

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## ‘Numne’

Emory B. Lease

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 07 / October 1897, pp 348 - 349

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00039305, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00039305](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00039305)

### How to cite this article:

Emory B. Lease (1897). ‘Numne’. The Classical Review, 11, pp 348-349 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00039305

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Here *sic* refers to *egregium forma*, etc., *deiecto lumina voltu*, and denotes the character in which the younger Marcellus accompanies the elder. This was partially perceived by Forbiger, whereas Conington's 'thus as we see' misses or evades the exact meaning of the particle.

Hor. Sat. 1, 4, 135, *hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis occurram*. Here *sic* stands in the same relation to *occurram* as *hoc faciens* does to *vivam*.

Ovid Met. 1, 695 seqq. *ritu quo cincta Dianae | falleret, et credi posset Latonia si non | corneus huic arcus si non foret aureus illi. sic quoque fallebat*. Here *sic* = *corneo arcu* and stands in the same relation to *fallebat* as *cincta* does to *falleret*. Cf. 13, 896 *sed sic quoque erat tamen Acis*, where also *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'in this form.'

Sallust, Cat. 7, *sed gloriae maximum certamen inter ipsos erat; sic quisque hostem ferire properaret*. Here *sic* = *maxime certans*. The failure to perceive its true meaning accounts for the variant *se* and Gründel's suggested *ac si*.

Propertius 2, 8, 15 seqq. *ecquandone tibi liber sum visus? an usque | in nostram iacies verba superba caput? | sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti?—sed morere; interitu gaudeat illa tuo*. Here *sic* = 'thus flouted,' *verbis superbis caput impulsus*, and thus fittingly connects vv. 17 seqq. with what has preceded (cf. Nägelsbach, *Lat. Styl.* p. 608), refuting the contention of Lachmann and Müller that a new elegy begins at v. 17.

Tacitus, Ann. 1, 34, *adistentem contionem in manipulos discedere iubet: sic melius audituros responsum*. Furneaux tr. *sic* 'as they were,' comparing Ann. 4, 40, 4 and 15, 17, 3 for this so-called idiomatic meaning. I sug-

gest that *sic* 'like this' is merely a secondary predicate, and = *adistentes*. In Ann. 4, 40, 4, (*simplicius acturum de inimicitiis primum Agrippinae, quas longe acrius arsuras, si matrimonium Liviae velut in partes domum Caesaris distraxisset. Sic quoque erumpere aemulationem feminarum*.) *sic* seems to mean simply 'in this manner,' viz. *distrahendo in partes domum Caesaris*. The other passage which Furneaux cites is Ann. 15, 17, 3, *quando in incerto habeantur Parthorum conatus, Suriam repetiturum; sic quoque optimam Fortunam orandam, ut pedes confectus itinerum spatiis . . . equitem adsequeretur*. Here *sic* either suggests *repetenti* and is a secondary predicate denoting the circumstance under which Fortune is to be addressed by Corbulo, or it may be taken as pointing to the following *ut* clause, which will then be explanatory. Cf. Cic. Or. iii. 46, *sic agam vobiscum . . . ut aliquid de vestris vitiis audiat*.

Before concluding, I must mention one more passage, Livy, 2, 10, 12, which is usually cited in support of the current explanation of Cic. Rosc. Am. 71. Livy's words are: *clamore sublato undique in unum hostem tela coniciunt, . . . iam impetu conabantur detrudere virum cum simul fragor rupti pontis simul clamor impetum sustinuit. tum Coeles 'Tiberine pater,' inquit, ' . . . hunc militem accipias.' Ita sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit*. Here I see no reason to doubt that *sic* points to what has gone before and = 'being thus circumstanced.' *Ita* of course means 'accordingly.' Hand. Tursell. iii. 485. Different is Quintilian 2, 21, 20 *ita sic quoque recte diximus*, where *sic* points to what follows, 'accordingly the following is also a correct statement.'

J. STANLEY.

### 'NUMNE.'

THIS form has had an interesting history. Its very existence has been both affirmed and denied. Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 and Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 have denied its Latinity. Neither Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wort.-form* nor Lindsay, *Latin Lang.*, even mentions it, though the former in his *Lat. Deutsch Wörterb.* cites it for Cic. 'numne vis audire?' But where does this occur? Elmer, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.* 1892, p. xx. in a footnote says: 'Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 and Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 are probably right in

denying the Latinity of this form.' Stolz in *Handb. d. Klass. Alt. Wissenschaft* ii.<sup>2</sup> does not mention the form at all, but in the *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Spr.* p. 439, § 83 simply records it. Ribbeck, however, *Lat. Part.* p. 13 maintains that the form does occur.

The passages that have been cited for its use are three:

(1) Plautus, *Truc.* ii. 6, 65. Goetz and Schoell however have a different reading here (line 546): *tu num nevis*, etc.

