

# 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](#)



---

## Debate in the Senate, as to the Restoration of Ptolemy Auletes, A.U.C 698 (B.C. 56)

R. H. Gretton

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 02 / March 1897, pp 108 - 109

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026342, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00026342](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026342)

### How to cite this article:

R. H. Gretton (1897). Debate in the Senate, as to the Restoration of Ptolemy Auletes, A.U.C 698 (B.C. 56). The Classical Review, 11, pp 108-109 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026342

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

self in the street. He had lost his money, which he had put in an empty water pitcher. The Father asked him to describe the coins, which were, in fact, the wet ones thrown by the local πνεύματα. If this is not ὑποκλοπή, what is it? At a distance from my books, I cannot give the exact reference, but I can procure it.

4. Same citation :—

πνεύματα ἢ κλαίοντα ἢ γελῶντα φοβερά, (sic) i.e. γελῶντα φοβερά. No need to go to Grimm, Sagen, no. 224! The Wesley case (1716) and Miss Rose Morton's 'Record of a Haunted House' (*Proceedings*, S. P. R.) will supply πνεύματα κλαίοντα. For γελῶντα

φοβερά I can provide an instance. The house and lands of an ancient family were sold, some thirty years ago, and purchased by acquaintances of my own. The local πνεῦμα always laughed horribly at the death of the squire. My friends, being new people, expected no such thing, but, when their father died, the πνεῦμα 'laughed consumedly,' as they told me.

Πνεύματα have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing, since the *Magical Papyri* were written. They should be edited by a Mage, or, at all events, by somebody who knows the modern parallels.

ANDREW LANG.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE, AS TO THE RESTORATION OF PTOLEMY  
AULETES, A.U.C 698 (B.C. 56)

'PROXIMA erat Hortensii sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus pl., quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit, ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi vehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et nova. Consules neque concedebant, neque valde repugnabant, diem consumi volebant; id quod est factum: perspiciebant enim in Hortensii sententiam multis partibus plures ituros, quamquam aperte Volcatio adsentirentur. Multi rogabantur, atque id ipsum consulibus invitis; nam ii Bibuli sententiam valere cupierunt.'

Cic. *Ad. Fam.* I. 2. § 2.

The traditional interpretation refers *ii* to *consulibus*; this makes *invitis* difficult, for if the consuls wished to waste the day, because their own inclinations were for the motion of Bibulus, the course which they took would suit their purpose very well. It would not matter which side the *multi* supported, in that case, because the day would be wasted, as the consuls wished it to be. Hence many editors read *consulibus non invitis*, but there is no authority for the insertion *non*.

I propose to refer *ii* to *multi*. Grammatically, if there is any difference between the two interpretations, it is slightly in favour of the latter, but in Cicero's epistolary Latin, this cannot be insisted upon. The situation in the Senate, I interpret as follows: the consuls were at the very beginning of their year of office, and were rather feeling their way in the Egyptian question. The one thing certain in their

minds was a desire not to offend Pompeius, as they were nearly sure to do, if they allowed the matter to be pressed to a further division. Hence they wanted to waste time—*diem consumi volebant*—and this they did by asking for *sententiae* on the demand of Lupus. But this very course—*id ipsum*—though the only one possible, with a view to wasting time, the consuls pursued reluctantly—*invitis*—because the senators, who thus gave their *sententiae*, let it be seen at the same time that they were strongly in favour of the proposal of Bibulus. This can be supported from *Ad. Fam.* I. 1 § 3. *Huic* (i.e. *Bibulo*) *adsentiantur reliqui consulares, praeter Servilium... et Volcatium... et Afranium*. The consulars would naturally be asked first, and would, as a whole, be for the proposal of Bibulus. Their assertion of this fact would be unwelcome to the consuls, both because it would tend to force the matter to a division, and because this support of an already rejected motion would confuse the consuls as to the general inclinations of the senate. And if the force of *multi* be pressed, I am inclined to think that the Senate were so uncertain in their intentions, that, once the lead was given, they would rather speak in favour of an already rejected motion, than give open support to any other motion as yet undecided, while the wishes of Pompeius were so uncertain as Cicero represents them to have been.

