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](#)

Peck's Suetonius *Gai Suetoni Tranquilli De Vita Caesarum Libri Duo*. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Harry Thurston Peck Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1889. pp. xxxv. 215.

Augustus T. Murray

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 38 - 41
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993168, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993168

How to cite this article:

Augustus T. Murray (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 38-41 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993168

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DE VRIES' STUDIES IN PALAEOGRAPHY.

Exercitationes Palaeographicas in bibliotheca Universitatis Lugduno-Batavae iterum indicit S. G. DE VRIES. Leyden: Brill. 1890.

THIS short disquisition of thirty-one octavo pages gives an account of a MS. fragment of Pliny's *Letters* found by De Vries (the well-known editor of Ovid's *Epistula Sapphus*) in the University Library at Leyden. The codex containing it is numbered Voss. Lat. Q. 98, and was written by two different scribes in the ninth century. The interval between these two parts (the former containing S. Augustin *de baptismo parvulorum* and *de patientia* with the six books *de Sacramentis* ascribed to S. Ambrose, the latter S. Augustin *de perfectione iustitiae hominis, de natura et gratia, de libero arbitrio* with most of his *de correptione et gratia*), a space occupying fol. 73^v to fol. 74^r, has been filled with a variety of excerpts; our Plinian fragment is on 74^r. The fragment extends from the beginning of *Epp.* i. 1 to *nisi tamen auribus nostris* in 2, a too inconsiderable excerpt in point of length to be of much value for the criticism of the *Letters*, but marked by this singular and unique peculiarity, that much of the writing is in *notae Tironianae*.

M. De Vries has appended a photograph in which the strange mixture of early minuscule with the *notae* is exactly reproduced. To the decipherment of the *notae* he devoted many hours of his vacation, and in most cases has satisfied himself as to the meaning of each one of them: in cases where he was in doubt he has taken the opinion of that most skilful of tachygraphical experts, M. Wilhelm Schmitz, on whose labours in

this obscure region of palaeography—combined with the great, but in England much neglected, work of Kopp—he has throughout founded his interpretation.

This is the one only specimen as yet discovered of any part of a Roman *classic* written in Tironian symbols. De Vries mentions the other excerpts where they are also employed pp. 19, 20: a fragment of Boethius *de consol. philosophiae*, of Isidorus' *Origines*, an epigram edited by Hagen from a MS. at Bern, and several extracts from ecclesiastical or medieval writers. From a letter of Cardinal Bembo written Jan. 18, 1513, to Julius II. (*Bemb. Epist. Fam.* v. 8) it appears that there then existed a MS. of Hyginus 'On the Stars,' written in these characters. Bembo's words are: 'Liber superioribus diebus e Dacia ad te missus [est], notis perscriptus cum vetustissimis, tum aetate nostra inusitatis atque incognitis, quaeque legi posse nullo plane modo uidebantur.....Erat autem is quidem liber Higini commentariorum de sideribus quaedam portio.'

For this codex Schmitz made a careful search in the Vatican, but in vain. M. De Vries comes to the conclusion that it is doubtful whether such a codex ever existed! *Non talem Bembum norimus*. This is much of a piece with the German disparagement of Cardinal Mai. The MS., I do not doubt, existed: but as Bembo does not describe the *notae vetustissimae*, we cannot be sure that they were Tironian. Supposing, however, that they were, the Vatican library is a large place, with infinite recesses and possibilities of stowage: may it not be in a corner still?

ROBINSON ELLIS.

PECK'S SUETONIUS.

Gaii Suetoni Tranquilli De Vita Caesarum Libri Duo. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by HARRY THURSTON PECK Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1889. pp. xxxv. 215.

WE have here an edition of a most interesting author with a commentary adapted in the main to the needs of the American college student; and the volume is the more to be welcomed because it has no predecessor

and brings a new author into the circle of those read in our colleges.

Prof. Peck follows Roth's (Teubner) edition closely as to text, differing from it only in some nine instances, all but one of which are noted in the commentary; though it can scarcely be said that all are defended. In *Jul.* § 2 *regi* has been omitted after *prostratae* without comment, and in *Jul.* § 20 sub fin. the corrupt *inductum [quendam] praemiis* is the occasion of an unfortunate error. Baum.

Crus. gives *induxit Vettium praemiis* (following Ursinus, Burmann, and Ernesti), Roth marks a lacuna, but suggests (p. xxxvii.) *indicem subornavit Vettium inductum praemiis*, and Peck reads *quendam induxit*: yet in his commentary he cites Ursinus' reading as from his own text and comments thus, 'This is the emendation generally accepted for the MS. reading—etc.' By a similar oversight in *Jul.* § 73 we have in the text Roth's reading *simultates contra nullas*, while in the commentary we read—' *Simultates contra nullos*. This reading of course makes *contra* a preposition. The majority of the MSS. have it so and there seems no good reason for reading with Roth and others *nullas*, making *contra* the adverb.' On page 208 Roth is censured for a similar error.

