
Es wäre erfreulich gewesen, wenn W. sich mit der (zugestandenermaßen sehr schwierigen) Frage der Chronologie mehr beschäftigt hätte; auch hätte die für Senecas ästhetische Theorie äußerst wichtige *epist.* 114 eine Betrachtung verdient. In W.’s Literaturverzeichnis, dessen Länge auf eine sorgfältige Beschäftigung mit der Sekundärliteratur verweist, fehlt überraschenderweise T. G. Rosenmeyer, ‘Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology’ (Berkeley 1989). Im Vergleich zu W.’s Gesamtleistung sind diese Einwendungen aber Bagatellen. Ihr Buch ist rücksichtslos allen zu empfehlen, die eine tiefere Einsicht in Senecas Tragödien bzw. in die *latinitas argentea* überhaupt gewinnen wollen.

Knoxville

Robert Sklenář

---

**Martin Steinmann:** *Handschriften im Mittelalter*. Eine Quellensammlung. Basel: Schwabe 2013. 932 S. 1 Abb. 82 €.

Visitors in recent decades to the Handschriftenabteilung of the Universitätsbibliothek at Basel, one of the best libraries in Europe, will remember the author of this book as a helpful and knowledgeable head of that department. He served it from 1976 to his retirement in 2005. His career of publication began in 1967 with a study of the Basel printer Ioannes Oporinus and continued with several works that concern the holdings at Basel, and for 25 years he edited and contributed to the ‘Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde’, where issue 110 (2010) is a Festschrift for him, ‘Scriptorium und Offizin’.

In the present volume, a scrapbook on a grand scale, he does not say when he conceived the idea for it or how much his method of working changed as electronic resources expanded, but a prodigious amount of labour has gone into it, plainly over many years. From a vast range of published sources, and often direct from manuscripts, he assembles in chronological order, so far as that can be determined, 905 entries that concern the production, care, and use of manuscripts in western Europe from Antiquity to the early 16th century.

Each entry has a heading in bold type, details of the immediate source, and a German translation. Length varies from single hexameters that contain every letter of the alphabet (65 and eight others) to two pages or more from such things as the *Liber ordinis sancti Victoris Parisiensis* (338) or the *Consuetudines domus*
clericorum in Zwolle (718). Most entries are in Latin but 30 in French, 19 in German, 17 in Anglo-Saxon and later forms of English, 11 in Italian, three in Irish, two in Spanish, and one in Dutch, to pass over the 14 words of 104 about which much ink has been spilt by historians of the Romance languages, and the snippets of Catalan in 752 and 764. As some entries are subdivided, 859 for instance into 31 extracts from a printed Vocabularius of 1473/74, the total actually reaches 1095. A neat symbol that represents an open book indicates manuscripts that St(einmann) has inspected himself, which number over 100 in nearly 50 libraries as far apart as Madrid, Perugia, Stockholm, and New York. Rarely included (p. 7) are inventories and scribal colophons and texts that would have needed illustrations or extensive commentary; St. limits commentary to an occasional brief remark about the source or a footnote on a problem of translation.

