Teuffel's Studies and Characteristics of Greek and Roman Literature *Studien und Charakteristiken zur griechischen und römischen Litteraturgeschichte*, von W. S. Teuffel. 2te veränderte Auflage. (Teubner 1889.) 5s. 6d.

E. S. Thompson

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 417 - 419
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191334, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191334](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191334)

How to cite this article:
E. S. Thompson (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 417-419 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191334

Request Permissions : [Click here](javascript:ReturnValue('https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms')())
to us a number of other phenomena occur to
the mind, confirming the conclusion that
there is some intimate local connexion
between the two texts. We remember that
whereas hitherto the Speculum had been the
oldest authority for the comma Johanneum,
this is now found in Priscillian (p. 6 1. 5).
We remember that both Priscillian and the
Speculum recognise the Epistle to the
Laodiceans, which is also found in Spanish
MSS. of the Vulgate. We remember
further that most of the MSS. of the Specu-
lum are French, coming up as it were from
the South and West—Limoges, Fleury sur
Loire, Mont St. Michel, St. Victor (Paris).
We remember lastly that there is a special
connexion between the Speculum and the
Spaniard, Theodulf bishop of Orleans. It
will, I believe, be found that there are in-
teresting relations between Priscillian and
the two Theodulfian MSS. For instance in
Deut. xxxii. 8 there is a closer resemblance
between Prisc. and μ than with other MSS.
of the Speculum : the same holds good of
Hos. ii. 18 : on the other hand Prisc. = Spec.
against a and still more μ in Job xl. 9 ;
Prisc. = a Spec. against μ in Isa. xxx. 15 :
Prisc. = Spec. against μ (vacat a) in Isa. xl.
6—8 ; Prisc. = Spec. Codd. MVLC against
Spec. cod. S as well as a μ in Amos v. 8. It
would seem as if the Theodulfian MSS.,
especially μ, had a fundamental affinity to
Prisc. but (as we might expect) were more
largely corrupted from the Vulgate. It
will be seen however that a number of
interesting problems are raised which will
need more fully working out than I can
profess to have done at present.

W. SANDAY.

TEUFFEL'S STUDIES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEK AND ROMAN
LITERATURE.

Studien und Charakteristiken zur griechischen
und römischen Litteraturgeschichte, von
W. S. TEUFFEL. 2te veränderte Auflage.
( Teubner 1889.) 5s. 6d.

The present collection of Teuffel's papers
differs from the previous edition, pub-
lished in 1871, seven years before the author's
death, by the addition of some papers, the
abridgment of others and the omission of one
or two. The whole has been edited by the
author's son from his father's papers. An
interesting sketch of Teuffel's life is also
supplied.

The material in the present volume has
all, with the exception of a short intro-
duction to Cicero's speech pro Quinctio,
been already published in some form,
and by far the largest part of it ap-
ppears in print now for the third time. It
is therefore not necessary to treat the
work as a new contribution to scholarship.
It derives its importance rather from the
personality of its author. To English
students Teuffel's name is well-known from
the translation of his History of Roman
Literature, which has gone through four
editions in Germany. His editions of the
Clouds of Aristophanes and of the Persae of
Aeschylus are deservedly popular. In the
useful and responsible work of translation he
was most active. To a collection of German
translations of classical authors he contrib-
uted the metrical versions of Aristophanes' Clouds, Horace's Ars Poetica, Persius and
Tibullus, besides being joint author of those
of Catullus and Juvenal; from him too came
the prose translations of Plato's Republic,
Lucian, Cicero's Orator and Brutus, Livy
and Tacitus's Dialogue on Orators. To this
sum of work must be added articles written
for Pauly's Real-encyclopaedie, some of the
volumes of which he edited, several 'Programs' etc., and a large number
of contributions to German periodicals. Some
of the papers published were preliminary
studies for a History of Grecian Literature,
which he had planned but did not live to
execute.

