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](#)

ΓΕΝΟΥΣΤΗΣ

John Burnet

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 2009, pp 393 - 394

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083335, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083335

How to cite this article:

John Burnet (2009). ΓΕΝΟΥΣΤΗΣ. The Classical Review, 14, pp 393-394 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083335

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Poetics as above quoted tells us that it was the Doric equivalent for the Attic *πράττειν*, which is only true with considerable qualification. It would certainly seem to have been eminently non-Ionic, for it does not occur once, as far as I can discover, in Herodotus and it is all but absent from Homer and the epic dialect.¹ When we look through the Attic orators we find to our surprise that Andocides, Lysias, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Hyperides, never use it in their extant remains, Dinarchus once in a fragment. It will be borne in mind that Lysias, from whom we have quite a large number of speeches, and Hyperides, of whom we have now about half a dozen, come nearest of all the orators to the language of ordinary Athenian life. On the other hand Antiphon and Demosthenes, Thucydides and Plato use it freely.² We should expect *a priori* to find Xenophon's practice agreeing with theirs, but as a matter of fact he avoids it all but entirely.³ We should again rather expect that Aristophanes and the comic fragments would agree with Lysias and Hyperides, but the word occurs in comedy fairly often. A prose word which Lysias and Xenophon unite in avoiding and

which comedy often uses has certainly something remarkable about it. Of the tragic poets Aeschylus uses it fairly often, Euripides more, Sophocles decidedly the most freely. It does not occur at all in the remains of Solon, if we are to follow the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* text of *Frag.* 37, 3 (Bergk) rather than that given in the text of Aristides.

I have stated these facts, not because they seem to me to point to any particular conclusion, but because they certainly have a meaning, which meaning may bear upon our problem, and someone else may see what that meaning is. The only thing I know of to throw light on the restriction of *δράμα* in Attic to tragedy, if it really was so restricted, is the regular use of *δρᾶν* in a ceremonial religious sense. In various Greek mysteries *τὰ δρώμενα* are put side by side with *τὰ λεγόμενα*, the former amounting sometimes almost to a play in dumb show. So Clement of Alexandria says that Demeter and Kore 'have become a mystic play' (*δράμα μυστικόν*, *Protrept.* 2, 12). Over and over again Pausanias in describing religious rites uses the word *δρᾶν*, just as *facere* has a special ritual sense in Latin. Athenaeus 660 A says *οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ θύειν δρᾶν ὀνόμαζον* and in the Lexicon of Hesychius *δρᾶν* is explained by the two words *πράττειν*, *θύειν*. If *δρᾶν* had these serious and solemn associations, they might account for a restriction on the meaning of *δράμα*, especially when we recall the religious origin and nature of Greek tragedy. Indeed the word *δράμα* itself may have been in ritual use, though I do not know of any evidence for this. The passage in Clement leaves it quite open. It is of course true that comedy was also connected with religious festivals, and it may be argued that therefore the semi-religious *δρᾶν* would not be unsuitable to it. But I think the facts go to show that *δρᾶν* was used of the really serious parts of religious performances, *i.e.*, sacrifices, mystical rites, &c., and not of the joviality and festivity added to them.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ΓΕΝΟΥΣΤΗΣ.

PLATO Phileb. 30 d-e. Τῇ δέ γε ἐμῇ ζητήσῃ πεπορικῶς ἀπόκρισιν, ὅτι νοῦς ἐστὶ γένουστῆς τοῦ πάντων αἰτίου λεχθέντος.

The reading here is particularly well

attested; for Porphyry, Proclus and Olympiodorus already had it, to say nothing of Hesychius, Suidas and the scholiast. It has been defended by Stallbaum and quite

recently by O. Apelt, who finds confirmation of the theory that *γενούσης* is a jocular form, containing a pun on *νοῦς*, in the words 'Ἀνάπαυλα γάρ, ὦ Πρώταρχε, τῆς σπουδῆς γίγνεται ἐνίοτε ἡ παιδιά, a view in which he had been anticipated by Paley. It is hard to see, however, how such a pun could give a rest to anyone, and Plato's 'fun,' like Coleridge's, consisted in metaphysical discussion such as has preceded the present passage (cf. *Parm.* 137 b.)

