's text, and his use of τὸ δαιμόνιον is reminiscent of πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον. Proclus makes use of the phrase πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον at *in Rem Publicam* 2.337.13–17:

εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ δαιμόνων ἔστιν φῦλον ἄλογον καὶ οὐ **πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον** λογικόν— ἐπεὶ πῶς ἡ Διοτίμα φησὶν τὴν γοητείαν καὶ οὐ τὴν ἱερατικὴν μόνην γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ δαιμονίου γένους, εἰ μὴ πρὸς τῷ λογικῷ τι δαιμόνιον καὶ ἄλογον ἦν;

By using this phrase Proclus gives a Platonic flavour to his  $\phi \tilde{\nu} \lambda o \nu \delta \alpha \mu \delta \nu \omega \nu$  (yet another way to describe a group of  $\delta \alpha (\mu o \nu \epsilon \varsigma!)$ .

Proclus also uses the phrase πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον at in Tim. 3.165.5–7:

πᾶν γὰρ τὸ δαιμόνιον τὴν μεταξὸ χώραν ἀναπληροῖ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

Proclus has changed Plato's notion of δαίμονες which act as conduits in an intermediate space: now everything that has to do with a δαίμων (πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον) fills up (ἀναπληροῖ) that intermediate space.  $^{140}$ 

In his commentary on the *Alcibiades* (46.1–11), in a long discussion inspired by Socrates' reference to his divine sign, τὸ δαιμόνιον (*Alc*. I 103a4–b2), Proclus draws upon the same passage in the *Symposium* but drops the adjective  $\pi \tilde{\alpha} v$ :

ἐπεὶ καὶ ὅταν μὲν τὴν δαιμονίαν μεσότητα νοῶμεν, θεῶν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀνθρώπων μεταξὺ θεωροῦμεν, ὅταν δὲ νοῦν ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τάττωμεν, ψυχὴν ἐξάπτομεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς. καὶ ἔχεις τὴν μὲν ἑτέραν διαίρεσιν ἐν Συμποσίῳ, τὸ γὰρ δαιμόνιον ἐκεῖ πού φησι μέσον εἶναι θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ... διὸ καὶ ἐνταῦθα περὶ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως τῆς ζητήσεως οὔσης νοῦ μὲν οὐδεμία μνήμη γενήσεται, τῆς δὲ τοῦ δαίμονος προνοίας ὑπομνήσει τὸν νεανίσκον ὁ Σωκράτης, ποτὲ μὲν αὐτὸν δαίμονα προσαγορεύων, ποτὲ δὲ θεόν.

At 46.5 Proclus uses the phrase μέσον ... θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, but earlier in the passage (46.2) he used the phrase τὴν δαιμονίαν μεσότητα to describe the same relationship (a noun which, as we shall see, Michael Psellus also uses at a much later date). It is especially significant that Proclus is using Plato's *Symposium* to inform his description of Socrates' divine sign, and nor is he the only author to do so.

Hermias (*in Phdr*. 70.9–13 L-M) uses our passage to describe the nature of Socrates' divine sign. Hermias is attempting to explain Socrates' divine sign because it is mentioned in the *Phaedrus* (242b8–c3). His use of our passage comes after he has cited the passage from the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup> Proclus also uses the phrase at *in Platonis Rem Publicam* 1.41.20, where he is not providing a verbatim quotation, but rather summarizing.

*Phaedrus* where Socrates' divine sign prevents him from crossing the river Ilissus; Hermias goes on to say what the divine sign is *not*, and he now says what it *is*:

ὅτι μὲν οὖν ταῦτα [sc. μόριον τῆς ψυχῆς, "a part of the soul," and ἡ φιλοσοφία αὐτή, "philosophy itself"] οὐκ ἔστι τὸ δαιμόνιον Σωκράτους, ἐναργῶς λέγεται, τί δέ ἐστι, ῥητέον. πᾶν μὲν οὖν τὸ δαιμόνιον γένος εἴρηται καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν Συμποσίφ μεταξὺ εἶναι θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, διαπορθμεῦον τά τε παρὰ θεῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς τά τε ἡμῶν ἀναγγέλλον τοῖς θεοῖς·

Several elements from our passage are present here: the participle  $\delta$ ιαπορθμεῦον remains, as does the phrase μεταξὸ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων; Hermias also preserves the object clauses, but with some rewording which includes the introduction of the new participle ἀναγγέλλον into the second object clause. Hermias also joins other authors in classifying δαίμονες as a γένος; to be specific, he classifies πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον as a γένος.

The second-century Latin author Apuleius wrote a work on Socrates' divine sign, *de deo Socratis*. In this work he quickly summarizes 202d1–203a8, but then elaborates on the duties of δαίμονες.