The result is a heavy book (1.6 kg) not easily read in a comfortable armchair and probably destined mainly for consultation. Much therefore depends on the 78 pages of the five indexes, especially the third and the last: ‘Autoren und Werktitel’, ‘Initien’, ‘Glossar’, ‘Handschriften’, ‘Nam en und Sachen’. Though aware that indexes are unlikely to answer questions that have not occurred to the compiler, I sampled St.’s by looking for material on four disparate topics that have aroused my interest from time to time: contamination (did it usually come about by simultaneous use of more than one exemplar or by later collation?), Echtheitskritik, capital letters for names, and damage or destruction by fire or flood. A preliminary difficulty faces anyone whose first language is not German: where to look in ‘Namen und Sachen’. On contamination I drew a blank: no entry for ‘Kontamination’, ‘Exemplar’, ‘Kollation’, or ‘Varianten’, and nothing pertinent under ‘Abschrift’. It would be premature, however, to conclude that the volume offers nothing pertinent, because Florus of Lyon in 166.1 and Stephanus Harding in 306 discuss variants both in the Vulgate and between the Vulgate and texts in Hebrew, and Gasparino Barzizza in 725 describes what he has done to the text of Cicero’s De oratore, for instance this: omnia quae potui antiquiora librornm exemplaria collegi; quod ex unoquoque verius videbatur attentissime in hunc nostrum transtuli. If these entries are indexed anywhere in ‘Namen und Sachen’ or ‘Glossar’, I do not know where. For ‘Echtheitskritik’ or ‘Zuweisung’ there is no entry, and ‘Verfasser: feststellen’ did not lead me to 636.1, an extract from a letter of 1378 in which Gerardus Magnus gives reasons for considering spurious a liber qui dicitur beati Bernardi de amore; I regret not knowing this splendid passage when I wrote about humanistic Echtheitskritik in R.F.I.C. 129 (2001, publ. 2003) 152–57. In 433 Boncompagno da Signa alleges that his rivals have tried to efface his authorship by erasing the title and darkening the pages with smoke to make them look older. On capital letters there are indeed pertinent entries, ‘Majuskeln’ in ‘Namen und Sachen’ and ‘capitales’ in ‘Glossar’, and one of them, 491.1 of 1275/76, includes this: Prime litterule … in nominibus dignitaturn et in propriis nominibus tam hominum quam alienum rerum debent esse mediocriter capitales. Not indexed, however, is 783 of s. xv”, which prescribes grande lettre … au commencement des clauses et a tous propres noms du monde et a tous noms importans dignite, sicomme sont Evsesques, Abbzez etc., and indexed only under capvives, where few readers will think of looking, are 752 and 764 of 1441–42 from Barcelona. On losses caused by haz-
ards of nature I found nothing under ‘Verlust’ or elsewhere, but 349, from a letter of 1136/37, asks for a volume of letters by Augustine and Jerome to be sent because a large chunk of ‘our’ copy has been eaten by a bear. I conclude that readers who welcome a change from the thematic arrangement usual before and since Wattenbach’s ‘Schriftwesen im Mittelalter’ have a price to pay unless they read the volume through.

Among thematically arranged works that have appeared recently classicists will inevitably consult volume IV (Part 1 2009, Part 2 2014) of B. Munk Olsen’s set on ‘L’étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles’, which has not only indexes but an ample bibliography; volume IV 1 covers ‘Travaux philologiques’. As the title indicates, he focuses on the secular Latin literature of Antiquity and its transmission up to 1200, so that the volumes have little to say about the production and care of mss. but a great deal about the state that the texts were in when the first medieval copies were made, about the libraries that they reached, and about the scholars who handled them. Just out, from the Italian school of paleography, is Serena Ammirati’s volume ‘Sul libro latino antico: ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche’ (Pisa & Rome 2015); it has a bibliography but indexes only «de testimonianze manoscritte citate».

Readers not disposed to think about the transmission of what St. puts in front of them need to be aware that distortion may have occurred at any of five stages: the author’s expression of his thought, the copying of his words by a scribe, the copying of the scribe’s words by a modern scholar, the copying of the modern scholar’s words by St., and the setting of St.’s words by the printer. The transmission is even more complex where the modern scholar’s words are a reconstruction from multiple witnesses. For some entries St. has cut out the third stage by inspecting a manuscript, but about other entries he says nothing more than that on occasion he has tacitly altered the punctuation of his source or corrected an obvious misprint (p. 10).

To start with the last stage, there are a few slips that look like misprints, and even St.’s German translations are not altogether free of them, but the layout of the volume is so elegant that three instances of prae- divided between lines after the a pull one up with a jolt (in 338, 527, 882). Towards the end of 223.2 aequa for aeque could have arisen either at this last stage or at the fourth.

At the fourth stage not many slips are as insidious as observavit for obseravit in 271 or as irritating as ferro for ferre in 9, utrisque for utrisque in 166.1, quicumque for cuicumque towards the end of 284, equivalentes for -ens in 653, insupere for insuper in 879, and ‘is’ for ‘it’ in 897. Presumably the laying out of four hexameters as two couplets in 130 and the reverse infelicity in 134, 178, 198, belong to this stage.

