

# 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](#)



---

## Note on Pliny, *Epp.* iii. 6, ix. 39

A. W. Van Buren

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 09 / December 1905, pp 446 - 447

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992539, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00992539](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992539)

### How to cite this article:

A. W. Van Buren (1905). Note on Pliny, *Epp.* iii. 6, ix. 39. The Classical Review, 19, pp 446-447 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992539

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

'*adorirentur*,' the rest vary between *adorientur* and *adoriantur*. In V. 29. 6  $\beta$  has 'si nihil *sit*—*consentiat*' and  $\alpha$  '*esset*—*consentiret*.' If we must choose between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  here,  $\beta$ 's readings are preferable. But I conjecture that their disagreement means that both have preserved and both corrupted part of the truth and that Caesar wrote 'si nihil *esset* durius nullo cum periculo ad proximam legionem peruenturos: si Gallia omnis cum Germanis *consentiat*, unam esse in celeritate positam salutem.' For Titurius desires to insist on the last—the dangerous alternative. This releases the Imperfect in the next section 'Cottae atque eorum qui *dissentirent* (O.R. *dissentiunt*).' \*I. 47. 1 seemingly has already been given as the only case where *uellet* follows a *H.P.*, and so  $\beta$ 's *misit* may be right, cf. \*I. 26. 6, and *mittit* have come from \*42. 1. On the other hand *uellet* may simply have followed the sequence of '*coeptae essent*,' which may be a Pluperfect of Emphasis. The character of the evidence is not such as to warrant us in changing Primary Tenses to Secondary where the MSS. give no variant, as Meusel does, for example, at I. 34. 3 and 43. 7.

#### § 9.—General Observations.

The foregoing review does not profess to have provided a simple and unerring answer to the question: 'Would Caesar in a given context have used a Primary or a Secondary Tense?' It contents itself with having traced the considerations by which in the main his choice would be, whether consciously or unconsciously, determined. Whenever there is still admitted fluctuation in the usage of a language or in other words whenever the associations of syntactical forms have not stiffened into a rigid convention, it is natural to suppose that the writer chooses the form most expressive of his meaning. This is true, but only partially true. For there is another factor—the factor of sound and in particular of *rhythm*—which, as at this time of day need hardly be shown at length, is apt to override the purely syntactical considerations, and

which, though it can receive but a bare mention here, must by no means be passed over, as it may well afford an explanation of the residual peculiarities in the tense sequences of Oratio Obliqua in Caesar.

In conclusion it seems advisable to note an inadequate or rather erroneous conception of the Oratio Obliqua, to which the current terminology, which in the above discussion it has been impossible wholly to discard, lends only too much support. Expressions like 'the conversion of Oratio Recta into Oratio Obliqua,' or 'the retention of the Tenses of the Recta' have a certain practical convenience, it is true, but no historical justification. The Oratio Recta and Oratio Obliqua are in their origins perfectly distinct. The connexion and correspondence which the mind perceives between them are the effects of usage and association. It is therefore inexact to call a form in O. Obliqua the 'equivalent' of a form in O. Recta, nor is it quite exact even to speak of them as 'corresponding.' For some expressions of O. Recta there is no 'equivalent' in O. Obliqua, and there are expressions in O. Obliqua, the 'equivalent' of which in O. Recta it is impossible to determine. And even in cases where the agreement in usage is sufficient to excuse the term, a comparison of the 'equivalents' may reveal their original diversity. Thus the ordinary expressions of a prohibition are in O. Recta *noli* with the Infinitive or *ne* with the Perfect Subjunctive, but in O. Obliqua *ne* with the Imperfect or the Present. And though for the sake of fixing our own thoughts we may say that in e.g. *B.G.* IV. 7. 4 '*uel sibi agros attribuant uel patiantur eos tenere quos armis possederint*' the tense of the *attribuite* and *patimini* of the Recta are 'retained,' it is more accurate to say that the *attribuant* and *patiantur* of an Oratio Obliqua of the present time (*iubeo*, *iubes*, *iubet*, *attribuant*) are used in an Oratio Obliqua of the past.