Ceterum sunt quaedam divinae mediae potestates inter summum aethera et infimas terras in isto intersitae aeris spatio, per quas et desideria nostra et merita ad deos commeant. Hos Graeci nomine daemonas nuncupant, inter <terricolas> caelicolasque vectores hinc precum inde donorum, qui citro ultro portant hinc petitiones inde suppetias ceu quidam utri[u]sque interpretes et salutigeri. Per hos

eosdem, ut Plato in Symposio autumat, cuncta denuntiata et magorum varia miracula omnesque praesagiorum species reguntur.  $(13.18 - 14.6)^{141}$ 

Earlier in the same work, Apuleius refers to the separation of the divine and mortal (nam, ut idem Plato ait, nullus deus miscetur hominibus 11.10) which Plato mentions at Smp. 203a1–2 (θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μείγνυται), but he prefaces this with a long expansion on the ways in which the two spheres are distinct (10.15 – 11.10). Apuleius, then, adopts Plato's description of δαίμονες from Symposium 202d1–203a8 and expands upon it, yet Apuleius' δαίμονες are not limited to the role and form Plato prescribed. In Apuleius, δαίμονες conform to Middle-Platonic ideology as far as their intermediate nature is concerned, and his work shares similarities with the ideas of Plutarch and (as we know from Plutarch) Xenocrates; as Dillon puts it, 'We have here, then, in the De Deo Socratis, the most complete connected version of Middle Platonic demonology extant.'  $^{142}$ 

In his edition of Alcinous' *Didaskalikos*, Whittaker notes, "C'est sans doute sous l'inspiration de *Banquet* 202 E 3 que les pères de l'Église ont employé ce verb [διαπορθμεύειν] et ses dérivés pour désigner le rôle intermédiaire du Fils." He then notes that Lampe demonstrates this use of διαπορθμεύω in his *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. A selection from these and other authors now follows.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>141</sup> Apuleius goes on to say that members of this race are responsible for ensuring the successful occurrence of the omens found in dreams, sacrifices, augury, and weather, among other phenomena, for these are the result of both the authority of gods and the agency of *daimones* (14.6–14). All references to Apuleius are to the page and line number in Tomas (1970).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>142</sup> Dillon (1977, 317–320). Dillon notes, "What he [Apuleius] is primarily concerned with, however, since it is with these that he proposes to link the daemon of Socrates, are the guardian daemons mentioned by Plato in the myths of the *Phaedo* (107dff.) and *Republic* x (617de, 620de), who accompany a man through life, know his inmost thoughts and most secret actions, and after death act as his advocate (or accuser) before the throne of judgement,' a sentiment found in Plutarch rather than Plato (1977, 319–320).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>143</sup> Whittaker (1990, 68 n.551).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>144</sup> Lampe (1969, s.v. διαπορθμεύω).

The eleventh-century (c. A.D. 1018–1081) intellectual Michael Psellus uses elements from Plato's text and elements which had become common when adapting Plato (*Opuscula psychologica, theologica, daemonologica* 126.5–11).

εἰσὶ δέ τινες ἀγέλαι δαιμόνων ἐστερημέναι σχεδὸν τῆς ἀγαθοεργίας, οἴτινες λέγονται κακοί, καὶ ἔτεραι ἀγέλαι δαιμόνων ἐστερημέναι τῆς ὄντως γνώσεως, οἴτινες ἄλογοι καὶ θηριώδεις ὀνομάζονται. ἐρμηνεύειν δέ φασι τὸ δαιμόνιον γένος καὶ διαπορθμεύειν θεοῖς τε τὰ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν ἐκφαντορικὸν ὑπάρχον ὡς κεκρυμμένων καὶ ἀφανῶν, τῶν δὲ ἀναγωγὸν ὡς διαπορθμεύεσθαι πρὸς τὴν μόνιμον τῶν κρειττόνων ἀγαθότητα δεομένων.

Psellus uses the two participles (in infinitive form, as befits indirect speech) and he preserves verbatim the two object clauses: these lines (126.7–9) are a direct quotation of Plato, modified to suit the grammar. The description of  $\delta\alpha$ ( $\mu$ ove; as an  $\dot{\alpha}\gamma$ 6 $\lambda$  $\eta$  or "herd" which we saw in Maximus of Tyre also appears here, and the presence of  $\tau$ ive; indicates a metaphor ("as it were"). The appearance of  $\varphi$ a $\sigma$ i, "they say," is curious: Plato (or rather, Diotima) is the subject in the original source, but Psellus ignores that fact, perhaps indicating how commonplace the passage has become. By using  $\varphi$ a $\sigma$ i, a verb which has a long history of use in expressions of traditional belief, Psellus indicates that the passage has become standard fare. <sup>145</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>145</sup> For an extensive list of instances of φασι being used in this way, see Fraenkel (1982, II, 470–471 on Aesch. *Agamemnon* 1040); see also Johansen and Whittle on this use of φασι in epic (1980, II, 234 on Aesch. *Suppliants* 291). The so-called Alexandrian footnote is also common in Latin: see Ross (1975, 77–78) and Hinds (1998, 1–2).