At the third stage the entries most disfigured, so far as I can judge, are three that concern British material of the 12th or 13th century. 308, 320, 416. The nine lines of 308, taken from an edition of 1846 made from a 17th-century Bollandist manuscript in Brussels that no-one appears to have checked since, include at least five mistakes, two of which, reserebat for -fer- and servat for -viat, were put right in 1878 by E. M. Goulburn / H. Symonds; but their suggestion for victitu- is dubious, and they left untouched arguebar for -bam and lenitatibus for lev-. In taking 320 from f. 105r of Cambridge C. C. C. 367, the editor omitted Benedictum after monachum and non id[…] (presumably ideo or idcirco) quod before Si, misread illius egressionis as eius recessionis, turned domum into
doctrinamentum, and restored Quare/Quapropter and venero, each truncated at the end of a line, as Quonium and ierovo; furthermore, it is not clear that James was wrong to give the second name as Edwius rather than Edwinus, and in the middle both script and style point to fraterne rather than fratem. In 416, a title and quatrain taken from Lambeth 236 f. 164v, there are four mistakes: QUO in the title for QUOS (admittedly most of the s is missing in a hole), requirit forat, ipso (unmetrical) for -a, and exceptt for ac-. Other accidents at the third stage were docuntur in 576 for docentur (Cambridge Peterhouse 210 f. 150v), at the beginning of 612 (Lambeth 198 f. 118r) ibi for vel (the «Zusatz von anderer Hand» belongs in the previous line before presidentem), and in 674 (B. L. Royal 17 B XLVII f. 45v–46r) susciipendus for -cipients, gradus for -um, and ut in the last line for et; and V. Gillespie, ‘Syon Abbey’ (C.B.M.L.C. 9, 2001) xlvi n. 45, says that ‘Raille’, the surname at the end of 873, was a misreading of ‘Baillie’.

As Rather of Verona observes in 200, the first two stages may be hard to distinguish. Towards the end of 234, which St. checked in Montpellier 68, the statement that Abbo velut prudentissima apes variis favos composita floribus mellitum defloravit opus is unconstructable, but the same wording appears in the other two manuscripts used in a work that St. does not cite, ‘L’abbaye de Fleury en l’an mil’ (Paris 2004), 62, where the editors say of composita «participe passé employé fautivement au lieu du participe présent componens» (the edition of 1605 actually printed apis … componens). Did the author slip up or an early scribe? A few words further on, it was St. who slipped up, because Montpellier 68 has munimen, not munimentum. On the other hand, notis in 149 for ‘people with experience’ looks authorial, and the last three lines of 177, which scan, look more like authorial than scribal gibberish.

There are other places where St.’s text certainly or probably suffered distortion somewhere in the first three stages. In most of them he was at the mercy of his printed source, because checking the ultimate source of all his entries would have required an unrealistic amount of labour.

