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](#)

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit L. Dittmeyer. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxvi + 467. Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles. Von Gunnar Rudberg. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1908. Pp. xxvi + 107.

R. G. B.

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 1909, pp 121 - 121

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0000322X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0000322X

How to cite this article:

R. G. B. (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 121-121 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0000322X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

perhaps ἀμέτροις or ἀλλοτρίοις. Cod. M. 6; if, as Sudhaus plausibly suggests, ἔχθρα is a blunder for καχεξία, we must transpose and write οἶον <καχεξία> νόσος κτλ. Cod. M. 30; read perhaps τὸ δὲ λέγειν <ὅτι> 'οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς λόγος', ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν· ἐστὶ γὰρ πρᾶγμα κτλ. Cod. M. 41, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἀταξία κτλ.: rather than change ἀκολασία to ἀταξία twice, and add ἀταξία the third time,—as the editor proposes,—I should prefer to excise ἀκολασία twice. Cod. M. 42, the restoration proposed by the editor,—ὡς τὰ πολιτικά ἢ ἀνομοίως for ἡ τὰ π. ἢ ἀνόμοια,—has much probability, but why did he not go further and change the next ἡ to καί, to correspond with the other sentence-endings?

R. G. B.

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit L. DITTMAYER. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxvi + 467.

Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles. Von GUNNAR RUDBERG. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1908. Pp. xxvi + 107.

It is safe to say that the new Teubner text marks a considerable advance in the study of the 'History of Animals.' The latest and best of previous editions was that of Aubert and Wimmer, of which Mr. Dittmeyer speaks in eulogistic terms, and to which, as his footnotes show, he is largely indebted; but, as regards their use of the manuscripts, Aubert and Wimmer were open to the criticism that 'criticis eorum ad-

notationibus non omnino fides haberi potest.' We may trust that in this respect the Teubner edition will prove reliable; and the editor claims that he records 'codicum A^aC^a (i.e. the representatives of the best family) omnes lectiones varias.'

Mr. Rudberg's 'Textstudien,' however, make it pretty certain that even the new Teubner text is not to be regarded as final. Mr. Rudberg deals mainly with William of Moerbeke's translation of the *Hist. An.*, giving a transcription of William's rendering of Book I. with the manuscript variants. He examines William's language and method of translation, and investigates the relation in which his Latin stands to the various Greek manuscripts. And finally he draws certain conclusions regarding the genealogy of the sources for the text—a problem which Dittmeyer, in his 'praefatio,' leaves untouched. Mr. Rudberg postulates an archetype, as representative of the first period of the text's history; as representative of the second period, he assumes the two archetypes which were the immediate sources of the two main families generally recognized (viz. A^a etc., and P etc.); close to this second period he places x, the source of William's Latin translation; and in the third period falls the division into the two families A^a, P. Whether these broader conclusions win acceptance or not (and they seem to require further proof), this careful study of William's style and value should prove indispensable to future investigators of the text of Aristotle. R. G. B.

CICERO'S ORATORY IN RELATION TO HIS RHETORICAL STUDIES.

1. *De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* thesım Facultati Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L. LAURAND. Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xx, 116. Fr. 3.
2. *Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron, avec une Esquisse de l'Histoire du 'Cursus.'* Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxix, 388. Fr. 7.50.

THESE two books, taken together, give an interesting and able estimate of Cicero as

a student of rhetoric and as a master of oratorical style.

The topics discussed in the Latin thesis are as follows:

I. What value did Cicero set upon the art of rhetoric? The conclusion reached is that he did not, as has sometimes been supposed, depreciate studies of this kind, but simply maintained that they must be conjoined with natural gifts, practice, and a well-stored mind.