Earlier in the same passage (126.2) Psellus provides a verbatim quotation of 202d13-e1 καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ, with a slight change in word order to suit his grammar.

καὶ ὅλως τὴν μεσότητα τῶν δαιμόνων ἀφορίζοντες οἱ παρ' Ἑλλησι σοφοὶ μεταξύ φασιν εἶναι πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον θείου καὶ θνητοῦ. μάλιστα δέ φασι τὴν δύναμιν χαρακτηρίζειν τὴν μεσότητα τὴν δαιμονίαν καὶ ἐκ τούτου δεῖν θηρᾶν τὴν νοητὴν αὐτοῦ αἰτίαν.

Here Psellus reinforces that the sentiments found in our passage have become ubiquitous by again using φασι. In addition to incorporating the thematic μεταξό, he uses μεσότητα, both of which flag the Platonic passage, much as ἐν μεσῷ accomplished the same in Maximus and even in Proclus ( $in\ Alc.$ , see above). More importantly, Psellus says that Plato's description of δαίμονες is the definition (ἀφορίζοντες) of daemonic "middleness" (τὴν μεσότητα τῶν δαιμόνων). His use of this noun (and the use by Proclus above) – which does not appear in the Symposium – shows that the notion of "the intermediate" is so strongly associated with Plato that words which invoke intermediacy will call to mind our passage. More importantly, Psellus' use of terminology that had been introduced hundreds of years earlier suggests that this particular word - μεσότητα – had become shorthand for the passage as a whole, perhaps even a title for the passage.

Maximus Planudes (c. A.D. 1250–1305) was a Byzantine humanist. In his *Compendia e Platonis dialogis* 114.1–17, as the title suggests, he provides a long verbatim quotation of 201e8–203a6. What is left out is the interaction between Socrates and Diotima: the text of Planudes is not punctuated by Diotima's questions and Socrates' professions of ignorance. Rather it is the philosophical statements of Diotima which he records, turning the dialogue into a

philosophical treatise. As expected, Planudes also retains the important phrase πãν τὸ δαιμόνιον from Smp. 202d13.

The ninth-century Byzantine emperor Leo VI (A.D. 866 - 912) is an example of an author who is influenced by the language of the *Symposium* but employs it in a Christian context (*Homily* 37.59-63).

οί μὲν ἐξ ὧν διακονοῦσιν—ἄγγελοι γάρ εἰσι τῶν ἐκ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διαπορθμευομένων—, ἔλαχον καὶ τὴν κλῆσιν, οἱ δέ, ὅτι διὰ παντὸς ἐπεστραμμένοι πρὸς αὐτὸν αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαμορφούμενοι ὅμμασιν, ἐκ τῆς τῶν ὀμμάτων πληθύος πολυόμματα λέγονται.

Leo retains the participle but changes its voice to reflect a slightly different function in the sentence: 'messengers of things being conveyed from God to humans' perhaps downplays the agency of  $\alpha\gamma$  and  $\alpha\gamma$  are emphasis on the origin of what is being conveyed:  $\alpha$  are  $\alpha$  agency of  $\alpha\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  are emphasis on the origin of what is being conveyed:  $\alpha$  are  $\alpha$  are expression 'from God to humans' is different from Plato's, if only by the slight change of participle and the switch to the singular 'God,' but the recognizable  $\alpha\gamma$  and  $\alpha\gamma$  are still present. Leo manages both to make an erudite reference to Plato and to disguise his pagan source. The switch from  $\alpha\gamma$  are  $\alpha\gamma$  beo  $\alpha\gamma$  is one that is sanctioned by the latter's occurrence six times in the *New Testament*. What is perhaps most interesting is that Leo

<sup>146</sup> Leo is not alone in simultaneously embracing Plato and rejecting him as a pagan: compare the comment which his contemporary, Arethas, makes on Plato, *Apology* 27e1, in the margin of MS. E.D. Clarke 39 (B): καλῶς γε σὺ ποιῶν, Σώκρατες, ὄνοις καὶ ἵπποις τοὺς θεοὺς Ἀθηναίων παραβάλλεις, (you do well, Socrates, when you compare the gods of the Athenians to donkeys and horses) (Cufalo 2007, 20). Wilson's view on this *scholium* is harsh (1983, 122–123): '...the remark serves only to warn us not to expect from Arethas the intellectual distinction of a philosopher.' Wilson does, however, admit that in Arethas, 'Once again we have an example of the rule that churchmen of the highest standing were liberal and tolerant in their attitude towards the literature of the pagan past' (1983, 120), a sentiment which must apply to Leo also.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>147</sup> Even though παρὰ θεοῦ occurs five times and ἐκ θεοῦ occurs six times in the *New Testament*, Leo chose the expression that is not present in his pagan source.

employs ἄγγελοι, as Proclus used ἡ ἀγγελικὴ τάξις, rather than ἀγέλαι δαιμόνων (Psellus), ἡ δαιμόνων ἀγέλη (Maximus of Tyre), <sup>148</sup> τὸ δαιμόνων γένος (Maximus of Tyre), or φῦλον δαιμόνων (Proclus): the language is clearly Christian.