61: The second occurrence of cur is odd, and the other family of mss. has quod. 85: Surely difficilia <ad> adipiscendum or difficilia ad apostem. 95, p. 91 n. 1: This footnote baffles me. 101: Though the syntax of this passage is opaque in the ms., the full stop after mancipaverit seems to be dividing a subordinate clause from its main clause. 104, the Indovinello Veronese: St. emends the first three words and wrongly gives areba for araba. 113: St.’s date is at odds with the text. The same thing happens in 689, 809, 840. 178:2: The rest of this quatrain is so capably written that ut frigida limpha sitis, ungrammatical and unmetrical, ought surely to be frigida limpha siti. 192: membranas … / pumice corrodo pellique superflua tollo / et pressando premens ferrumque velumque meniscus … / pumice corrodo. St. takes this punctuation over from Winterfeld, but it makes et superfluous and gives poor sense. Surely linea signatur, which scans, is standing in for lineam signa, which does not, and the previous verse goes with it: to rule a line one presses on a metal point drawn across the page against a ruler held steady. 203: If this entry, not «Vers» but a couplet, aimed at including all the letters of the alphabet, it was a miserable failure. 207: In this dedication, for which the only extant ms. of authority is one produced 200 years later (Montpellier 186 f. 38r), did Flodoard really write velcumque, printed in 1611 and most recently in 1998? The ms. has vel cumque, but in spite of the division it seems likely to be a misreading of utcumque, St.’s «jedenfalls». 208: renovavit atque meliores effectus is the kind of thing that makes one despair of editors. 236: Is senissimus right? It could easily be a misreading of sanctissimus (sc. > se-). 247: Transposing tantum quoque would restore metre. 280, 4, p. 225 n. 2: I see nothing wrong with quiddam. 311: The pas-
sage occurs on f. 196v, not 194v. 325: Like Wattenbach and before him G. Peignot, 'Essai sur l’histoire du parchemin et du velin' (Paris 1812) 31, St. quotes this passage of Hildebert from an edition of 1708, which took it ex Andegavensi et Victorino; the latter is now B. N. Lat. 14933, not yet available in Gallica. Hildebert speaks of using pumice for rubbing away *pilos et nervos* from parchment and goes on to interpret *pilos* allegorically without returning to the other noun, which Peignot and Wattenbach leave unexplained and St. takes in a sense unknown to dictionaries, «Fasern». Read *n(a)/tos*, 'blemishes'. 389: Though these elegies allow a spondee for a dactyl after the caesura in the pentameter, the punctuation of the sixth pentameter introduces a less plausible novelty. In the following hexameter is *degit*, not clearly rendered by St., a fancy way of saying *est* or what? 419: Johannes Scotus wrote *diligentissuque*, not *diligentius quia*, a slip made somewhere along the way. 503: St., who has seen the ms., gives *tandum aliquantulus*, but Thurot’s *tantum aliquantulum* seems more appropriate. 529: The page reference should be 114, not 11. 539: *salarium modum quem deceit ampliores excidat* seems to be an unhappy compromise between *salarium modum quem deceit excidat* and *salarium quam deceit amplius exigat*. 604: What on earth is *properdictum?* 619: The better edition of S. Rizzo / M. Berté (2009) rightly has no full stop after *quidam*. 636.1: at the end of the first paragraph: St.’s text is unconstruable, and the editor printed not *similitudinem* but -ne, though with an absurd comma before it. Read *ut cibus undique tercia digestione completus, a priori undique recedens similitudine, membrorum substantiam assumat*. 639: *latori* belongs with *inquam*, as in St.’s translation, though it omits *ut aiebam* (unproblematical: the writer has just talked at length about the reading). 642: *retenti* should be *recenti*, not the only word, I suspect, that the editor misread. 725. 726: Barzizza died in 1430; see R. G. G. Mercer, ‘The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza’ (London 1979) 135–36. 732: *quam* ought surely to be *quasi*. 758: The total is not «6 d. zu hoch» but 8d. too low. Presumably ‘viid.’ in the cost *pro scriptura* was overlooked. 845: *perstare* is hard to swallow. Should it be *prestare*, ‘excel’? 873: Both occurrences of *v* in ‘alle oyere yat shalle succede’ and the first occurrence in ‘theme yat wylle’ stand for the English letter *þ* (‘thorn’), pronounced like *th*. 895: Can *ossarum* be right?

Scholars often quote pieces of medieval Latin as if they understood them when one suspects that they did not. The best remedy is translation, but not all scholars are practised translators, and besides time the process involves frequent agonies over the best way to express the sense of the original even when it is not in doubt. Translations make up almost half of St.’s volume, and so he has put readers heavily in his debt. As I feel more at home in Latin than in German, I have not checked them all, but they sometimes gloss over difficulties in the interest of making sense.

