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](#)

Otto's Roman Proverbs *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer: gesammelt und erklärt* von Dr. A. Otto. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. Pp. xli. 436. M. 10.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 41 - 42
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0099317X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0099317X

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 41-42 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0099317X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

thinks of awkwardness in Keats's 'pure serene' (on Chapman's *Homer*), and we have but to open Milton to find a host of similar phrases, e.g. *P.L.* 2. 406, 'the palpable obscure,' 2. 829, 'the void immense,' 3. 12, 'the void and formless infinite,' 3. 45, 'ever-during dark,' 3. 380, 'excessive bright,' 4. 770, 'his proud fair, etc.'

Throughout the commentary Suetonius's favourite words are noted, e.g. *contionor* Jul. 2, *compello* Jul. 17, *acies* (= battle) Jul. 30, *dum taxat* Jul. 55, *civilis* (= courteous) Jul. 75, *demando* Jul. 76, *confisco* Aug. 15, *dignatio* Aug. 46, *conflo* Aug. 52. The list might be increased by *commoda* (= pay) (see above), *non perinde* as used in Aug. 80 (see above) and *plurifariam*; see Aug. 46, 80, T. 43, Cal. 54, Cl. 21, N. 24, Vit. 9, while of *multifariam* Baum. Crus. gives only three examples.

The typography of the work is excellent. Perhaps a dozen misprints have been noticed,

of which only *quin est* for *quin et*, p. xxxiv., and *rationiarium* for *rationarium* p. 65, would be misleading. Errors in the Greek passages cited or occurring in the text are also rare, although by a process of assimilation we have *συγγενείς* καὶ *κηδεστές* on p. 117, and the accents and breathings are occasionally wrong. The note on *notavit* p. 186, should come under § 39 instead of § 38, and that on *profectus est* in Jul. 18. p. 129 is a little late in its place.

Occasionally a note seems needless, e.g. that on the conative imperfect p. 7, on *ad viginti milibus* p. 132, *reus* > *accusator* p. 133, *umbo* = *ἀμβων* p. 157, and the many etymological notes alluded to above.

Post-Augustan and poetical words and ἀπαξ εἰρημένα are often but not always noted, and an incomplete index concludes the work.

AUGUSTUS T. MURRAY.

EARLHAM COLLEGE,
Richmond, Ind.

OTTO'S ROMAN PROVERBS.

Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer: gesammelt und erklärt von DR. A. OTTO. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. Pp. xli. 436. M. 10.

THE plan of this work includes an introduction, an alphabetical list of proverbs (1950 in number), and two valuable indices. The result is a scientific apparatus for the study of Roman proverbs, as distinguished from those which are Latin in form but Biblical in origin or mediaeval in date. Such an apparatus has been much needed, and has not been satisfactorily supplied by the latest successors of Erasmus in this department, Binder and Vannucci, who have included too much in their collections, and have not indicated with sufficient clearness the earliest written sources to which the proverbs given can be traced. Particular portions of the ground have, however, been adequately covered in recent articles and monographs, not only by the author himself, but by Pflügl, Landgraf, Wölfflin and von Wyss, and the way has thus been paved for the present work.

In his Introduction, Otto refuses to apply too rigid a definition in the admission of proverbs to his collection. The use of the phrase 'proverbial expressions' in the title prepares the reader for some freedom in

this respect; but no undue laxity is shown, and doubtful cases are marked as such. For one thing, Otto rightly insists (and this at once narrows the field) that a saying must at least have *vogue* if it is to qualify as a proverb; otherwise it is probably simply a quotation. After further clearing the ground, he discusses, by the aid of an elaborate index, to be referred to presently, the subject-matter of Roman proverbs, and shows how they may be supposed to reflect the national life and characteristics. He also directs attention to some interesting points connected with their form (alliteration, rhyme, etc.), and with their comparative frequency in various authors. On the latter point he remarks, for instance, that they are oftener to be met with in Plautus than in Terence, in Livy than in Caesar or Tacitus, in Cicero *ad Atticum* than in Cicero *ad Familiares*.

