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](#)

Conway's Italic Dialects *The Italic Dialects edited with a Grammar and a Glossary.* By R. S. Conway, M.A., Professor of Latin in University College, Cardiff; late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. 2 vols. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1897. 30s.)

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 03 / April 1898, pp 164 - 165
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025774, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025774

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 164-165 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025774

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CONWAY'S ITALIC DIALECTS.

The Italic Dialects edited with a Grammar and a Glossary. By R. S. CONWAY, M.A., Professor of Latin in University College, Cardiff; late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. 2 vols. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1897. 30s.)

For the study of Italic dialects we have hitherto had to rely on two manuals: Zvetaieff *Inscriptiones Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae* (Moscow, 1886, pp. 184), containing all the dialectal inscriptions except the Umbrian, and Buecheler *Umbrica* (Bonn, 1883, pp. 224). Facsimiles of the Umbrian Inscriptions were given in Bréal *Les Tables Eugubines* (Paris, 1875, 25 fr.), and of the others in Zvetaieff *Inscriptiones Italiae Mediae* (Leipzig, 1885, 30 m.). To the student of Umbrian, new publications are hardly necessary. Nothing could be more satisfactory than M. Bréal's facsimiles, and little has been added to the explanation of the records since the careful and thorough edition by Buecheler. But Zvetaieff's plates, which occasionally were photographs not of the inscriptions themselves but merely of drawings of the inscriptions, left something to be desired. And thanks to the impulse given by a course of lectures by Prof. Brugmann at Leipzig, the interpretation and analysis of the Oscan and other dialectal remains has made not a little progress, a work in which Prof. Conway has played a part along with other pupils of Prof. Brugmann, such as Dr. Buck, Dr. von Planta, and Dr. Bronisch. The time might be said to have come for a new publication which should provide us with reliable reproductions or descriptions of the dialectal remains and with an improved interpretation and grammatical analysis. And yet it is with a slight feeling of regret that one relinquishes the trim and handy manuals of Buecheler and Zvetaieff for the two μεγάλα βιβλία that have appeared almost simultaneously, Prof. Conway's *Italic Dialects* (2 vols, pp. 686) and Dr. von Planta's *Grammatik der Oskisch-Umbrischen Dialekte* (2 vols, pp. 600 and 772).

Of the two books, Prof. Conway's is undoubtedly the more suitable for English students. Its clear arrangement and neat type give it an immense advantage over its German rival. But anyone who wishes to push his study of the Italic dialects to the furthest limits will have to proceed to

the fuller, though more unwieldy, Grammar of Dr. von Planta. I do not know that it would not have been better if Prof. Conway had delayed the publication of his book until he could have availed himself of Dr. von Planta's researches. For though he has paid a visit to Italy to verify the reading of a number of inscriptions, Dr. von Planta seems to have spent more time and labour over them; and where the two authorities differ, one is generally inclined to put more faith in the readings attested by the latter. It is annoying to find the unlikely form *úniveresim* 'universim' in an Oscan inscription (No. 114, 'now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March, 1894') re-attested by Prof. Conway, while Dr. von Planta assures us that the true reading is *inim verehias* 'et civitatis.' I could have wished, too, that Prof. Conway had followed Dr. von Planta's plan of appending to each inscription a Latin translation.

One element of Prof. Conway's book which is lacking in the German work is the Lists of Place Names (ancient and modern) and Personal Names of the dialectal districts. Dr. von Planta tells us in the preface to his second volume that he had intended to include lists of the kind, but had given up the idea, partly because he thought them more suitable for a separate publication, partly because it was impossible to secure a full list of Umbrian Names until the completion of Vol. xi. of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.¹ He has, however, throughout his two volumes quoted any Personal or Local Names which threw light on the phonetic laws of the dialects or any other topic of discussion. For example, in illustration of the difficult words *smursim-e*, *Coredier* on the Iguvine Tables, he refers to the names of two places in the neighbourhood of Gubbio (*Iguvium*), viz., *Morcia* and *Gorregi*, which I do not find in Prof. Conway's lists.

On p. xxv. Prof. Conway explains the principles on which his lists of Personal Names have been compiled. They are taken from the Indices of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and are arranged in different classes accordingly as they occur 'frequently,'

¹ Prof. Conway (p. 443n.) says of these Umbrian Names: 'without the aid of an index I did not think it worth while to attempt a collection of the cognomina.'

i.e. at least six times, less than six times, or only once. The uncertainty of such an arrangement is obvious; but it is better to have a 'rough and ready' list than to have no list at all. And it is extremely interesting to get a bird's-eye view of these dialectal names *Magius*, *Jubellius*, *Blossius* and the like. They seem to transfer one to quite a new world of vocabulary; and a careful study of them could not fail to produce valuable results for the Ethnography of ancient Italy. I trust that some reader of Prof. Conway's book will be impelled to undertake for the Names of Italy what Prof. Fick has done for the Greek Names, and will add to the names supplied by the Indices to the *Corpus* those that are scattered through the writings of ancient authors.

