

The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Notes on the Text of Pliny's *Epistles*

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 16 / Issue 3-4 / July 2012, pp 175 - 176

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800002743, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800002743

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1922). Notes on the Text of Pliny's *Epistles*. The Classical Quarterly, 16, pp 175-176 doi:10.1017/S0009838800002743

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

very improbable. Therefore Bentley's *merito-tuo té-amo* is almost certain. His *Quid? Ego dicam* is also much better than Muretus' *Quid? Quid ego dicam?* So far good. The last words remain to be explained: Dziatzko's reading involves no abnormality in the *hóc . . . quód*; Bentley's '*ego dicam hoc cum fit quod*' does: the *hoc* has a right to be in the forte of the foot. Also the evidence for *confit* is strong. All can be put right by a change of punctuation, reading:

DE. *Ego dicam (Hoc confit!) Quod uolo . . .*

He feigns a hesitation. He begins: 'Thanks ever so much! But . . . Mi. Well? DE. I'll tell you. (*Aside*, It's coming off!) What I want is . . . Mi. What next? What is there to come?' By making *Hoc confit* an aside, you justify *hoc* having no ictus on it. And this interpretation of *Quod uolo . . .* agrees with Micio's next words *Quid nunc? Quid restat?* which show that Demea is hesitating. But it is a further possibility that (*Hoc confit!*) belongs to Aeschinus: in which case Demea's sentence would run *ego dicam . . . quod uolo*, with an interruption.

Ad. 236 iamne enumerasti *id quod* ad te rediturum putes?
id om. BCFP.

Which is the right reading? The scruple that moved me to look more closely into this verse led in the first instance to the answer that BCFP are right: *id quód* is unlawful. But a further question arose: is *quód ád te* lawful? You have *Quod in test* in *Eun.* 401, but that is the first foot of the line: otherwise it must conform to *Haut.* 845 *serua quod in-test filium*.

But once you come to scrutinize the passage, you see than Sannio is calculating not the figure of his profits, but the probable date of his return from Cyprus. The sense therefore requires

iamne enumerasti *quoad* te rediturum putes?

Cf. *Phorm.* 148 *Quoad* expectatis uestrum? and *ib.* 462 *Percontatum ibo ad portum quoad* se recipiat.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

My best thanks are again due to Mr. C. J. Fordyce, of Balliol College, for reading my proofs and correcting my references.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF PLINY'S *EPISTLES*.

THE following notes are based on the *apparatus criticus* in the edition of E. T. Merrill (Teubner, 1922):

I. 20. 5 'uides ut statuas, signa, picturas, hominum denique *multorumque* animalium formas, arborum etiam, si modo sint decorae, nihil magis quam amplitudo commendet.' Why 'many *animals*' and not 'many men' and 'many trees'? Read *mutorum*; with 'animalia,' a standing opposition to 'homines,' as in Seneca, *Ep.* 76. 26 'ea quae tam homini contingunt quam mutis animalibus,' where also it has been corrupted to *multis* as in many other places.

IV. 3. 4 (in a compliment to Arrius Antoninus upon his poems) 'quantum ibi humanitatis, uenustatis, quam dulcia illa, quam *antiqua*, quam arguta, quam recta.' This is the reading of BF, but MVD have *amantia*, which can scarcely be a corruption of *antiqua*. The variants are much better explained by 'antiqui<tatis> *amantia*,' or 'antiqui<tatem> *amantia*'; for the accusative is correct, though less common, Cic. *Att.* I. 19. 1 'ciui amanti patriam.' So Seneca, *N.Q.* 6. 12. 1 'Archelaus anti-

quitatis diligens.' The thought is Plinian; see *Ep.* VIII. 24. 3, especially 'sit apud te honor antiquitati.' The *Thesaurus*, reading 'amantia' only, says 'nota neutrum.' If so, then note also Ovid, *Fasti* 6. 113.

IV. 27. 4. In the complimentary verses upon himself that Pliny quotes from Sentius Augurinus we read:

unus Plinius est mihi priores:
mauult uersiculos foro relicto
et quaerit quod amet putatque amari.

The MSS. here vary between 'amari' and 'amare,' which is better supported. A parallel is sought in IX. 33. 6 (in the story of the enamoured dolphin), where the boy 'agnosci se, amari putat; amat ipse,' and I imagine the text is intended to mean 'he looks for something to love, and he thinks he is beloved.' But suppose he is not? What use is his 'thought?' I fancy Pliny's flatterer wrote 'putetque amare,' 'someone to love and to think loves him.'

VI. 2. 9 'sed de his melius coram ut de pluribus uitii ciuitatis. nam tu quoque amore communium soles *emendari* cupere quae iam corrigere difficile est.' Our scholars, troubled about 'communium,' have overlooked a worse corruption in 'emendari,' which means the same as 'corrigi,' a verb with which it is not seldom conjoined. A conclusive example is X. 39. 6 'quae uidentur *emendanda corrigere*, quae transferenda transferre.' The sense, that we should wish to see 'ended' what we cannot have 'mended,' is secured by the change of a letter 'amendari,' 'put out of the way,' often written 'amandari.' Cf. Cicero, *N.D.* 2. 141 'ut in aedificiis architecti auertunt ab oculis naribusque dominorum ea quae profluentia necessario tætri essent aliquid habitura, sic natura res similis procul *amendauit* a sensibus.'

VII. 4. 7 'transii ad elegos; hos quoque non minus celeriter explicui: addidi *alios* facilitate corruptus.'

If Pliny means only that he wrote some more 'elegi' after his first piece, 'his corruptus' seems unjustifiably strong. It would be a great improvement to read 'alios <atque alios>.' Lipography is common enough in the MSS. of the *Epistles*.

VII. 6. 13 'non facile me repeto tantum adsensum agendo consecutum quantum tunc non agendo. similiter nunc et probatum et exceptum est quod pro Vareno hactenus *non tacui*.'

Thus the MSS., with the exact contrary of the sense required; as Sichard, Schaefer, Stangl, C. F. W. Müller have seen, but without hitting on the easiest remedy, *conticui* to wit, probably from the rarity of its use for 'remaining silent,' for which, however, see Livy 30. 30. 2 'paulisper alter alterius conspectu, admiratione mutua prope attoniti, *conticuere*. tum Hannibal prior . . .' Cf. Ulpian, *Dig.* 48. 19. 6 'qui *tam diu conticuerunt*,' cited in the *Thesaurus*.

X. 116. 2 'ipse enim sicut arbitror, praesertim ex sollemnibus causis, concedendum *ius* inuitationis.'

This is the emendation of Scheffer; but the tradition appears to be 'iussi' or 'iussisti' that is 'ius *istud*.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

CAMBRIDGE,
July 25, 1922.