The papers in the present volume are of
various origin. The first three—on 'The
Position of Women in Grecian Poetry,' 'The
Comparison of Ancient and Modern Lyric
Poetry' and 'Aristophanes's Relation to his
Time'—are lectures delivered before popular
audiences, and present little that is original.
Of the rest some belong to the class of
'Programs,' etc., others were published with
volumes of translations (as the paper on
Cicero's life, and that on Tibullus); some
are contributions to periodicals. It is in this last class that most of the points of detailed criticism are to be found. The subjects range over the whole field of classical literature, from Homer to Procopius and Agathias, from Plautus to Appuleius, and testify to a wideness of reading and wideness of sympathy probably rarely equalled. Teuffel though an accurate was not a microscopic scholar. We find, as we might expect, that the literary and historical point of view is to him more attractive than the purely philological. Even in points of criticism it is nearly always from the exegetical side that he attacks the difficulty.

A good sample of the temper he was to bring to the teaching and interpretation of the classics is seen in one of the theses which he selected when qualifying as Privatdocent in his University of Tubingen: 'Antiquitatis res non eam ob causam exponenda sunt ut litterarum monumenta intelligentur, sed haec monumenta explicanda sunt ut antiquitatis res cognoscantur et intelligantur.'

It is easy to accept as conformable to the impressions we thus gather of his mind the account given by his son of Teuffel's qualities as a teacher. It was to this part of his work, in fact, that he himself attached primary importance. 'In his lectures he always endeavoured as far as possible to present some entire work rather than a mere introduction or fragment; it was the future teacher that held the front rank in his regard rather than the future scholar. Accordingly, in his allusions to illustrative literature he was more scanty than is usual; his pupils did not take home from his lectures references that could only be of use to men that had the command of a well equipped University Library. What he gave them was carefully arranged, sharply defined and clearly and briefly expressed.'

The estimates that he forms of authors are in nearly all cases at once sane and sympathetic. Like most of his compatriots he failed fully to appreciate the genius of Virgil. To Euripides also he seems inclined to do something less than justice, when, in explaining the grounds of his harsh judgment of women, he calls him 'ein Bücherwurm.' On the other hand he pays a worthy tribute to the marvellous insight and deep feeling shown by Sophocles in the portraits of women we find in six of his seven extant plays, and compares him in this quality with Goethe, attributing to both poets 'ein weiblich weicher receptiver character'—a view of Sophocles's genius that perhaps is not a familiar one. Tibullus, whom he translated, is a favourite of his; he considers him 'der innerlichsche' of all the Roman elegiac poets. (He is at the moment referring to Tib. iv. 13, which he considers genuine, as he also does the Encomium Messallae, though a very youthful and immature production.)

It remains to say something of those papers that deal not with the general characteristics of authors, but with particular places. Here again the leading impression is of a judgment trained and sobered by wide experience. It might be said of Teuffel that without being a man of eminent originality he had a great knack of taking the winning side on disputed questions. On points of textual criticism his general tendency is decidedly conservative. (Is this, it might be asked, a mark of the wide-reading, as opposed to the minute scholar?) In a long paper on 'die horazische Lyrik und ihre Kritik' he vigorously repels the destructive criticism of Lehrl, Gruppe and others. A series of papers on Plato's Symposium are mainly directed to showing how much too far the noble sport of gloss-hunting had been carried by Sauppe, Jahn and Usener. The desire to bring out the ἥδης of the different speakers, and the general laxity of conversation, will, he rightly thinks, account for a good deal that might seem irregular, clumsy or superfluous. His views in the main coincide with those accepted by A. Hug, who mentions him as one to whom he is indebted in the preface to his valuable edition of the Symposium, and by Schanz. Neither of these editors, however, have been willing to follow him in his defence of the addition ἡ ὕποπτη τὰ ἔριδιν at 190 E. Here, surely, conservatism has carried Teuffel too far. A suggestion of his on Plato, Republic 376 D, instead of ἵνα μὴ ἔμεν ἵκανον λόγον ἢ συχνὸν διείσιμον to read ἵνα ἔμεν συχνὸν λόγον ἢ ἵκανον διείσιμον, deserves careful consideration. The transposition of ἵκανον and συχνὸν is supported by three MSS. The Zurich editors (ed. 6) mention the suggestion in their introductory notes, but do not adopt it.