John Chrysostom (c. A.D. 354–407) had a typical *classical* education in rhetoric, consisting of the study of pagan authors including Plato, with an initial view to join the civil service; his pursuit of a career in the Church came after completion of his formal education. <sup>149</sup> In his work *in Genesim* 53.83, he employs only one of the two participles (διαπορθμεύοντες), but he retains the formula of the object clause. He has adapted the language of Plato to a context which deals with teachers rather than *daimones*.

καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς δὲ τοὺς ὑμετέρους, ὅσοι διὰ σωματικὴν ἀσθένειαν νηστεύειν οὐ δύνανται, προτρέπεσθε μὴ ἀπολιμπάνεσθαι τῆς πνευματικῆς ταύτης τροφῆς, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς διαπορθμεύοντες, καὶ δεικνύντες, ὅτι ὁ φαγὼν καὶ πιὼν μετρίως οὐκ ἀνάξιός ἐστι ταύτης τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ἀλλ' ὁ ῥάθυμος καὶ διακεχυμένος.

In his *Dialogi cum Mahometano*, proem. 2, the late fourteenth-century/early fifteenth-century (A.D. 1350–1425) Byzantine emperor Manuel II Palaeologus follows the practice of preserving the one participle (διαπορθμεῦον) while using a cognate (ἑρμην-) of the other.

καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐρμηνεῖς ἡμῖν τοὺς λόγους διαπορθμεύοντες ἦσαν, ὃ πολλάκις βουλομένω μοι λέγειν μὴ πάντη γήινον μηδὲ χαμερπές, ἀλλὰ γενναιότερόν τι καὶ

<sup>148</sup> Proclus also uses αἱ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀγέλαι (in Alc. 32.5).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>149</sup> Kelly (1995, 6–8, 14–17); he prefers (4) to assign John's birth to 349.

ύψηλότερον (τοιαῦτα γάρ, ἃ πρεσβεύομεν) ἐμποδὼν ἐφαίνετό τε πανταχῆ καὶ προσίστατο·

He is not quoting the *Symposium*, but it is clear that he is following in a tradition of phraseology which has its origin in the *Symposium*.

Joseph Bryennius was a "monk who was also a scholar, a theologian, and an ecclesiastical diplomat." He was an exact contemporary of Manuel II Palaeologus (c. 1350–1430). In this passage (*Orationes* 12, lines 260ff.) Bryennius is not quoting, but he still shows the influence of the *Symposium*.

καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ζωαρχικῆς οὖν Τριάδος, εἰ καὶ ὁ Υίὸς πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπορθμεύει τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ αἴτιός ἐστιν αὑτῷ τῆς ὀντότητος, αὐτὸν αἴτιον αὐτῆς ἔχοντι τὸν Πατέρα, ὃν ἄρα καὶ ὁ Υίός.

In a Christian context he uses one of the participles, in a different form, but it is a strong example of how the participle has become integral to expressing conveyance from the divine to mortals.

## ii.3 Plutarch

In the discussion on the indirect transmission of *Symposium* 201d1–212c3, Plutarch was noticeably absent. The lack of verbatim transmission of Plato's text does not mean that Plutarch did not transmit the text in a looser fashion.

Plutarch makes use of the ideas of *Smp*. 202d7–11 and elsewhere in his *Isis and Osiris* 360E:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>150</sup> Rees (2000, 584). Rees' paper provides a good look at Bryennius' methods of quotation and his "reminiscences," and notes his strong belief in Greek orthodoxy and tendency to "Christianize" (584–596).

τῆ δυνάμει τὴν φύσιν ὑπερφέροντας ἡμῶν, τὸ δὲ θεῖον οὐκ ἀμιγὲς οὐδ' ἄκρατον ἔχοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς φύσει καὶ σώματος αἰσθήσει συνειληχός.

Plutarch's οὐκ ἀμιγές mirrors Plato's οὐ μείγνυται (203a2), and he echoes Plato's τίνα δύναμιν ἔχων (202e2). Here Plutarch includes Plato as one of several ancient authorities on the subject of *daimones* and the characteristics of those who are neither god nor mortal. The phraseology is not that of the *Symposium*, but the ideas expressed are similar.