J. P. POSTGATE.

#### NOTE ON PLINY, *EPP.* III. 6, IX. 39.

THESE two letters are of some interest as throwing light on Pliny's method in editing his correspondence for publication.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Mommsen, in *Hermes* iii. (1869), pp. 31, 32.

In iii. 6, he requests a friend to have a base made, of whatever kind of marble he shall choose, for a certain statuette; he fails however to state the desired dimensions of the

base, or the size of the statuette. In ix. 39, he tells another friend that he is about to rebuild a certain temple of Ceres and construct a porticus, and asks him to purchase four marble columns, of whatever kind he shall choose, and also marble for floor and walls; likewise, to buy or have made a cult statue. No dimensions are given, no estimates of the amount of marble required for floor and walls; as regards the porticus, for the design of which he would be glad of suggestions, the general lie of the land is indicated, but not by any means so definitely that an architect could go ahead and draw up plans and specifications.

Neither of these letters, then, could

actually have been sent in its present form, since neither conveys the information necessary to enable the recipient to carry out the request of the sender. How is this to be explained? I think it probable that the original letters which Pliny actually sent did give the necessary information, but that in editing the collection for publication he found it more in accordance with his canons of taste to strike out the details relating to feet and inches, which would detract from the dignity of the composition 'as a whole.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

*American School of Classical Studies in Rome,*  
October 1905.

## REVIEWS.

### SHARPLEY'S *PEACE OF ARISTOPHANES*.

*The Peace of Aristophanes.* Edited with Introduction, Critical Notes, and Commentary by H. SHARPLEY. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1905. 8vo. Pp. 188. 12s. 6d. net.

AN edition of Aristophanes, that might rank with the great editions of Aeschylus and Sophocles, is still work that invites the attention of scholars. Mr. Neil left us the *Knights* as an exemplar; and Mr. Sharpley has done something to continue the tradition. His volume is no mere school-book: he has not, from considerations of space, burked any discussion; and he possesses a sane judgment and elegant taste which have served him in good stead. To speak broadly, the English reader will find a text based on critical principles which will approve themselves to him and a commentary sufficient to his needs, illuminating and convincing. In the Introduction is a sketch of the play with some remarks upon it, and the question of a second edition is discussed; a valuable description of the probable scenic arrangement is given, and some account of the manuscripts and their relative value.

The excellence of the work so far as it goes makes it the more regrettable that Mr. Sharpley has interpreted his duty as an editor so narrowly in one direction. He gives us nothing of the same character as

e.g. Dr. Verrall's discussions of the plots in his editions of the *Agamemnon* and above all the *Choephoroi*. It is not that Mr. Sharpley is unequipped for the task: there are hints enough to show that he 'could, an he would'; and it is in the hope that he will go on to edit other plays that the suggestion is thrown out of a fuller treatment for Aristophanes' genius, and Athenian Comedy in general. Apart from this unfortunate self-limitation, our editor is successful in calling attention to the strength and the weakness of the play; he makes us feel the intense throb of Panhellenic sympathy, the merry jollity, the passionate loyalty to Athens; though he hardly perhaps sees as clearly into Aristophanes' prejudices as did Mr. Neil—indeed he follows a little too devotedly Mr. Whibley's statements as to the poet's political views.

On the question of a second edition our editor's conclusion is that 'it is perhaps a wholesome thing that there should be a few problems in the domain of scholarship in which the evidence for and against is so equally balanced or so conflicting as to make dogmatism an impertinence.' In his discussion of the manuscripts, it is hard to resist a suspicion that the whole subject is to him somewhat wearisome: at any rate he can hardly be said to go deep enough. In considering the relation between the Ravenna MS. (R) and the Venice (V),

G G