To Plautus Teuffel devoted special and careful study. A few suggestions made by him (in Fleckheisen's Jahrbuch, 1867) after Brix had published his first edition of the Menaecheum were all adopted by him in the second. A subsequent treatment of the difficult passage in the same play (vv. 592 sqq.) in the Rhein. Mus. xxii is partially adopted by Brix in his third edition. I venture to think that Brix might have gone
further in adopting Teuffel’s interpretation than he has, and will conclude this paper by a brief discussion of this passage. A misprint in Teuffel may incidentally be noted. He says (p. 332) that in v. 591 the palimpsest A gives tetuli. It really gives (wrongly) DETULI. In the following verses the MS. reading (following A as far as possible) is aut plus aut minus quam opus fuerat dicto (?) dixeram controversiam ut sponsio fieret ille qui praedem dedit nec magis manifestum ego hominem unquam ullam teneri vidi.

Ritschl, followed by Brix 1, 2 and Wagner read in v. 592 plus minus quam opus fuerat etc. Teuffel, with very slight violence to the MSS., reads haud plus haud minus etc. Menaechmus, he says, being in a hurry, naturally confined himself in his speech to what was necessary, and said just so much; no more; but also, having regard to his duties as patronus, no less. This reading and this explanation is adopted by Brix in his 3rd edition. I do not understand why Mr. Onions (Journ. Phil. vol. xiv. p. 66) said that this reading ‘hardly gives the sense required.’ It appears to me that the sense, as explained by Teuffel, is good enough; but there is another force that may be given to the same words that makes them even more appropriate. Roman procedure was full of pitfalls by which the unwary might learn to their cost the dangers of saying (or claiming) too much, as well as too little. Such passages as Cic. de Orat. I §§ 167 sqq. are instructive on this matter; perhaps too Plaut. Most. 632 is in point here. Menaechmus in proposing the complicated sponsio by which he hoped to give his good-for-nothing client a chance of escape no doubt had to be extremely particular as to his language, and to say haud plus haud minus quam opus fuerat. Brix still thinks that the question was between the acceptance of a sponsio and a summary trial, and that the folly of the client consisted in his insisting on a summary trial, where he had no chance, rather than resorting to the sponsio, where he might possibly escape under a cloud. I think Teuffel is right in saying that if that were the meaning we should expect instead of nec, before magis manifestum in v. 594, some adversative particle. ‘He preferred summary trial; though in that case he had not a leg to stand upon.’ Teuffel therefore seems rightly to explain praedem dedit in v. 593 (the right reading of the rest of the line is not of present importance) not of consenting to stand a summary trial and giving the requisite surety in case of conviction, but of giving surety for the penalty as if already convicted. In other words, the client ‘caved in’—‘and indeed,’ adds Menaechmus, ‘I must say I never saw a man with a worse case. The more fool and rascal he, for not caving in at the beginning, and sparing me my valuable time and misplaced ingenuity.’

E. S. THOMPSON.

SCHRADER'S PREHISTORIC ANTIQUITIES OF THE ARYAN PEOPLES.


Dr. Schrader’s Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte is a book of such an established and deserved reputation that no apology was necessary for offering it to the public in an English translation. But we may go beyond that point and say that it would be hard to find any book more to be recommended just now to the early student in philology and prehistoric archaeology. Its special merits lie in a combination of extensive learning with perfect common-sense and a judicial tone. It is this last quality which gives the book a peculiar value at the present moment. We have had in England of late enough and to spare of a polemical style of writing upon questions of philology and primitive culture—dogmatism upon the one side, ricanement at that dogmatism upon the other. Neither of these weapons of controversy is employed by Dr. Schrader. The first portion of his book is devoted to an extremely learned and, within the limits of his space, complete summary of the history of comparative philology during the century, in so far as it concerns the problems of prehistoric study; or at any rate in so far as it concerns the study of...