Elsewhere (*Isis and Osiris* 361C), Plutarch's reliance on our passage in the *Symposium* is much clearer when he tackles *Smp*. 202d7–203a1:

ὅ τε Πλάτων ἐρμηνευτικὸν τὸ τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζει γένος καὶ διακονικὸν ἐν μέσῷ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, εὐχὰς μὲν ἐκεῖ καὶ δεήσεις ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμποντας, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ μαντεῖα δεῦρο καὶ δόσεις ἀγαθῶν φέροντας.

For the most part, Plutarch does not employ Plato's vocabulary, in stark contrast to those authors who chose to preserve the signpost participle διαπορθμεῦον, favouring instead the semantically related διακονικόν. Because he names Plato, he does not need specific language to recall the passage. He does, however, employ a cognate, έρμηνευτικόν, of the other participle which acts as a predicate of τὸ γένος. While τὸ γένος is a feature in other ancient authors who quote our passage, Plutarch refrains from modifying it with the typical δαιμόνιον (Alcinous, Hermias, Psellus) or έρμηνέων (Alcinous). Plutarch also eschews μεταξύ in favour of ἐν μέσφ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, changing the singular nouns of the *Symposium* to plurals.

At 416F (Obsolescence of Oracles), Plutarch recalls the same passage:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>151</sup> Nor is Plutarch the only of our authors to incorporate δύναμιν: Psellus (126.2) also took care to transmit it. <sup>152</sup> Plutarch employs this verb (διαπορθμεῦον) only once. In part one of this chapter (i.4) we came to expect the replacement of words with synonyms, as per Whittaker (1989, 83–84).

οὕτως οἱ δαιμόνων γένος μὴ ἀπολείποντες ἀνεπίμικτα τὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ποιοῦσι καὶ ἀσυνάλλακτα, τὴν ἑρμηνευτικήν, ὡς Πλάτων ἔλεγεν.

He uses a cognate (ἑρμηνευτικήν) of one of the participles and the phrase δαιμόνων γένος. Plutarch is in no way providing a quotation here, yet other elements from the *Symposium* are present. When he says ἀνεπίμικτα τὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, he echoes *Smp*. 203a2 (θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μείγνυται), his use of ἀνεπίμικτα bringing to mind οὐ μείγνυται, and with τὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, he recalls θεὸς ἀνθρώπω.

Plutarch makes several references to Plato's concept of  $\delta\alpha$ ίμονες, <sup>153</sup> but Plato is only one of the many authors he draws upon. <sup>154</sup> Plato's authority was probably a necessary component of any conversation involving  $\delta\alpha$ ίμονες, but Plutarch's discussion is by no means a faithful reproduction of Plato. Plutarch follows the patterns found in other ancient authors, employing cognates of Plato's participles, talking about  $\delta\alpha$ ίμονες as a γένος, and phrasing intermediacy in a way different from Plato's μεταξύ.

## ii.4 Medieval, Renaissance, and modern traces

In the medieval *Historia Regum Britanniae* (6.18), Geoffrey of Monmouth (twelfth century) discusses the intermediary nature of spirits, or *daimones*, to explain the birth of Merlin.

adductus autem Maugantius, auditis omnibus ex ordine, dixit ad Vortegirnum: "in libris philosophorum nostrorum, et in plurimis historiis reperi, multos homines huiusmodi procreationem habuisse. nam ut Apuleius de deo Socratis perhibet, **inter lunam et** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>153</sup> Plutarch Isis and Osiris 360E, 361C, Obsolescence of Oracles 416F.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>154</sup> For a discussion of Plutarch's system of δαίμονες see Dillon (1977, 216–224), especially on Plutarch's dependence on Xenocrates and Plutarch's theory of guardian δαίμονες. Brenk (1977, 85–112) discusses Plutarch's δαίμονες as they appear in *Obsolescence of Oracles* and *Isis and Osiris*.

terram habitant spiritus, quos incubos daemones appellamus: hi partim hominum, partim uero Angelorum naturam habent: et cum uolunt, assumunt sibi humanas figuras, et cum mulieribus coeunt. forsitan unus ex eis huic mulieri apparuit, et iuuenem istum in ipsa generauit.

He names Apuleius' *de deo Socratis* as his source, but Apuleius had clearly taken what Plato wrote on *daimones* in the *Symposium* and incorporated it in his work on Socrates (see ii.2 above). Interestingly, Geoffrey does not place these spirits between God/gods and humans, as Plato did in the *Symposium*, but says they derive their natures from humans and angels. Christian influence may also be present in the notion of a spirit taking human form to procreate with a human woman.