46.2 at the beginning: St. does not translate *votum meum*. 60: I have not seen the edition that St. uses, but the earlier edition by Madoz gives *inexpressos*, and St.’s *in expositos* can hardly mean «mit den Auslegungen». 70.3: I do not understand *martabatur*. Obviously it can mean ‘was getting married’, but how is that relevant? St.’s translation fudges sense and syntax. 77: *Sicut in pelago quis positus desideratus est porto: ‘Wie einem, der zur See fährt, der Hafen als ersehntes Ziel erscheint*’. Either the scribe was turning the commonplace round or his grasp of Latin was very shaky. 110: The third verse, *Omnibus est gazis melior sapientia donis*, is unconstruable and St.’s «alle Schätze und Gaben» a fudge. Dümmler wondered about reading *mundi* for *donis*; an alternative might be *melius … donum*. 217: If *kaurum* was a misreading of *kanum* or *kannum* (cf. 65), *exurgens* need not be made transitive. 281 at the end: St. renders *commentum* as «Interpretation», but the syntax is awry, and the plural apparently required would mean ‘inventions’. 321 at the end: St. treats *memor* as a verb (P. L. 184.1021 implausibly gives *memoror*), but *ubi* ought surely to be *vobis*. 675: *in illarum sententias delirare: dass … die Sätze darin unsnirig werden*. The sense must be close to that, but the Latin does not say *in illis sententias delirare*. Before the phrase, this entry (B. L. Lansdowne 560 f. 43v), no scribal masterpiece (*-as is twice written
for -os, and verum looks wrong), has at the end of the previous line an unconstruable que suppressed by the editor. Perhaps the scribe forgot to add dam at the beginning of the next line; quedam would provide a badly needed subject for delirare.

I am still counting on two hands, though, the outright mistakes that I have encountered.

101: querat means ’were to ask’, not »klagt«. 232: erogaveris means ’supply’, not »als Entgelt erbitstück«. 411 towards the end: St. translates silen … dasian the wrong way round.

486: The unidentified work by Aquinas De erigendis ingeniius, mentioned in the same breath as De aqaurum conductibus, surely concerned not »Ermutigung der Gemüter« but the erecting of machines (’engines’, to keep the same word). 509:4: St. takes res as a word, with unhappy results, when in fact it is the second syllable of cares. The oddest mistake occurs in 221, where he renders ad composingendos codices as »für die Buchmalerei«; the whole entry in identical words forms part of 243, where he rightly gives »zum Heften der Bände«. Incidentally, this is one entry where it seems perverse not to add a cross-reference. Another is 18, related to 13, and another 201, where he does add a cross-reference to 147, but apparently he meant 144: and anyway 305 is identical except for the error scriptor at the end, though again St.’s translations are not. Doubtless the members of each pair entered the collection years apart.

A few matters of less consequence arise.

3 at the end: No proper equivalent of discripta appears in the translation. 59:3 A note would have been welcome on eras. 65: Such »Alphabetverse« struggle to make sense, but could Zephyri not be nominative plural? 109: quisque probably means quisquis/quiunque, ’whoever’, not »doch jeder«. 131: The translation omits Auctoritas … deficit. 167: In Porfiriis depincta opuscula the epithet probably means something more concrete than »kunstvolle«.

So miscellaneous a volume invites a miscellaneous sample and miscellaneous observations, for which I follow the order of the entries.

