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](#)

Traube, Vorlesungen, Vol. II Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, Ludwig von Traube, herausgegeben von Franz Boll. Zweiter Band: Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters. Pp. viii + 176. München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1911.

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 04 / June 1912, pp 131 - 132

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199950, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199950

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 131-132 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199950

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

generally seen or at least not seen clearly. How subtle these differences are he indicates in the quotation with which I began. But he has, I think, made good his contention that 'il ne nous est pas pour cela interdit de l'analyser.' The conclusions which he reaches in Part I. are confirmed to a remarkable extent in the Second Part, in which the subject is approached from a different point of view. Roughly

speaking, Part I. treats of the sense of the words, Part II. of their sound.

I have not space to deal with the very full treatment of the use of the Participles nor with the careful study of the 'Phrase nominale pure.' On these topics the Historical Appendix is specially interesting. There is a useful Index to the passages quoted from Plautus and Terence

W. E. P. PANTIN.

TRAUBE, *VORLESUNGEN*, Vol. II.

Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, von LUDWIG TRAUBE, herausgegeben von Franz Boll. Zweiter Band: *Einführung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters*. Pp. viii + 176. München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1911.

THIS second volume contains the lectures delivered by Traube on his appointment to the newly-created Chair at Munich University of Mediaeval Latin. They cover an enormously wide field of subjects, mapped out in three divisions: (1) Mediaeval Latin MSS., (2) Mediaeval Latin language, (3) Mediaeval Latin literature, and serve, as the title shows, to introduce the student to this new branch of study and to provide him with a bibliography. They are, it need hardly be said, of paramount importance for the palaeographer and the historian. But the readers, too, of this journal will find much that is interesting. For example, on p. 21 Traube argues that all our extant Latin MSS. (except the Egyptian and the Herculean papyri) are by Christian scribes; on p. 25 he mentions that in Insular (Irish and English) MSS. *si* was written precisely as *fi* was written in MSS. of the Continent, so that a Continental scribe would be sure to write *definit* instead of *desinit* in transcribing from an Insular original; on p. 40 he shows that the old theory is wrong, which supposed the Latin classics to have been sheltered through the Dark Ages in the haven of Irish monasteries, for archetypes in Irish script were rather written in Continental monasteries by

Irish missionary monks than in Ireland itself; on p. 59 he specifies some criteria for the Spanish provenience of an archetype, such as the spelling *quum*, the exchange of *v* and *f*, aphaeresis (e.g. *Srael* for *Israel*); on p. 67 he enumerates some monkish corruptions of text—e.g. *abbas se crevit* for *ab asse crevit* (Petron. 43), *Galileae* for *galeae* (Val. Flacc. 3, 76), *qui demonibus* for *quidem omnibus* (Cic. *Epp.* 72, 48 M.), *unigenitio* for *uni negotio* (Vell. 2, 114, 1). The metrical element in Latin Prose, so much discussed recently, is explained, so far as regards Mediaeval Latin literature, on pp. 115-121. In his account (on pp. 123 sqq.) of the 'subscriptiones' in our MSS. of the Latin Classics (e.g. the Mavortius 'scriptio' in Horace MSS.), which tell of the editorial activity of the fifth century, his bibliography includes (besides the well-known treatises of Jahn, Haase, and Reifferscheid, and Birt's 'Antikes Buchwesen') Lommatzsch 'Literarische Bewegungen in Rom im 4 und 5 Jahrhundert nach Christus' (in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XV. (1904), pp. 177-192) and Usener 'Anecdota Holderi' (in the *Festschrift zur Begrüssung der XXXII. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*. Bonn, 1877). These 'subscriptiones' are to be treated in a volume of the 'Quellen und Untersuchungen' by Traube's pupil, Dr. B. A. Müller. The immediately following pages, dealing with the mediaeval transmission of the Latin masterpieces will be the most interesting to a classical scholar, who will, however, glean valuable information

throughout the whole volume. The remark (on p. 90), that it is only in Latin MSS. written by Irish scribes that an irregular division of syllables between lines, such as *p | uncto*, is found, should be remembered by editors of fragmentary MSS. Tested by this rule a large number of the conjectural supplements of fragmentary lines accepted in Müller's edition of Festus will be seen to be impossible. The fragmentary *Codex Farnesianus* of Festus was written in Italy (probably at or near Rome, according to Dr. E. A. Loew, the leading authority on Italian script); and no Italian scribe would be guilty of a monstrosity like (p. 318, l. 5) so | l or (p. 310, l. 31) parti | m.

Mommsen's conjecture (on p. 330, l. 23) scrib | <it> is impossible, but not Müller's scrib | <tae>. Festus spelt *strittavum* (p. 314, l. 24), not *stritavum*, since the fragmentary MS. shows *strit* at the end of the line. Marx suggests <terro> r as the ending of the Lucilius verse in Festus (p. 257, l. 33); but the scribe can hardly have written *terror*, for the r (according to Marx the final r of the word) stands at the beginning of a line. Indeed, this whole book of Traube's emphasises the warning that the Latin classics cannot be edited rightly without a considerable acquaintance with Latin Palaeography.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SHORT NOTICES

C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae. Vol. II., Libri vii.-xv. Ed. CAROLUS MAYHOFF. 8vo. Pp. xiv + 592. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1909. M. 8.

WHEN Dr. Mayhoff, in 1902, brought out the third volume of the Teubner Pliny, it was practically the first volume of a new edition, so great was the change in the method of arrangement from that which he had followed in 1875, when his first recension of Vol. II. was published. The present recension of Vol. II., containing books vii.-xv., marks the completion of that new edition. The codices on the collation of which the text is mainly based are named at the head of the page; a useful collection of Testimonia is printed below the text, and the critical notes are full. The editor shows the same diligent care as before *emendationum suo quamque auctori reddere*. For this and the preceding volume he has himself collated two codices, *a* (Vindob. ccxxiv.) and *F* (Leid. Lips. vii.), and has been led to attach an independent value to *F*, which he believes to be a parallel copy from the same archetype as *D*, and not a copy of *D* itself, as Detlefsen supposed. The connection between *D* and *F* appears in any case to be closer than that between *F* and

R or any other codex of the same family.

The text is in many respects more conservative than that of 1875; in particular the more precise knowledge of Pliny's style, which is due to the work of J. Müller and others, has led to the omission in the present volume of a multitude of small additions previously inserted against the consensus of the MSS. Dr. Mayhoff, however, admits to the text, or prints in the critical notes, many conjectural emendations. Among these a considerable number are his own, many of them convincing, and many probable. In ix. 36, for example, *tacite* is much the best conjecture made for supplying the missing word between *adnatate* . . . *leniterque*; and in xi. 154 *fuco* for *vero* seems certain. But all the emendations accepted are not equally attractive; and some appear to be quite arbitrary. To take a few examples: In viii. 81 for *id quoque fabius* of the MSS., Dr. Mayhoff reads *id quoque adicit*, which seems far-fetched in comparison with Pellicerius's *fabulosius*. In ix. 5 *tanta, ut alias thynnorum, multitudine* can hardly be right for *et alias, tanta, etc.*, which needs no correction. The point of Pliny's account lies in the vast shoals of tunny seen by