The *Commentary on Plato's* "Symposium" by the great Renaissance humanist Marsilio Ficino (1433–99) is an exploration of Platonic philosophy, with statements made in the *Symposium* serving as the starting point for discussions of Platonic philosophy across the whole. It is unsurprising that Ficino does not discuss intermediaries and *daimones* in the manner other authors do, given that his *Commentary* takes the form of a contemporary symposium during which the speakers use other Platonic works to explain the philosophy introduced in Plato's *Symposium*. Such a format means that Ficino's discussion on *daimones* draws on the presentation of *daimones* across all of Plato's works. In Ficino,

The beings which inhabit the region of ethereal fire located under the moon, or that of the pure air, or that of humid air located next to the water, the Platonists call daemons. The rational beings which inhabit the earth they call men. The gods are immortal, and impassible, but men are passible and mortal. Daemons are immortal, of course, but passible. The Platonists do not ascribe the passions of the body to the daemons, but

certain emotions of the soul, by which they somehow love good men and hate evil men. They mix agreeably and eagerly in the governing of lower things, but especially of human affairs, and from this friendly service, they all seem good; but some Platonists and the Christian theologists claim that there are other certain bad daemons. For the present we are not concerned with bad daemons. The good daemons, our protectors, Dionysius the Areopagite is accustomed to call by the proper name, Angels, the governors of the lower world, and this differs very little from the interpretation of Plato. Those whom Plato calls gods, and the souls of the spheres and stars, we can, after the manner of Dionysius, call Angels, ministers of God, which is still no different from what Plato called them; for, as appears in the 10th Book of Laws, Plato does not in the least bind spirits of this kind within the narrow limits of the spheres, as he does the earthly creatures in bodies, but he asserts that they are endowed with such great virtue by the supreme God that they are able to enjoy the vision of God at once, and they are able without any labor or care to rule and move the globes of the world according to the will of their father, and by moving them, easily govern lower creatures. Therefore it is rather a difference in words between Plato and Dionysius than a difference in meaning. 155

The familiar concept of *daimones* as intermediaries who interact with the mortal world is still present, but Ficino give them a role which, as we shall is, is recognizably Christian. Interestingly, the gods, which are here equated with Angels, are able to be intermediary and access that ultimate "vision," which reminds readers of the ultimate end described by Diotima. Ficino introduces three "Venerian daemons," two of which have their daemonic status because they are

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>155</sup> Jayne (1944, 185–186).

"the mediaries between lack of beauty and beauty," 156 a role which corresponds to that of daimones laid out in our passage. While Ficino does not give evidence for contemporary thought on our specific passage, his attempt to explain the whole of Plato and to join it to Christianity is significant. It is also worth noting that Ficino had a keen interest in our passage: a manuscript written in Ficino's hand transmits excerpts including the text of *Smp*. 201d1–6 and 202d13–203a8.

The characterization of *daimones* introduced in *Smp*. 202d1–203a8 became so integral to thought on angels and guardian spirits that its presence can still be felt today. In his discussion on 'Guardian Spirits,' in his book *The Catholic Catechism*, John A. Hardon demonstrates implicitly that Plato's thinking about *daimones*, as laid out in the *Symposium*, is ingrained in Catholic doctrine.

...The Church bids the faithful to honor the angels whom God has given as guardians of the human race. It is certain that each of the faithful has his own guardian angel, as implied in the Scripture and found in the common understanding of believers... we may say that every human being has a guardian spirit since, in the present dispensation of providence, angelic assistance is part of God's universal salvific will... Within the realm of created beings, the angels are most like God because they are pure spirits (having no body), but they are also like us because we too have intelligence and will. They are providential intermediaries between God, whose vision they already enjoy, and mankind, whom they are entrusted to lead to the vision not yet attained... Otherwise than

<sup>156</sup> Jayne (1944, 187).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> Milan: Ms F 19 Sup. It contains excerpts of many Platonic dialogues.

the saints who are also intercessors for us before God, angels are specially appointed to guard and direct their charges on earth. That is one side of their ministry, from men to God, and this is intercessory. Catholics are therefore bidden to invoke the angels on both counts, to solicit their continued protection and to ask for their prayers in our regard. As St. Ambrose puts it, "The angels should be entreated for us, who have been given us to guard us." <sup>158</sup>

Specifically, angels or guardian angels are provided by God to help mankind reach God's vision: Hardon's description of this function is reminiscent of Diotima's description of the function of Eros in leading lovers to an ultimate end. These guardian angels are also described as intermediaries, able to lead humans to the divine because they partake in the nature of each. Surely the *Symposium* is the ultimate origin of the post-Platonic understanding of the intermediate nature of spirits, however much it was later appropriated by Catholicism. The dual function of guardian spirits also has roots in the *Symposium*: they "guard and direct their charges on earth," but also, at least in Catholic practice, humans seek God through angels and through their guardianship. Plato established the existence of spirits who are both divine and human in nature, who act as intermediaries travelling between both the divine and the human, and whose knowledge of the divine enables them to lead mankind. Such spirits remain entrenched in modern Catholicism.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>158</sup> Hardon (1975, 86–87).

