'κίρτος ignotum: cκίρτος coni. Hecker'.[20] Actually what Hecker wrote was not a common noun but Cκίρτος,[21] the satyr. Was this a forerunner of the Sicyonian-Phliasian namesake, whom we met at Pergamum?[22]

*State University of Milan/*                                           L. LEHNUS
*Wolfson College, Oxford*

[20] Page, cf. Campbell (ed.), *GL* iii. pp. 488–9.       [21] See *Philologus* 5 (1850), 510.
[22] Doubts on the assumed attribution of the poem to Dionysodorus (most recently *SEG* 39, 453) arose during the discussion following a paper on Callimachean chronology, which I gave in Cambridge in November 1994: I am indebted to members of the Literary Seminar for many thought-provoking comments. I am especially grateful to Dr (now Professor) James Diggle, Cambridge, and to Mr Franco Basso, Oxford, for reading subsequent drafts of this note and offering helpful suggestions, as well as for greatly improving my English. For what is here I am solely responsible.

# AELIAN, *VARIA HISTORIA* 8.1 AND THE TRANSMISSION OF [PLATO], *THEAGES* 128d2–3

φωνὴν πολλάκις ἔφασκε [sc. Cωκράτης] θείᾳ πομπῇ
ἐγκεκληρωμένην αὐτῷ κτλ.

Dilts (Teubner, 1974) prints ὁσίᾳ πομπῇ (ὁσίαν πομπῆς codd., *corr.* Faber). Hercher before him (Teubner, 1866) adopted the conjecture θείᾳ πομπῇ (Davis). Several pieces of evidence tell in favour of the latter text.

1) For θείᾳ πομπή cf. Hdt. I.62.4, III.77.1, IV.152.2, VIII.94.2; Ael. *NA* 3.47; Plu. *Rom.* 9.7, *Mor.* 323e; Aristid. I.36, I.37 Lenz–Behr; Joseph. *AJ* 11.335. ὁσίᾳ πομπή on the other hand seems to be unattested.

2) ΘΕΙΑΙ and ΟCΙΑΙ are easily confused in majuscule script (cf. Pl. *Grg.* 492b2 ὅσοις F, θεοῖς BTP; Dodds ad loc. compares also Eur. *Heracl.* 911 ὁ còc Wecklein, θεòς L). The confusion is encouraged by the similarity in meaning of the two words.

3) In *VH* 8.1 Aelian is paraphrasing [Pl.] *Theages* 128d2–129a1; his model for the lemma above is 128d2–3, which in our mss. and printed texts runs: ἔcτι τι θείᾳ μοίρᾳ παρεπόμενον ἐμοὶ ... δαιμόνιον (Aelian's φωνὴν alludes to Socrates' divine sign, τὸ δαιμόνιον). θείᾳ πομπῇ therefore has every appearance of being a deliberate reminiscence of θείᾳ μοίρᾳ.

A little further reflection on the precise relation between Aelian's text and *Thg.* 128d2–3 may shed unexpected light on the ancient state of the Platonic passage (and, incidentally, strengthen the case for θείᾳ πομπῇ as the true reading in *VH* 8.1). A third text provides our point of departure.

In a loose quotation of *Thg.* 128d2–7 in the anonymous *Frag. Comm. in Arist. Rhet.* 325.6 Rabe, παραπεμπόμενον is given in place of παρεπόμενον (128d2).[1] This could, admittedly, be nothing more than our commentator's personal contribution to the text he was quoting: the substitution of παραπεμπόμενον can be accounted for contextually, since πέμπω and related forms are sometimes applied to the activity of δαίμονες[2] (and *Thg.* 128d2ff. is assuredly a 'demonological' context). Yet I suspect that παραπεμπόμενον is in fact no mere aberration but represents rather the reading which Aelian found in his copy of *Thg.*, i.e. ἔcτι τι θείᾳ μοίρᾳ παραπεμπόμενον

[1] *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, vol. XXI.2 (Berlin, 1896): πολλάκις ἔλεγεν [sc. Cωκράτης] ὅτι cύνεcτιν αὐτῷ τὸ δαιμόνιον θείᾳ μοίρᾳ παραπεμπόμενον ἐκ παιδὸς αὐτῷ κτλ.
[2] Cf. e.g. Soph. *El.* 1156–8; Pl. *R.* 620d8; Plu. *Mor.* 361c, *Sull.* 7.10; Cass. Dio 57.15.7; Iamb. *Myst.* 3.16; *Lyr. Adesp.* 1018 (b) 3–7 (*PMG*); *AP* VI.182.5; see F. Pfister, *RE* suppl. 7, 106.

