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](#)

Two Notes on the Verrines

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 03 / April 1905, pp 160 - 160
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000184, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000184

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (1905). Two Notes on the Verrines. The Classical Review, 19, pp 160-160
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000184

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TWO NOTES ON *THE VERRINES*.

Cic. Div. in Caec. § 25.

Huic ego homini ium ante denuntio, si a me causam hanc vos agi volueritis, rationem illi defendendi totam esse mutandam, et ita mutandam ut meliore et honestiore condicione quam qua ipse vult imitetur homines eos, quos ipse vidit amplissimos, L. Crassum et M. Antonium, qui nihil se arbitrabantur ad iudicia causasque amicorum praeter fidem et ingenium adferre oportere.

With part of the above (the doubtful clause *et ita mutandam*) I have dealt in a previous note, *C.R.* vol. xviii. p. 208. That something was felt to be wrong with what follows may be inferred from the variants reported, e.g. *condicione sit* Pseud. Asc. and Lg. 45, *esse vult* Par. 7776 (p), G¹, Par. 7822, and the dett. A better line of emendation is suggested by the fact that in the three leading members of what I propose to call the Y family of MSS., viz. Par. 7776 (p—11th cent.), Lg. 29, and Harl. 2687 (which I cite together as pqr), before *imitetur* we have *ut*. If to this *ut*, we add the letter *i*, on the supposition that it may have fallen out in front of *imitetur*, and so read *uti*, construction and meaning alike become quite clear: *rationem . . . mutandam . . . ut meliore et honestiore condicione quam qua ipse vult uti imitetur* etc. Hortensius, if left to himself, would be at his old tricks; but he is hereby warned that he will have to rely in this trial, as Crassus and Antonius always did, on his own *fides* and *ingenium*..

In Verr. ii, 1 § 149 (Muell. p. 194, 36).

Iste quid ageret nesciebat; si in acceptum non rettulisset, putabat se aliquid defensionis habiturum: Habonium porro intellegebat rem totam esse patefacturum. Tametsi quid poterat esse apertius quam nunc est? Ut uno minus teste haberet, Habonio opus in accep-

tum rettulit quadriennio post quam diem operi dixerat.

The above is given as in Mueller's text,—eliminating, however, the ridiculous German commas (e.g. between *post* and *quam*) which have so long vexed our classical texts. But Madvig, in his *Epistola Critica ad Orellium* (pp. 89–90), had already shown a better way of punctuation, which is followed in the main by Jordan in the Zürich edition. What Madvig failed to see is that, on any explanation, *haberet* is an impossible reading. In place of *haberet*, it is natural to suggest *ageret*, such interchanges being of not infrequent occurrence. For example, in his *Actio Prima* (Mueller, p. 133, 36) all the MSS. give *secum habere* for *secum agere*. For the construction, compare § 117 *uno signo ut sit minus*,—though the *ut* there is not a final *ut*, as here.

We ought to return, therefore, to the punctuation suggested by Madvig, and read *Iste . . . esse patefacturum—tametsi quid . . . quam nunc est?—ut uno minus teste ageret, Habonius . . . dixerat*. Habonius was the fraudulent guardian, who wanted a quittance for his contract. Verres saw that if he declined to give such a quittance, he might be able to enter some defence of the charge now brought against him: on the other hand (*porro*) he saw that such a refusal on his part would lead Habonius to make a clean breast of the whole business (just as though anything were needed to complete the exposure!) and so, in order that he might shut his partner's mouth (*ut uno minus teste ageret*), he gave him the quittance asked for four years after the date he had set for the completion of the work.

W. PETERSON.

McGILL UNIVERSITY,
MONTREAL.

REVIEWS.

GAYE ON PLATO'S CONCEPTION OF IMMORTALITY.

The Platonic Conception of Immortality and its Connexion with the Theory of Ideas.

By R. K. GAYE. Pp. x + 259. London: C. J. Clay and Sons. 5s. net.

MR. GAYE'S Essay, which obtained the Hare

Prize in 1904, deals with an interesting and important aspect of Platonic speculation. For the questions raised in it concern not merely immortality and the Ideas, but also the Platonic doctrine of the soul in general and its relation to body. Beginning with