Conclusion 100

# Conclusion

As demonstrated in part two of chapter four, *Symposium* 201d1–212c3 has been an influential passage for the history of ideas in Western thought from the time it was written. Even though the focus of chapter four, part two was on only a small portion of our passage, it was abundantly clear that, from the time of Plato's immediate successor Xenocrates, people were transmitting, translating, and transforming the text, each interpreting it in light of their own philosophical, literary, and religious priorities and emphases.

The text of *Smp*. 201d1–212c3 which comes to us through our primary witnesses, the MSS. B, D, T, P, W, and the papyrus (*P.Oxy*. 5.843), is a stable one in spite of, or because of, the attention given to the passage. There is a strong bipartite *stemma*: as expected, BD and PW form two separate branches, with T agreeing with PW much more than it does with BD. The papyrus does not show a tendency to agree more with one set of manuscripts than with the other. While the focus of this thesis has been on the state of the text rather than on which readings are more "correct" or "Platonic," the tendency of modern editors to favour the MS. B may lead to the inference that there is one very secure tradition (transmitted by B and D) and a few other traditions (those of T, PW, and the papyrus) which often vary from this more correctly transmitted text. This inference is not true. Although they most often agree with each other and with the papyrus, the readings of BD and TPW both vary in quality. It is important when trying to determine the state of the text to give all primary witnesses equal consideration. In spite of the slight favour editors have traditionally shown BD since the early nineteenth century, it is clear that the medieval MSS. preserve a fairly uniform text with relatively small discrepancies.

Conclusion 101

Other ancient authors have also preserved small sections of our passage in their own works. In most cases these testimonia are not lengthy enough to demonstrate allegiance to any one MS. or MS. family, permitting us to conclude that the text they used differed little from that preserved in the medieval MSS. Where readings in the text differ from those of the primary witnesses it is clear that the testimonia are usually inferior witnesses, but, nonetheless, they do sometimes provide readings of value. The indirect tradition itself, let us recall, has been subject to its own imperfect transmission, and nowhere can we safely say that a later scribe has not corrected an ancient author through comparison with the text of Plato.

While the testimonia, for the most part, do not undermine the state of the text in the medieval manuscripts, the variations found within them do leave us with something of value. The unique readings of the indirect tradition rarely change or modify the meaning of Plato's text. If the testimonia were to alter the meaning found in the direct tradition then there would be grounds to question whether the text was different, or understood to mean something different, in antiquity. But the closeness of the testimonia to the primary witnesses, at least in meaning if not in exact wording, reinforces the impression that the text is stable.

Quotation, paraphrase, reference, and allusion are not distinct classifications, and ancient authors subjected our passage to all these treatments. Plato's definition of  $\delta\alpha$ iµove $\zeta$  (202d1–203a8) became integral to Western thought. It was transmitted through phrases and key words from the passage, words which then became part of new phrases developed by those who used the passage. Even words which were synonyms for words within the passage came to symbolize and recall it. Plato's description of  $\delta\alpha$ iµove $\zeta$  was so influential in describing the interaction between the divine and mortal that Christianity, from its inception to the present day, was able to unite and reconcile its God with humans through the agency of a Platonic intermediary figure,

Conclusion 102

Christ. The study and transmission of this Platonic passage may have been the work of the educated classes, but the ideas contained within it became the common property of all. Plato's δαίμονες were thoroughly integrated into the public consciousness.

The investigation of *Symposium* 202d1–203a8 has looked into only a sample of the many ancient and medieval authors who make use of it. This thesis is only intended to be an overview, but the study could be taken to completion by looking into all instances where this passage influenced later authors. And further, while Plato's description of δαίμονες was the focus, it is only one section of our passage, and there are other sections which were influential. The myth of Penia and Poros had impact and influence upon later authors and merits a similar examination. Likewise, motifs such as the great chain of being, assent to contemplation of forms, and especially procreation or fertility as a metaphor for thought, all lived on in other authors. Our passage of Plato's *Symposium*, then, contains many sections which make it influential, the promise of which is easily visible from this overview of its most influential part.