ἐμοὶ ... δαιμόνιον. Hence when Aelian wrote φωνὴν ... θείᾳ πομπῇ ἐγκεκληρωμένην
αὐτῷ he was modifying the text which he had before him, but in a systematic way that
can be easily paralleled from many other ancient quotations from philosophical
works: he has given nominal expression (πομπῇ) to the notion contained in the
participle (παραπεμπόμενον) and, conversely, has transferred the idea of allotment
from noun (μοίρᾳ) to participle (ἐγκεκληρωμένην).[3]

On this assumption, παραπεμπόμενον cannot be simply the quirk of a late
Aristotelian commentator but instead existed in the textual tradition of *Thg.* by at
least the early third century A.D. Indeed, fluidity of transmission in precisely this
portion of the text is evidenced also by the substitution of παραγινόμενον pro
παρεπόμενον in the quotation of the passage by Aelian's older contemporary Clement
of Alexandria, in *Stromata* I.21.133.3 = II.83.1 Stählin–Früchter (γίγνεϲθαι would
have occurred to Clement as the word which Plato regularly predicates of Socrates'
sign, e.g. *Ap.* 31d1, *Euthphr.* 3b6, *Euthd.* 272e3, *Phdr.* 242b9, *Tht.* 151a4).[4]

*Memorial University of Newfoundland*                                M. A. JOYAL

[3] See J. Whittaker, '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* (New York, 1989), pp. 63–95, esp. 83–9; id., *Alcinoos. Enseignment des doctrines de Platon*
(Paris, 1990), pp. xxii–v.
[4] But Calcidius' use of *comes* in his quotation of *Thg.* 128d2–7 (*in Ti.* 263.20–264.2 Waszink)
strongly suggests παρεπόμενον as his model (see Waszink's *apparatus fontium*).

## ROSCIUS AND THE *ROSCIDA DEA*

> Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans,
>     cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
> pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra:
>     mortalis visus pulchrior esse deo.

The verb *consisto* ('stop') can be used in the context of stopping to exchange greetings
and conversation with an acquaintance accidentally encountered: 'confabulatum
consistere', as it is defined in the *Thesaurus* (IV, 464.67–76). That this sense of *consisto*
was common parlance in the late Republic is clear from its occurrence five times in
Plautus and three times in Cicero,[1] both in the speeches and in a letter. This is also
the meaning that *consisto* carries in the first line of the epigram of Q. Lutatius Catulus
(Morel[2] p. 43; Courtney pp. 76–7) transcribed above.[2] Any of the examples cited in the
*Thesaurus* will make this clear, but especially so the following lines from Plaut. *Aul.*
114–17:

>                                 me benignius
> omnes *salutant* quam salutabant prius;
> adeunt, *consistunt*, copulantur dextras,
> rogitant me ut valeam, quid agam, quid rerum geram.

These lines suggest the *mise en scène* that the poet imagines for his encounter with
Aurora. Like Plautus' Euclio, Catulus' Aurora is cast in a distinctly mortal role, as

[1] Cic. *QRosc.* 66, cited in *ThLL*, is irrelevant.
[2] Discussed most recently in A. Perutelli, 'Lutazio Catulo poeta', *Riv. Fil.* 118 (1990), 257–81,
and in H. Dahlmann, 'Das Rosciusepigramm des Q. Lutatius Catulus', *Gymnasium* 88 (1981),
24–44. There is a new commentary on the poem in E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*
(Oxford, 1993), pp. 77–8. These works are cited below by their author's name.