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](#)

C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae. Vol. II., Libri vii.–xv.
Ed. Carolus Mayhoff. 8vo. Pp. xiv + 592. Leipzig: B. G.
Teubner. 1909.

K. Jex-Blake

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 04 / June 2012, pp 132 - 133

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199962, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199962

How to cite this article:

K. Jex-Blake (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 132-133 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199962

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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

Alexander's soldiers. Again, in xi. 276, where *oculi quibuscumque sunt longi* is the reading of all the MSS., it is difficult to see how Dr. Mayhoff's *quibus utrimque* is nearer to οὐδ' ἂν μὲν ὥστε μακροί, the words of Aristotle on which no doubt the passage Pliny quotes from Trogus is based. In viii. 32 it is unsatisfactory to fall back on the traditional text *commoritur ea dimicatio, victusque*. The *dimicatio* ue of $\bar{d}^2$ (Par. Lat. 6799) certainly suggests Detlefsen's *dimicatione*. Possibly Pliny wrote . . . *cum, moriturus ea dimicatione victusque*, but no emendation proposed as yet seems really final. However, though much may remain doubtful in the reconstruction of the words of Pliny, Dr. Mayhoff has certainly given us a greatly improved text, and deserves our gratitude.

K. JEX-BLAKE.

Latin and English Idiom. By H. DARNLEY NAYLOR, Professor of Classics in Adelaide University. Cambridge University Press.

PROFESSOR DARNLEY NAYLOR is of course quite right to advocate translation of Latin into good English, even at the expense of absolute literalness. Free renderings into idiomatic English are (he says) 'condemned for a piece of impertinent paraphrase.' One may ask, by whom? The Professor, I hope,

is beating the air. Surely no scholar who is not making a crib for Passmen thinks of translating Latin quite literally. We all aim at good English. However, it is ungracious to criticise; for Professor Naylor has provided an excellent object-lesson by translating Livy's preface into very good English indeed. Some day he ought to go on to Cicero, whose style is essentially even more un-English than Livy's, and therefore should provide a greater number of instructive problems.

Gesammelte philologische Schriften von JOHANNES VAHLEN. I Theil: Schriften der Wiener Zeit, 1858-1874. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 14; Cloth M. 16.50.

WE have already noticed in the *Classical Review* the collections of Vahlen's Latin opuscula. This volume includes all the papers of moderate length, but excludes four long papers on Aristotle's *Poetics* and on Laurentius Valla, which are long enough to go by themselves. The papers are not brought up-to-date, but printed as they are; except that a few references are given to later work on the same subjects. Aristotle is the favourite subject here: his *Poetics*, *Ethics*, *Politics*, and *Rhetoric*, with miscellaneous notes, fill about a third of the volume. Other authors treated are Lycophron, Plato, Ennius, Plautus, Horace, Varro, Cicero and Livy.

NOTES AND NEWS

SCOTLAND is very useful in educational matters: it makes experiments—sometimes with less than the national caution—and tabulates the results for the benefit of the Southron. Thus, the *Oxford Magazine* has been advocating the reform of Responsions by the substitution of 'Unseens' for passages from prepared books; and then comes Professor G. G. Ramsay, and tells the *Magazine* that Scotch ex-

perience is against this. Unseens are of course excellent, he says, for Bursary examinations. But when the Commission of 1889 made a 'Preliminary' examination at Universities in which all the translation papers were unprepared, this was not found to work nearly so well, as a test of the 'ordinary men coming from less favoured schools' than those which produced the best scholars. The