

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](#)



P. Ovidi Nasonis Artis Amatoriae. Libritres. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit C. Marchesi. L. 5.P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit Carolus Landi.

E. H. Alton

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 5-6 / August 1918, pp 124 - 124
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00011665, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00011665

How to cite this article:

E. H. Alton (1918). The Classical Review, 32, pp 124-124 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00011665

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

hope from conjectural emendation. A new MS. is needed or a collation of a lost MS. When it appears it may indeed show that this or that guess has been a lucky guess. And in our joy over the one that has hit the mark we may forget the ninety-nine that did not, and exclaim: 'Really there is something after all in conjectural emendation at haphazard.' Failing a new MS., the elucidation of the Ueberlieferungsgeschichte may bring some sound footing or some guide-post for future progress. The great merit of the re-edition of Baehrens' Teubner text is that the classification and description of the MSS. are at last presented adequately. The new editor, Vollmer, had for colleague Traube, whose genius made a science of Ueberlieferungsgeschichte. But since most of these MSS. are Renaissance recastings, Sabbadini is the one man who can help us. In this small volume we have his last word on the subject he had treated in *Scoperte dei Codici*, 1914.

W. M. LINDSAY.

II.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Artis Amatoriae. Libri tres. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit C. MARCHESE. L. 5.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit CAROLUS LANDI.

ITALIANS are determined not to depend on foreign publishers for their texts of Latin authors, and Messrs. Paravia have made arrangements with Professor Pascal to superintend the issue of an extensive *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum*. To judge by these two volumes the enterprise is likely to be successful. The scheme seems sound. The books are handy in size and pleasant to read. The critical appendices are concise, and, speaking generally, adequate.

For a recension of the *Ars*, R is of supreme importance. Unfortunately M. Marchesi has not been able to collate this MS. His knowledge is derived 'ex N. Heinsii et praecipue R. Merkelii, R. Ehwaldii, et N. Housmanni (sic) adnotationibus.' He has examined twenty inferior MSS. in Italian libraries, but, as he admits,

without any result. For O, which he rather unduly depreciates, he has used Ellis' excellent collation, and he quotes the readings of Merkel and Ehwald for the Guelferbytanus and the Bernensis respectively. But R is sacred, almost a fetish, for M. Marchesi, and his loyalty to that manuscript has, I fear, clouded his judgment. However there is much good work in the notes, which are on the whole sound. I have noticed at times a certain carelessness in ascriptions. Burman, for instance, gets the credit of several of Heinsius' conjectures.

The *Tristia* has been carefully edited. As regards manuscripts, Mr. Owen has left little to be done by subsequent editors, and Mr. Landi has drawn upon Mr. Owen's data and accepted his conclusions regarding the tradition. Mr. Landi has made some researches in Italian libraries. He cites readings from a number of secondhand MSS.; the following list is nearly exhaustive: *Marcian.* XII. 55, IV. 1, 85 *lateo* = L, V. 7, 29 *nomen et umbra*; *Marcian.* XII. 56, V. 12, 28 *vacavit*; *Laur. Strozz.* 124, III. 4, 73 *longe*, IV. 1, 10 *laxat*, IV. 3, 19 *praesentis inhaeret*, V. 12, 28 *vacavit*; *Laur.* 36, 2, IV. 3, 23 *num*; *Laur.* 36, 33 (=Owen's β), IV. 3, 83 *functa est*; *Ambros.* F 87 Sup., V. 12, 28 *vacavit*; *Ambros.* I. 8 Inf., III. 8. 36 *luenda*, III. 10, 47 *in litore*. This last manuscript has a flagrant interpolation of four lines in place of III. 3, 39, 40.

The text adopted and the critical notes approximate very closely to Mr. Owen's recent edition. In most cases where Mr. Landi adopts a different reading he makes a return to the text of Mr. Owen's larger edition (1889).

E. H. ALTON.

Trinity College, Dublin.

III.

Cicero: de Re Publica. Ed. C. PASCAL, 1916. L. 2.75.

Cicero: pro Milone, pro Archia. Ed. S. COLOMBO, 1917. L. 2.

THE materials for the criticism of these works vary a good deal in character. For the greater part of the *de Re Publica* we have nothing except the palimpsest discovered by Cardinal Mai, and re-