7: This extract from the Digest includes a revealing paragraph on the ambiguity of liber. 14.1: Pachomius says that no-one who goes off to pray or eat should leave a ms. non liga-
tum, which St. renders as »offen«. Perhaps custodians of ms. these days have nothing worse to fear than strain on the binding or droppings from winged insects on the pages, but against theft some medieval libraries resorted to chains, and Veronika von Büren accordingly suggests to me that Pachomius meant ’unattached’, ’nicht angebunden‘. Alternatively, the ms. was to be tied up with a cord or ribbon so that unbound quires stayed to-
gether in the right order. I am not aware of other ancient evidence for either practice; Pachomius said codicum, but even the tying up of rolls is unattested unless Catullus’s lora at 22.7 were so used. D. Muzerelle, ’Vocabulaire codicologique‘ (Paris 1985) fig. 315, schematically illustrates a bound manuscript tied shut with a cord or ribbon. 37: Salvian’s comment that giving the author’s name in a title illustrates terrestris gloriae vanitatem recalls Cicero’s gibe at philosophers who put their name on works de commemenda gloria (Pro Archia 26, Tusc. 1.34). 47.2: Probably with good reason, St. interprets Bibliotheca as ’the Bible‘. His ’Glossar‘ cites only one instance of this sense, but there are others in 175, 318, 412, 422, and probably 280, and the sense is amply documented in the ’Dictionary of medieval Latin from British sources‘. 56.2 at the end: Isidore says that in the Latin alphabet only I and X are also numerals. Several ms. correct him. 74: amore captus may be an echo of Vir. Ecl. 6.10 or Georg. 3.285. Other classical echoes certain or likely occur in 281 (exactos … tyrannos = Horace Odes 2.13.31), 543 (verba soluta modis = Ovid Trist. 4.10.24; studio fallente laborom = Ovid Met. 6.60 rather than Horace Sat. 2.2.12, where austerum precedes; est aliquid = Ovid passim, Juv. 3.232; non bene convenient nec in una sede morantur = Met. 2.846), 871 (scribentem … opus = Ovid Pont. 3.9.21–22). 91: Paulus Diaconus sends to Corbie a copy of Gregory’s letters in which he has marked with the
symbol zeta (Z, for ζήτει = require) passages that need correcting; he has also put the symbol forinsecus ad aurem, «aussens am Rand». As the context demands this sense, unattested for auras elsewhere, Du Cange under zeta (3) conjectured oram, which K. Neff, 'Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus' (Munich 1968) 129, adopted without comment in his text and W. M. Lindsay, 'Palaeographia Latina II' (1923) 11, conjectured again; but where in any ancient or medieval work does ora any more than auras refer to the margin of a page or book? That the ms. does indeed give aurem can be seen in A. Crivellucci, 'Pauli Diaconi Historia Romana' (Rome 1914) plate V. I wonder if Paulus was ingeniously adapting Augustine, *Enchiridion de fide spe et caritate* XV 59 (C. C. S. L. 46, p. 81) dicant aliquid non ad aurem forinsecus sed intus animae hominis. L. M. Hartmann, M. G. H. Epp. 2 (1899) xvi–xvii, reports that the symbol Z does appear in the text of Gregory that follows, but he does not say where on the page. It has been debated whether anything in the ms. was written by Paulus himself; see H. Hofmann, Deutsches Archiv 57 (2001) 17–19.