(2) Cic. *N.D.* i. 31, 88.

(3) Cic. *Lael.* 11, 36.

Krebs-Schmalz, *Antib.*<sup>6</sup> ii. p. 159 say: 'ist aber noch für Cicero zu halten'; cf. also Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*<sup>2</sup> § 158. Merguet, *Lex. Phil. Schr.* and Menge, *Repet. d. lat. Spr.*<sup>6</sup> § 409 under 'numne' cite these passages for Cic. It is the reading of B. and K., Halm, and Mueller.

The following occurrences of this form I have not seen noted:

(1) *Afranius*, 29 (Ribbeck, *Scaen. Rom. Poes. Frag.*):

Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam?

(2) *Dec. Laberius*, 22:

Numne aliter hunc pedicabis?

(3) *Prudentius*, *Contra Sym.* i. 322:  
Numne etiam caeli minor et etc.

(4) *Idem.* ii. 940:

Numne Leontini sulcator solvere etc.

(5) *Idem.* *Ham.* 871:

Numne animarum oculis denso etc.

The above five well-established occurrences of this form added to the two probable occurrences in Cicero would lead to the conclusion that a denial of its existence is no longer possible.

EMORY B. LEASE

University of Michigan.

### CYPRIAN *ī* = "OR."

In *Ind. Forsch.* ii. p. 219 n. Persson suggested that this word, which is only known from the Idalium-inscription Cauer<sup>2</sup> 472, 24 *ī ēξ τῷ κάτῳ*, may be identical with the first syllable of *ī-δέ*. But Hoffmann, *Gr. Diall.* i. p. 163, noticing that *ī* only appears in this inscription before consonants, and comparing the change in the dialect of Idalium of *ē* to *ī* before *a* or *o*, supposes a similar change of *ē* to *ī* before a word beginning with an initial vowel. But perhaps as in Cretan, which

sometimes shows *μέ* for *μή* before vowels only, though *μή* before both consonants and vowels (*vide* Schulze, *K.Z.* xxiii p. 133 *seq.*), so in this dialect *ī* was shortened before initial vowels, and then passed into *ī*.

Could the reading *ῶς ī ἅπαντα* X 410 be referred in its origin to a similar shortening of *ει* before vowels, *ī* being first graphic representation of *ει*, and then changed by grammarians to *ī*?

C. M. MULVANY.

### EMENDATIONS OF PLATO, *REPUBLIC* IX. 580 D AND III. 390 A.

THE usually accepted reading in Plato, *Rep.* ix. 580 D is *εἶεν δὴ, εἰπον· αὐτὴ μὲν ἡμῖν ἡ ἀποδείξις μία ἂν εἴη· δευτέραν δὲ δέῃ τήνδε, εἴαν τι δόξῃ, εἶναι. Τίς αὐτῇ;*

The words *δὲ δέῃ* are admitted on the authority of *Ξ*, *γ*, and other late MSS.: *δὲῃ* *δὲ* is the reading of the two best authorities, A and II. It has not, so far as I can discover, been hitherto pointed out that *δὲῃ* *δὲ* is a mere orthographical slip for *δὲ* *ιδέ*. We should read *δευτέραν δὲ ιδέ τήνδε, εἴαν τι δόξῃ εἶναι*. As soon as *δὲ* *ιδέ* was written *δὲῃ* *δέ*, the transposition *δὲ* *δὲῃ* was an obvious, though unsatisfactory, remedy.

Another curious slip has crept into the text of all the MSS. in iii. 390 A *τί δέ; ποιεῖν ἀνδρα τὸν σοφώτατον λέγοντα, ὡς δοκεῖ αὐτῷ κάλλιστον εἶναι πάντων, ὅταν παραπλείαι ὦσι τράπεζαι*

*σίτον καὶ κρεῖων, μέθην δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων οἰνοχόος φορέησι καὶ ἐγγεῖν δεπάεσσι.*

All the MSS. (with one exception) read *παραπλείαι* or *παράπλειαι*. The word is ex-

plained by L. and S. to mean 'almost full.' But surely—not to mention the strange use of *παρά*—this involves a ridiculous bathos. Why should Odysseus have said it was the most beautiful thing in the world (*κάλλιστον πάντων*) when the tables are nearly full of bread and meat? Surely it is an even more beautiful spectacle when they are quite full! A reference to the original in Homer *Odyssey* ix. 8 *παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι* shews that we should read

*παρὰ πλείαι ὦσι τράπεζαι  
σίτου καὶ κρεῖων κ.τ.λ.,*

or else, if we cannot allow the *ι* in *πλείαι* to be treated for purposes of scansion as a *γ*, then

*παρὰ πλείαι ὦσι τράπεζαι κ.τ.λ.*

Plato's Homer must have read

*παρὰ δὲ πλείαι (πλείαι) ὦσι τράπεζαι,*

or else the variant is due to Plato himself.