The sentence preceding the one under discussion, *perspiciebant enim... adsentirentur*, must be considerably discounted. Cicero is

here writing to Lentulus Spinther; but in a letter to Quintus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 2) written only two days later, he says, *Sine dubio res a Lentulo remota videtur esse.*

It is unfortunate that the wishes of the consuls cannot be accurately discovered. Lentulus Marcellinus later on in this year opposed Pompeius, but the fact that Cicero mentions this as his one objection to Marcellinus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 4. § 5) would seem to show that it was rather a sudden development, and that at the beginning of the year, at any rate, Marcellinus was not against Pompeius (cf. Drumann. Vol. II. sub 'Claudii Marcelli' no. 31). Marcius Philippus is still more an unknown quantity. He was deliberately passed over, on the

assignment of provinces in 49 B.C. (Caesar *B.C.* I. 6), and would therefore seem to have been insignificant in politics: he tried to dissuade Octavius from entering on his inheritance (Velleius Paterculus, II. 60, Suet. *Aug.* 8 Appian *B.C.* III 10, 13, cf. Cic. *ad Att.* XIV. 12) and disgraced himself when sent as ambassador to Antony at Mutina (Cic. *Ad Fam.* XII. 4, *Phil.* VIII 10, IX. 1.) and would therefore seem to have been hesitating, cautious, and incompetent.

If the reference of *ii* to *multi* is satisfactory from a political point of view, it may perhaps be of some use, as obviating the necessity of inserting *non* before *invitis*.

R. H. GRETTON.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

### ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF οὐ μή.

In the April number of this review, I ventured to criticise Prof. Goodwin's view of the construction οὐ μή, basing my objections (i) on usage and (ii) on meaning. As my criticism was confined to a particular theory, questions (such as whether μή after δαίω is interrogative) which would not affect the validity of my argument whichever way they may be decided, were left in abeyance, nor was more than a passing reference made to the double negative theory of οὐ μή + Fut. I agreed with Prof. Goodwin wherever possible, in order to emphasise the fact that even on his own premises his theory is untenable. To this method Mr. Whitelaw has taken exception. He justly objects to an explanation, with which he is satisfied, being dismissed as 'very improbable,' 'unphilosophical' or 'absurd' without further argument; and though personally I am only guilty of using the first and mildest of these epithets, I should certainly not have employed it without arguments in justification, had I known that this theory, which I had long believed obsolete, still claimed adherents. With such apology by way of introduction, I propose now to examine the theory as expounded by Mr. Whitelaw. In his own words it is thus briefly stated 'οὐ μενεῖς; = μένε,' (therefore) 'οὐ μή μενεῖς; = μή μένε' (p. 239a). (i) But why is the combination οὐ μή and not οὐκ οὐ? Mr. Whitelaw offers no explanation; does he hold the view that since οὐκ ἔστι; = is it not so? therefore οὐ μή ἔστι; will mean 'is it so'? I suppose he does; or if not, what limitations does he lay down to the possibility of

double negatives? I can imagine none, unless he supposes that the μή is due to false analogy with the μή in μή μένε. But it is hardly probable that scholars will be prepared to shift so heavy a burden on the already well-laden back of 'false analogy.' I am of course not unaware that attempts have been made to explain this μή on other lines, but it does not appear that Mr. Whitelaw would accept such explanations. For instance Dr. Verrall in a note on Aesch. Sept. 236, says that 'a sensitive ear' requires the change; a double οὐ was also objectionable for grammatical reasons and so μή was substituted. From Dr. Verrall's note one would suppose that there was dire necessity compelling the Greeks to adopt a construction of the 'will you not not-talk,' type, and that as their sensitive ears revolted at the double οὐ, aesthetic taste got the better of grammar and they substituted μή for the second οὐ. I cannot agree with this view. 'Will you not not-talk' sentences do not appear to me indispensable in any language. So cumbersome a form of sentence would never, I believe, have even occurred to the Greek mind, certainly it is unlikely that grammar would have been sacrificed in an effort to retain it. For after all, if I wish to negative 'it is not raining,' I simply say 'it is raining,' and similarly the negative of οὐ περιώψασθέ με; (Leave me alone) is not οὐ μή or οὐκ οὐ περιώψασθέ με; but simply περιώψασθέ με; (Don't leave me alone). Scepticism on this point may be removed by reference to Ar. Ach. 55.

(ii) Mr. Whitelaw admits that 'if it were