The proverbs themselves are arranged in the alphabetical order of the leading word contained in them. They are carefully numbered for convenience of reference, and are illustrated abundantly from Greek and Latin, sparingly from modern languages. The number of Greek analogues quoted—some on almost every page—leaves upon the mind the impression (true or false) that, in this direction also, the Romans were mainly imitators.

As the references to Greek and Latin authors aim at something like completeness, it may be mentioned that some omissions strike one even on a first reading; but these are not of great importance, and the general execution of this part of the book is so good as to leave little room for criticism.

Two indices are given—one of passages quoted, the other of subject-matter. The former gives a list of the literary sources for the proverbs, and includes a large proportion of later and ecclesiastical writers, though it is among these that Otto himself thinks that most omissions will be detected. The index of subject-matter is a most elaborate one, extending over more than twenty pages of small print, and arranged under such headings as: A. Nature. I. Inorganic Nature. (1) Heaven and Earth. (2) The Ele-

ments. (3) Relations of Time and Space. (4) Geography. II. Organic Nature. (1) The Vegetable Kingdom. (2) The Animal Kingdom. B. Man. I. The Human Body (with a great number of subdivisions). II. Human Life. (1) Private Life (with subdivisions). (2) Public life (with subdivisions). III. Human Action (with subdivisions). C. History. D. Mythology. E. Phrases and Formulae. (C.D. and E. also with subdivisions.)

The scale of this is no doubt formidable, but the student of ancient life and the comparative paroemiologist (if there is such an one) will feel grateful to Dr. Otto for having, while providing so much well-sifted material, made it easy to refer to it and to draw deductions from it.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

TEUFFEL'S HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

W. S. Teuffel's Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. Neu bearbeitet von LUDWIG SCHWABE. Fünfte Auflage. Leipzig (B. G. Teubner), 1890. 2 vols. pp. xiii. 1346. 14 Mk. 40.

THE late Professor Teuffel's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, published in 1870, had gone through three editions previous to his death in 1878, and has been twice republished since that time with large additions by the editor, Dr. L. Schwabe, who undertook the work of revision in obedience to the author's wish. This revision (as the editor explains in the preface to the fourth edition, 1882) necessitated the recasting of much of Teuffel's work, while the alterations were too numerous and sometimes too radical to be merely thrown into notes. In the new edition the original has been still more freely modified, though the strict chronological plan and the general structure remain undisturbed. The divergence is frequently noticeable even without comparison of the author's last edition. We find Teuffel set aside, by name, in reference to several disputed points, e.g. the significance of the Greek letters standing for the names of the *dramatis personae* in the MSS. of Plautus and Terence (§ 16, n. 8), the story of Lucretius' suicide (which Dr. Schwabe does not, like Teuffel, regard as a pious fiction), the authorship of the 'Culex' (which he refuses to assign to Vergil) and that of the panegyric on Messalla (which he

denies to Tibullus). On the other hand the author's view is tacitly rejected, e.g. in reference to the length of Terence's life (§ 108, n. 7), the date of the first performance of the *Adelphoe*, (§ 110, n. 6), the nationality of Manilius (§ 253, n. 2), etc.

It is thought by many English admirers of Vergil that Teuffel, in common with most German critics, failed to appreciate that poet's artistic qualities. Dr. Schwabe—whose ability in this field of criticism is so well attested by his writings on Catullus—is even more emphatic than Teuffel in his strictures on the *Aeneid*, and his language in the present edition is stronger than in the last: a great part of the poem, he now insists, is 'flat and lifeless, not to say oppressively dull' (dumpfe Leblosigkeit, ja einschläfernde Langweiligkeit); its *aequalitas* is simply monotonous; the over-elaboration of the whole leaves no room for gradation or climax. It would seem that he has been provoked to this counterblast by a new outburst of enthusiasm on the other side—'that adoring admiration of hidden beauties in which an hysterical aestheticism has recently indulged.' He has, however, made amends by considerably enlarging and improving the somewhat meagre characterisation of the poet in the earlier editions. He still retains the familiar spelling of the name, but only in its shorter form; that is, he keeps 'Virgil' alongside of 'Vergilius,' presumably regarding it as established in the