In *Aug.* § 2 init. after *adlecta*, the words in *Senatum* are omitted on account of the following in *patricios*, but the 'I have therefore omitted them' gives no credit to previous scholars who have also struck them out.

No information whatever is given the student as to the sources of the text of Suetonius, and the MSS. are very rarely alluded to.

On account of the author's freedom of speech, the following passages are relegated to the notes: *Jul.* § 7 *occasiones in urbe*—fin.; *Jul.* § 22 *omnium capitibus*—fin.; *Jul.* § 49 entire; *Aug.* § 68 entire; *Aug.* § 69 *exquireret*—fin.; *Aug.* § 71 *confleverit omnia*—*Aleae rumorem*; but it may be doubted whether this device obviates the objections to such passages. All will however agree that Prof. Peck is right in making these omissions sparingly.

Pp. i.—xiii. of the introduction treat, in a somewhat too florid style, of the position of Suetonius in literature and of his writings. Here, under § 9 Στέμμα Πομπῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπισήμων, we have mention of the lives of Terence, Horace and Pliny, but the life of Vergil prefixed to the commentary of Donatus, and which has for so long passed under his name, is entirely passed over. We should gladly have seen the arguments in favour of ascribing that life also to Suetonius briefly stated. The second part of the introduction (pp. xiv.—xxxiv.) is more important, dealing as it does with the author's language and style. In this, while much of interest and value is given, e.g. the technical expressions, rare words, fondness for adverbs in *-im* and participial constructions, numerous evidences of Greek influence, etc., much more was to have been desired. Particularly faulty is the treatment of the subjunctive on pp. xxv. f.,

where, with the exception of examples of irregularities under the head of the tenses, this important subject is dismissed with a reference to the frequent potential use. Under the head of conjunctions § 17, we do have a bare mention of *quamquam* occurring with the subjunctive *Jul.* § 3, but it is made in such a way as to lead the student to regard the construction as an exception, although it occurs again in §§ 54, 69, 79, and 81, of the same life, and Baum. Crus. index gives no case of the indicative. Altogether the treatment of the conjunctions is very unsatisfactory, and a lack of system mars the whole introduction. The student will be unable to discriminate between what is peculiar to Suetonius and what is common to Silver Latin or to tell whether a given phenomenon occurs once or many times in Suetonius himself.

A genealogical chart of the family of the Caesars would add to the value of the work as a text-book, and an historical introduction would have been of great assistance. It may be said also that the notes on history, biography, and geography in the commentary are not judicious.

The commentary itself is interesting and instructive. More help might have been given the student in some passages, though opinions will always differ as to the proper amount. The grammatical notes are few and unsystematic.

A few details may be noticed here.

In *Jul.* § 1 *Annum agens sextum decimum patrem amisit* is so characteristic of Suetonius as to deserve a note; cf. *Aug.* § 8, *Quadrimum patrem amisit*, *Nero* § 6, *Trimulus patrem amisit*; cf. also *Tib.* § 6, and the *vita Verg.* with Nettleship's note. For *designatus* = *designatus* cf. *Calig.* 12, *Tib.* 31, *Dom.* 10. The writer questions the value of the many etymological notes scattered through the commentary, pp. 121, 122, 123, 127, 129, 134, 156, 162, 169, 176.

In *Jul.* §. 6 the practice of delivering funeral orations over matrons might well have been illustrated by *Plut. Caes.* § 5., as in Baum. Crus.; and in *Jul.* § 11 the section of Plutarch should have been given. It is *Caes.* § 6. In *Jul.* § 9 the note on *sed et* is not quite clear: 'In this sense *sed* is regularly accompanied by *etiam* as here.' The student would gather from the note on *medicinam professos* in *Jul.* § 42 that the two passages cited were the only ones where the noun *professor* occurs in Suetonius; but see also *Tib.* 14, *Gram.* 4 fin., 9 fin.; *Rhet.* 1 fin. For the expression in the text cf. *Rhetoricam professos* in *Rhet.* § 3. The note

on *equos dimittebat* in *Jul.* § 60, citing *B. G.* 1. 25, might well have included *Tac. Germ.* 30 fin., '*Equestrium sane virium id proprium, cito parare victoriam, cito cedere. Velocitas iuxta formidinem, cunctatio propior constantiae est.*' In *Jul.* § 74, for the idiomatic use of *a* in *a manu*, cf. *Vesp.* § 3, same phrase; see the Harper Lexicon (Lewis and Short) s. v. *B. ii. p.*

In commenting upon *Jul.* § 81, the interesting parallels between what Suetonius says of the prodigies announcing Caesar's death and those mentioned in Vergil's fifth eclogue in the lament for Daphnis should not have been passed over. I cite them in full:

Suet. '*Proximis diebus equorum greges quos in traiciendo Rubicone flumine consecrat ac vagos et sine custode dimiserat, comperit pertinacissime pabulo abstinere ubertimque flere.*'

Verg. *Ecl.* v. vss. 24ff.

