

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](#)



The Opening Sentence of the *Verrines*

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 09 / December 2009, pp 440 - 441

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990930, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990930

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (2009). The Opening Sentence of the *Verrines*. The Classical Review, 18, pp 440-441 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990930

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

793 Read εἴ τε μοιχεύων : ἀντί τοῦ 'μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ἰμῶν.' The scholium appears in this form in VRGE, except that VR read ἄν for ὦν. Dindorf (Dübner) read ἐστὶν for ὦν, but erroneously, since μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ἰμῶν is a perfect paraphrase of εἴ μοιχεύων τις ἰμῶν ἐστὶν ὅστις of the text of the play.

800 Read μεγάλη πράττει κἀστὶ νυνί : παραγραφέντα ἐκ Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου. The MSS. have παρὰ τὰ γραφέντα, except Γ which reads παραγραφέντα.

807 ταυτὶ μὲν ἠκάσμεθα : διεσκέμμεθα. Princeps. Read ἠκάσμεσθα : διεσκώμμεθα. Musurus is responsible for διεσκέμμεθα, which occurs in none of the MSS. that have the note (VEM). For the form διεσκώμμεθα, cf. Suid. (s.v. ἀνεικάσασθε) : ἀνασκώψατε (= Hesych. s.v. ἀνεικάσασθε, Bekker, An. Graec., 596, 24), and Hesych. (s.v. εικάζειν) : σκώπτειν, εὐικάζειν ('fort. γελοιάζειν' Meineke), τὸ λέγειν 'ὄμοιος εἶ τῷδε.'

822 ἄλλως (i.e. ἵνα καὶ τὰ Θεαγένους) λέγεται ὅτι μεγαλέμπορος τις ἐβούλετο εἶναι περαίτης ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, ἐκαλείτο δὲ

'καπνός' ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνόμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει. Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις.

The Scholium is found in this form in VI²E, except that V omits ἐν before Δήμοις. It does not occur in RGM. περαίτης has given serious offence, and various substitutes have been proposed: περιλαλητής Casaubon; καίπερ αἴτης (!) Toup; ἐπαίτης or προσαίτης Meineke; πράκτης Kock; πένης ὦν or καίπερ πένης ὦν Blaydes; πράτης H. Jackson.

The Scholium furnishes another interesting case of the possible recovery of verses from a play now lost. The order of words in the Scholium is not possible in prose, and indicates that the writer unconsciously followed the order of words in Eupolis's verses. Adopting Mr. Jackson's substitute for περαίτης, the verses in the *Demí* may have run:

μεγαλέμπορος τις εἶναι βούλεται
πράτης ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, Θεογένης,
καπνός δὲ καλεῖται, πολλὰ γὰρ ὑπισχνόμενος
οὐδὲν τελεῖ.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

THE DATE OF THE DIONYSALEXANDER.

PAP. OXYR. 663.

I AM not sure that the argument does not fix the date for this play even more precisely than its beneficent discoverers think. This is certainly the case if the corruption noted by them in l. 8 is, as I would suggest, nothing more than the writing of Π for Π' so that ΠΥΩΝΠΟΙ¹¹ stands for περὶ ἰῶν

ποιήσεως. When the insignificant omission is made good, a sense emerges which implies that when the Dionysalexander was produced the project for the legitimizing of the younger Pericles was either debating or accomplished.—Turning to the audience they talk with one another on the question how men may get themselves sons.'

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VERRINES.

Cic. Div. in Caec. i. § 1. Si quis vestrum, iudices, aut eorum qui adsunt, forte miratur me . . . ad accusandum descendere . . . una et id quod facio probabit, et . . . putabit.

Instead of the vulgate miratur, all the MSS. have mirantur, until corrected in the fifteenth century. This is true of Par. 7776 (eleventh century): it is true also of Par.

7823, which, though late, can be shown to have faithfully preserved the tradition which the now mutilated codex of Claudius Puteanus (Par. 7775, thirteenth century) derived from what must have been the archetype also of the famous ninth century MS., Regius 7774 A.

The explanation is that mirantur must have been a copyist's error for mirabitur.

The substitution of *v* for *b* is a common occurrence, which would result in this case in *mirantur*, passing easily into *mirantur*. This is one more instance of the need for paying attention to neglected errors in our

MSS., and the opening sentence of the *Verrines* should no longer be misquoted.

W. PETERSON.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.
Oct. 29, 1904.

HORACE, *ARS POETICA*, vv. 125 FOLL.

Si quid inexpertum scenae committis et
audes
personam formare novam, servetur ad unum
qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.
difficile est proprie communia dicere: tuque
rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque moraberis
orbem
nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpretis

I would suggest a way of throwing light upon the force of *proprie communia* and dispelling all ambiguity, by transferring here some lines (240-3) which cause an almost equal perplexity where they stand. If set before v. 128 they will shew that the force of *difficile* has been misapprehended, and remove the difficulty which is serious at first sight of taking *proprie communia dicere* in the most obvious sense 'to treat with originality themes that are common property.' It is always taken to mean 'it is hard, so do not attempt it.' But with this sense none of the proposed interpretations seem to suit the entire context. It is assumed that Horace is warning off the Pisos from a too difficult enterprise, and that *proprie communia dicere* is therefore in contrast with *Iliacum carmen deducis in actus*, and parallel to *proferre ignota indictaque*. This interpretation of Acron (and Mr. Wilkes) who takes *communis* as *intacta, non ante dicta*, would do very well if the sentence stood alone. But, as Professor Wilkins says, the parallelism of *publica materies privati iuris erit* is too close to be denied, and *publica materies* cannot bear the sense of 'unappropriated material' because v. 133 speaks of translation.

Orelli's (and Dr. Johnson's) interpretation, 'it is difficult to give individuality to abstract types' is subject to the same grave objection that the parallelism of *publica materies* is ignored. Even if this could be, it does not suit so well as Acron's view the

alternative parallelism with *ignota indictaque primus* which both these interpretations require. Neither is it much in the way of the ancient dramatists to individualise types.

Professor Wilkins offers another interpretation which has the merit of preserving the ordinary sense of *communis*. '(It is fairly easy to treat novel themes without inconsistency.) The difficulty arises when you endeavour to treat familiar themes in a distinctive and individual manner. You are selecting a theme from the *Iliad*: then you are wise to confine yourself simply to throwing Homer's poem into dramatic shape, instead of attempting an originality of handling which would probably lead you into inconsistencies.' On this view v. 128 whilst recommending *communis* dissuades from treating them *proprie*. This can hardly be right, for lines 131 foll. plainly give directions how to treat the theme *proprie*, with freedom and originality. It is not likely that a courtier like Horace would say to the Pisos 'It is too hard for you but this is how I should advise your betters to do it.' Moreover it would be very confusing to set *ignota indictaque primus* not parallel to *inexpertum* and *persona nova* but as belonging to the alternative contrasted with these. If now we set vv. 240-3

Ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi
quavis
speret idem, sudet multum frustra que
laboret
ausus idem: tantum series iunctura que
pollet
tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris.

between v. 127 and v. 128 all these difficulties are removed and the sense is quite clear.

Horace has mentioned two courses

Aut famam sequere, aut sibi convenientia
finge. (v. 119)

In the eight lines which follow he has given