Now the *ζήτησις* to which this is an ἀπόκρισις is ποῖον γένους ὁ νοῦς; and the answer here given to it is referred to below (31 a) in the words νοῦς μὲν αἰτίας ἦν συγγενής καὶ τοῦτον σχεδὸν τοῦ γένους. It is not, therefore, surprising that modern critics have mostly seen in the first six letters of *γενούσης* the genitive γένους, and as a matter of fact, the Clarke MS. (B)¹ reads γένους τῆς as against the *γενούσης* of the ancient Platonists and Ven. T. But what is to be done with the τῆς? Bekker simply omits it; Wohlrab and Bury more prudently retain it in square brackets. But there is no answer to the question where it came from, an answer which is all the more necessary as the letters ΓΕΝΟΥΣΤΗΣ, however divided or accented, were certainly in the ancient vulgate and also in the splendidly accurate edition which formed the archetype of our MSS.

Now, I am not quite sure how γένους τῆς τοῦ πάντων αἰτίου λεχθέντος is to be translated; but I maintain that, if we are fair to the MS. tradition, this is not the only occurrence of such a phrase in the *Philebus*.

¹ With Ven. Π and Vat. Δ; but these, at least in the *Philebus*, are demonstrably copied from B.

In 32 a-b we have τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀπείρου καὶ πέρατος κατὰ φύσιν ἐμψυχον γεγονὸς εἶδος, where Stallbaum writes τοῦ, but τῆς is attested by Stobaeus as well as by BT. Again, in 52 c we have a phrase still more like the one we are dealing with, namely τῆς τοῦ ἀπείρου γε ἐκείνου....εἶναι γένους. It is utterly unmethodical to destroy these three instances of τῆς, attested as they are both by the ancient vulgate and the archetype of our MSS., without at least forming some theory of how they could be interpolated at a very early date.

The fact is that the problem is one that calls for the ἐπιδὰι of hermeneutics rather than the τομή of criticism. How the 'ellipse' should be filled up is the real question. Something may be said for 'understanding' μοίρας, but in view of 25 c (ὅποσα...τῆς τὸ μᾶλλον τε καὶ ἥττον δεχομένης ἐτίθεμεν εἰς ἓν φύσεις.—Τῆς τοῦ ἀπείρου λέγεις;—Ναί), we should probably decide for φύσεις. It is worth noting too, that, in the vexed passage 66 a, τὴν αἰδίον ᾗρησθαι (or εἰρησθαι) φύσιν, it appears that φύσιν is only a conjecture based on the φάσιν of Ven. T.² The word is omitted by the Clarke MS. (B) altogether and also by Stobaeus, which proves that this is not one of the accidental omissions which characterise B. But this raises further questions which demand a separate discussion.

JOHN BURNET.

² It seems to be assumed that the φάσιν of ΓΣΞ CH' is merely a corruption. The readings of T (the original of these MSS.) in the *Philebus* are as yet unpublished, but I am in a position to state that it has φάσιν quite unmistakably.—J.B.

Ω—ΣΩΣ IN THEOCRITUS AND HOMER.

Ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error.
Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 41.

THIS line (found also in the *Ciris*, 430) was explained by Heyne, *cum vidi, tum statim amore exarsi*. But this would require *ut-ita*; hence Voss took the *ut* as exclamative. 'How I saw! how I was lost!' Wagner, however, gives what in the opinion of most editors is the correct rendering: the first *ut* is temporal, the second and third are exclamative. 'When I saw, how was I lost! how my perverse madness carried me

away!' Thus too Dahl, *Die Lateinische Partikel Ut*, p. 14.

This rendering is that of Servius, who says that the first *ut* 'est temporis,' the second is 'quantitatis,' that is, the *ut perii* shows the *magnitudo amoris*; the first is equivalent to *postquam*, the other two *pro admirandi significatione posita sunt*. This too is in harmony with the Berne scholia, in which *ut vidi* is glossed by *mox statim, ut perii* by *valde, ut me* by *quemadmodum*. In other words the first *ut* is temporal, the second expresses degree, the