# Bibliography

- Allen, T.W. Codex Oxoniensis Clarkianus 39 Phototypice editus, Pars prior. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1898.
- Bergk, Th. "Philologische thesen." Philologus 30 (1870): 677–682.
- Bluck, R.S. *Plato's Meno*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Boter, G.J. "The Venetus T of Plato." Mnemosyne 39 (1986): 102–111.
- Brenk, Frederick E., S.J. *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Brockmann, C. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Platons* Symposion. Serta Graeca. Beitrgäge zur Erforschung griechische Texte, Bd. 2. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1992.
- Burnyeat, M.F. "Socratic Midwifery, Platonic Inspiration." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 24 (1977): 7–16.
- Cufalo, D. *Scholia Graeca in Platonem, I: Scholia ad Dialogos Tetralogiarum I VII continens*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2007.
- Denniston, J.D. *The Greek Particles*. Revised by K.J. Dover. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Diller, Aubrey. "Codex T of Plato." Classical Philology 75 (1980): 322-324.
- Dillon, John. "Ficino and the God of the Platonists." In *Laus Platonici Philosophi: Marsilio Ficino and his Influence*, 13–24. Edited by V. Rees, P.J. Forshaw, and S. Clucas. Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Dillon, John. "Tampering with the *Timaeus*: Ideological Emendations in Plato, with special reference to the *Timaeus*." *The American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 50–72.
- Dillon, John. The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Dodds, E.R. Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Dodds, E.R. *Plato: Gorgias*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Duke, E.A., W.F. Hicken, W.S.M. Nicoll, D.B. Robinson, J.C.G. Strachan, eds. *Platonis Opera*, tom. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Ferrari, G.R.F. "Platonic love." In Richard Kraut, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 248–276.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. Aeschylus, Agamemnon. Oxford: Oxford University, 1950.

- Friis Johansen, H. and Edward W. Whittle. *Aeschylus*. The Suppliants. Copenhagen: Aarhus University Press, 1980.
- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1908.
- Guthrie, W.K.C. *A History of Greek Philosphy*, vol. 4. Plato, the Man and his Dialogues: Earlier Period. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Hardon, John A., S.J. *The Catholic Catechism: A Contemporary Catechism of the Teachings of the Catholic Church.* Garden City: Image, 1975.
- Henry, Paul and Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer. Plotini Opera. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Janko, Richard. Philodemus. On Poems. Book One. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Jayne, Sears Reynolds. *Marsilio Ficino's Commentary on Plato's* Symposium: *The Text and a Translation, with an Introduction*. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1944.
- Joyal, M. Review of Duke *et al.* (see above), in *Hermathena: A Trinity College Dublin Review* 165 (1998) 119–129.
- Joyal, M. Review of Brockmann (see above), in *Échos du monde classique/Classical Views* 40, n.s. 15 (1996) 432–439.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Lampe, G.W.H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Lear, Gabriel Richardson. "Permanent Beauty and Becoming Happy in Plato's *Symposium*." In James H. Lesher, Debra Nails, and Frisbee C.C. Sheffield, eds. *Plato's* Symposium: *Issues in Interpretation and Reception*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006. 96–123.
- Lucarini, Carlo M. and Claudio Moreschini. *Hermias Alexandrinus: In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Murphy, David J. Review of Brockmann (see above), in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 94.01.07 (1994).
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Osborne, Catherine. Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Outler, Albert C. "The 'Platonism' of Clement of Alexandria." *The Journal of Religion*, 20, no.3 (1940): 217–240.

- Rees, D.A. "Joseph Bryennius and the Text of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*." *The Classical Quarterly* 50 (2000): 584–596.
- Ross, David O. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Sheffield, Frisbee C.C. *Plato's Symposium: The Ethics of Desire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Sheffield, Frisbee C.C. "*Eros* and the Pursuit of Form." In Pierre Destree and Zina Giannopoulou, eds. *Plato's Symposium: A Critical Guide*, 2017. 125–141.
- Thomas, Paul *Apulei Platonici Madavrensis de Philosophia Libri*. Second edition. Leipzig: Teubner, 1921.
- Van Den Hoek, Annewies. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996): 223–243.
- Vicaire, Paul. Platon: Oeuvres Completes, 4. Le Banquet. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989.
- Wachsmuth, C. and O. Hense. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, vols. I–III. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1884–1912.
- West, Martin L. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, applicable to Greek and Latin texts*. Leipzig: Teubner Stuttgart, 1973.
- Westerink, L.G. "The title of Plato's Republic." Illinois Classical Studies 6 (1981): 112–115.
- Whittaker, John. "Proclus and the Middle Platonists." In Jean Pepin and H.D. Saffrey, eds. *Proclus Lecteur et Interprete des Anciens*: Actes du colloque international du CNRS, Paris (2–4 octobre 1985). Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1987. 277–291.
- Whittaker, John. "The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation." In J.N. Grant, ed. *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*. Papers given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6–7 November 1987. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1989. 63–95.
- Whittaker, John. *Alcinoos: Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990.
- Whittaker, John. "Arethas and the 'collection philosophique." In Dieter Harlfinger and Giancarlo Prato, eds. *Paleografia e Codicologia Greca*: Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino-Wolfenbuttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983), vol. 1. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso, 1991. 513–521.
- Wilson, N.G. Scholars of Byzantium. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983.