Here are some small matters which have occurred to me in reading Prof. Conway's pages: (p. 31) *proiecitad* of the Luceria inscription (*C.I.L.* ix. 782) will, if we admit Osc. *tt* for *ss*, be equivalent to **proiecissat* (cf. *incipissat*), as *fundatid*, *parentatid* of the same inscr. to *fundassit*, *parentassit*; (p. 42)

why *Anīmula* in Plaut. *Mil.* 648 rather than *Anīmula*?; (p. 50) Prof. Conway's identification of Osc. *Evklūi* with Hesychius' *Εὔκολος* *Ἑρμῆς παρὰ Μεταποντίους* seems certainly right; (p. 223) the *s* of Lat. *rosa* has been admirably explained by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Comm. Metr.* ii. 21; (p. 321) for 'Magulini' read *Magulnii*; (p. 512) how can Lat. *pār* Neut. correspond to **pāros* as *vir* to **vīros*?; (p. 597) *baetere* not 'betere' seems to be the true form of the Verb, the *ae* becoming *i* in compounds, *ad-būtere*, etc.; (p. 603) the connection of Lat. *dignus* and *decet* should, I think, be abandoned; (p. 615) the explanation of *eēhiā* as **eevehiiā*—connected with Lat. *veho* is supported by Skutsch's discovery that *akkāto* was the Oscan form of Lat. *advocatus*; (p. 616) Osc. *eituns* would surely be Lat. **itōnes* not **ēlōnes*; (p. 625) is Osc. *Herukinaī* (epithet of the Oscan Venus) not to be explained as *Erycinae*?; (p. 637) why does the *a* of *Numasioi* show it to be a distinct formation from *Numerius*? Would not *Nūmāsio* become *Numerio*?

W. M. LINDSAY.

HERWERDEN'S *PAX*.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ cum scholiorum antiquorum excerptis recognovit et annotavit H. VAN HERWERDEN. 2 vols. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1897. 8 fl. 15.

THIS is an elaborate but yet not quite a satisfactory edition of the *Pax*. The most valuable part of the book should be the text, in constituting which Herwerden has used a collation of the Ravennas made by himself in 1856, and a collation of Venetus 474 made by Cobet in 1842. Such a text ought to be distinctly in advance of those current, which still depend on Bekker's collations of R. and V.

When recently in Venice I was allowed through the kindness of the authorities of the Marciana to take about forty photographs of the text of the *Pax* as given by V. I have compared Cobet's collation very carefully with these. In many passages he restores to us the correct reading which Bekker missed:—e.g. 469 ἀλλ' ἄγε τὸν ξυνάλεκτον (which perhaps supports Dobree's ἀλλ' ἄγετε ξυνανέλεκε). 1040 θυλήματα. 1195 ἐπεισφόρει. 227 παρασκευάζετε. But I have

noted the following passages in which the collation fails:—56 V. has γὰρ not μὲν. 113 V. has λάθραι. 133 V. has αἰετοῦ. 137 V. has μέλ' ἐάν not μέλε δν. 246 It should be noted that V. has ὦ Μέγαρο, Μέγαρο(α), (α) being erased. The hiatus perhaps explains the corruption in ἐπιτρέψεσθ'. 282 V. anticipates Porson by reading Λακεδαιμονίοισιν. 355

τέ V. reads καττρίμμεθα (sic) in rasura. 374 V. μοι νῦν not νῦν μοι. 386 V. R. read ἐμοῦ not ἐμοῦ γε (? γε comes from Ald.). 402 κλέπτει τε V. The old report that αἱ τε are in ras. is correct. 446 The old report of V. πάσχοιτο τοιαῦταθ' is right. 473 Τρυγ. praef R.] so too V. 528 V. assigns to Τρυγ. 584 V. reads ἐδάμην not ἐδάμην. 628, 630 V. marks the speaker by a line only. 703 V. reads ἰδὼν not ὁρῶν. 704 V. reads γεγενῆσθ' ἐν τῇ πόλει. 711 V. has καταγέλασας written in ras. 717 V. has κατέδει not κατέδη. 939 V. omits μὲν with S. (Ven. 475). 746 V. also reads ἐπαθ' (? corr.). 759 V. has ἡμῶν. 864 V. has φανεί. 932 V. has λέγη not λέγει. 953 V. has τοῦθ' εὔ. 986 V. S. read ἡμῖν. 1144 V. reads ἄφαυε not ἄφευε. 1226 V. ποήση not ποήσει. 1240 τί δ' ἀρα V. as