Non ulli pastos illis egere diebus
frigida, Daphni, boves ad flumina nulla neque
amnem

libavit quadrupes nec graminis attigit herbam.

Suet. *Ea vero nocte, cui inluxit dies caedis, et ipse sibi visus est per quietem interdum supra nubes volitare, alias cum Iove dextram iungere.*

Verg. vss. 56f.

Candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi
sub pedibusque videt nubes et sidera Daphnis.

See Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil*, on the purport of the fifth eclogue.

In the note on *Jul.* § 83, the statement *plerosque* = *multos* gives the student nothing by which to judge the frequency of its occurrence; see *Jul.* §§. 50, 52, 68, 83; *Aug.* 40, 59; *Cal.* 36, 39; *Claud.* 46; *Nero*, 11, 38, 45; *Dom.* 19.

In *Jul.* § 86 *adinspectantium* deserves a note, especially as it does not occur in Harper's lexicon. The reading both here and just below *sollicitum maluisse* is passed by unnoticed. Caesar's words '*Non tam sua quam rei publicae interesse ut salvus esset*' might well have been paralleled by *Aug.* § 28, '*Sed reputare et se privatum non sine periculo fore et illam (i.e. rem publicam) plurimum arbitrio temere committi, in retinenda perseveravit, dubium eventu meliore an voluntate.*'

In *Aug.* § 17 Prof. Peck translates *Bononiensibus—gratiam fecit* by 'he even pardoned the people of Bologna.' Surely this is an error. The student will now be unable to translate *coniurandi* so as to give any satisfactory sense. The true rendering is 'he even excused the people of Bologna from swearing etc.', and so I see it is taken

by Baum. Crus. (= *concessit ut ne coniurarent*; see his index s.v. *gratia*). Prof. Peck gives the same rendering in the note on *gratiam fecit eis Aug.* § 38, and again it is wrong. That passage should be rendered 'He permitted those—to give up their horse.'

In § 17, as a parallel to *exauctorare*, the *cum ignominia dimisit* of § 34 should have been included.

In *Aug.* § 21 med., in the note on women as hostages, *Tac. Germ.* 8, might well have been cited, '*Adeo ut efficacius obligentur animi civitatum quibus inter obsides puellae quoque nobiles imperantur.*' To the note on *Aug.* § 24, *citra commoda*, 'without reference to what was due them,' it might well have been added that *commoda* is very frequent in Suet. in this sense, *Aug.* 49, *Cal.* 44, *Nero* 32, *Vit.* 15, *Galb.* 12.

In *Aug.* § 32 the criticism of the Lewis and Short Lexicon, while just, is not quite accurate. Both Prof. Peck's passages are cited there, not *Dig.* 48. 19. 16 only. Curiously *Aug.* 32 is the omitted one. In *Aug.* 45 *Corollaria* means *garlands* (a meaning not given in L. and S.), see the whole passage in Pliny cited by Prof. Peck, and Baum. Crus. note. For *xyistici* = *athletes* add *Galb.* 15.

In *Aug.* 53 the *grandi iam natu* need give no trouble; cf. § 89, *quem iam grandem natu*. In *Aug.* § 58 *prima plebs* deserves a note. Is it τὰ πρῶτα or = prior?

In *Aug.* § 80, *Coxendice et femore et crure sinistro non perinde valebat*, the concise use of *non perinde* with the suppression of the second member of the comparison should have been noted, the more so as it is so common in Suet. that its occurrence in the *vita Verg.* is one of the arguments for attributing that life to him; see Nettleship *init.*

In § 83, from the note on *pumilos* the student would gather that *nani* (*vâvoi*) is pure Latin. In § 86 another argument for writing *myrobrechis* in Greek letters is that the student will not find the word in L. and S. We miss a reference to the *calamistris inurere* of *Jul.* 56, although in the note on that passage the present one is cited. In this connection, it may be doubted whether all students are sufficiently familiar with the *vetus comoedia* § 89, and 'the famous κοῤῥή' § 94 to need no explanation. In § 95, *puro sereno* is criticised as 'an awkward use of *sereno* coupled with another adjective.' We doubt the awkwardness. It may be paralleled by *nitido sereno* Sil. 5. 58 and *serenum nitidum* Mart. 6. 42. 8. (both in L. and S.), and seems to us simply poetic. No one

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.