This and 332 name and discuss the exemplar. 163: This canonic from a synod includes the lament that divinae scripturae verax et fidelis intelligentia iam ita dilabitor ut vix eius extrema vestigia vereripiantur, more striking in 859 than when Cincius Romanus in 1416 (705) says that at St Gallen erant ... abbas monachique ab omni litterarum cognitione alieni. 191: On completing every page the scribe checked it, he says, against the exemplar. 237, 239: Froumound seems to have adapted the endings of subjunctives arbitrarily to his Leonine verses. 217: This includes a remark about a distinctive hand. 258, 3: This entry must be one of those included because «der Herausgeber an ihnen seine Freude hatte» (p. 8). 281: Heinricus admits upsetting some of the brethren at Pomposa by writing ms. that they cannot read ob nimiam titulationem. For copying Buridan’s quaestiones Johann von Neumarkt in 612 wants a clericus familiar with the abbreviations used in logic and philosophy. 309: These instructions for making ink, incaustum, are a model of clarity. Not that I have tried it. 316: Hugh of St Victor recommends committing to memory wherever something occurs on the page. 369: Peter of Blois complains of being gazumped in Paris over a purchase of books. 397: A scribe apologizes for miscalculating space and thereby forcing the pictor to make spheres oval. 417: This is one of several entries that speak of using a particular ms. as a model for script and layout; cf. 494, 513, 718, 737, 786. The scribe here is to work sine aliquius alterius operis scripture interpositione excedentis quantitatem x sol. bon., but the contracts in 494, 507, 536, 694, allow no interruption. 507 also asks for no decline in quality after the opening page. 491, 2: Conradus de Mure gives sound advice on dividing words between lines. 491, 2: This entry mentions scriptrices, absent from the ‘Glossar’. 503: Thurot understandably recoiled from these ‘puerilités’ about the shapes of letters. Much the same view could be taken of 45, 72, and parts of 56, 56, 95, 513: Salimbene de Adam says that he has carried out his teacher’s wish that after his death someone should keep alive his technique for creating palimpsests; he has erased all his teacher’s works down to the last letter (he adds that he was horrified by the man’s prophecy). 601: Thomas Wallensis alleges that a deceitful scribe hired secundum numerum linearium vel punctorum que sunt in exemplari seizes the chance of skipping passages in the hope that if he is caught out it will not be till he has been paid. 666 (the number of the beast): This is an extract from the statutes of my college. 696: singled out in St.’s ‘Einleitung’ (p. 7): This describes a present given to Jean Duc de Berry for New Year 1410: ‘un livre contrefait d’une pièce de bois paincte en semblance d’un livre, ou il n’a nuls feuillets ne rien escript’. 720: auscultati, ‘listened to’ in a process of correction, deserved a place in the ‘Glossar’. It is absent from S. Rizzo’s ‘Lessico filologico degli umanisti’, but for another occurrence see F. Ehrle, ‘Historia bibliothecae Romanorum pontificum tum Bonifatianae tum Avenionensis’ I (Rome 1890) 139 (a. 1351) fraternitatem tuam actente rogamus quatumque quecumque habes de operibus ipsis [sc. Tullii] velis nobis copianda concedere ac per latorem presencium mictere vel illa facere copiari, copiam cum originalibus asculatam fideliter et correctam celeriter transmitteris. 731, 3: This statute for the Collegium Amplusianum prescribes that any funds not needed for maintaining the fabric should be used in emendacionem librorum librarie, maxime libros papireos in pergamenos, utiliter commutando. 783: This Modus scribendi ac formationis litterarum of s. xv/z, «unpubliziert?», pre-
scribes round s at word end but the other elsewhere. 790.3: Especial care is to be taken in sexternis imponendis et praescindendis, nam in his faciliter magna damna contingere possunt. In a footnote St. expresses surprise that quires of six bifolia should have been thought especially at risk. As quires of any size needed to be in the right order, to have their bifolia in the right order, and to keep marginalia of value, perhaps sexternis means just ‘quires’. Cf. 647 in presenti volume sunt 7 sisterni sive codices in quorum quolibet preterquam in ultimo scilicet septimo sunt 12 folia, in 7 vero 8 solum; for codices in the sense ‘quires’ St.’s ‘Glossar’ refers to 676 as well as this entry. 859.13: The device cavilla defined here enables scribes to keep their place in the exemplar.

This impressive and instructive volume «wünscht sich interessierte Leser» (p. 9). It found one in me, and I hope their number rapidly grows. I also hope libraries do not banish it to the stack but add it to the works of reference on their open shelves. Over 200 of the entries are reproduced under ‘Quellentexte’ at www.codices.ch, but without their number, and users on line should beware of missing the rest.

Cambridge

Michael D. Reeve


Die Eigenständigkeit dieses politisch-kulturellen Standortes zwischen den Mächten und Welten mußte immer wieder behauptet werden. Schon in der Endphase des Peloponnesischen Krieges hatten sich die rhodischen Städte ihre Unabhängigkeit teuer erkauft, indem sie bereit waren, sich politisch und administrativ völlig neu zu orientieren und zu arrangieren. Ob die äußere Bedrohung des späten 5. Jh. als Ursache für den drastischen Schritt eines freiwilligen Synoi kismos ausreichte oder ob weitere Gründe hinzukamen, wieso die Städte der Insel sich zu einer einzigen Stadt zusammenschlossen und ihre frühere Eigenständigkeit großenteils aufgaben, ist trotz zahlreicher und gehaltvoller moderner Analysen und weniger antiker Aussagen nicht ganz geklärt. Zum äußeren Druck hinzu kamen jedenfalls auch gemeinsame politische Ambitionen und merkantile Interessen der Inselelite, auch wenn die ökonomischen Anliegen wohl weniger
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