ment spielen’), und abstracta pro concretis wie potentia (‘Königin’) und conclusio (‘Sockel einer Säule’). Es ist eine nützliche Liste der lateinischen Wörter mit ihren griechischen Äquivalenten (aus der LXX, oder eventuell Varianten) beigefügt worden.


Deshalb wird die Frage, ob man mit Ayuso die Marginalglossen aus den spanischen Vulgatahandschriften als Vetus Latina Hispana bezeichnen darf, von Moreno Hernández nur für die handschriftliche Tradition positiv beantwortet, für den Ursprung der Texte jedoch, im Lichte der unverkennbaren Beziehungen zu alten europäischen Texttraditionen, als unrichtig betrachtet.

Zu bemerken ist, dass der Autor die Zeitschrift Vigiliae Christianae zu Unrecht singulariter erwähnt (Vigilia Christiana, S. 287² und S. 451).
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G.J.M. Bartelink


Any visit to a bookshop or library well stocked with recent publications about the ancient world will provide one with many examples of the sourcebook-mania that has struck the field. The numerous sourcebooks, which of course frequently overlap, are

presented by their authors as contributing to a bright future where those without Greek or Latin will be provided with a full range of source material in translation. They are generally praised by reviewers as particularly useful. Now there is no denying that such collections can be very handy, but I have several misgivings.

First, any sourcebook of somewhat wider scope is necessarily (highly) selective, but the criteria for selection are seldom clearly stated.—Secondly, it is such a waste of energy to collect existing translations or retranslate literary texts if good translations already exist. This is also true from a didactic point of view (and most collections of translated sources are said to have been produced to some didactic end): it is far better to be forced to locate useful fragments as part of a complete body of text, rather than have somebody else decide which fragments are worthwhile and which are not. Sourcebooks, if produced at all, are most usefully limited to previously untranslated material, above all inscriptions and papyri, which should be presented complete. In fact, such collections are very rare.)—Thirdly, the very concept of the sourcebook seems to imply a curious overestimation of the actual words, the 'Wortlaut' (and this is to be taken literally: imagery, and archaeological material in general are usually lacking or a mere illustrative extra). As others have already pointed out there is the danger of taking the ancients at their word, while problems of genre, context, representativeness, and so on, are not allowed to spoil the game, let alone the problem of translating, which touches upon the raison-d'être of these collections. There is nothing wrong with translating, but if we talk of translations that are to be used in academic teaching (or even research) there should be more awareness of what the very fact of translation entails. In fact, commentary should take as much space as the sources themselves, or even more, but that is not the usual proportion).

The whole idea of letting the sources speak for themselves (even if this is not intended, it is what usually happens), seems curiously old-fashioned. Indeed, the making of sourcebooks is not so new as many say: there are examples of the genre from the 19th century onwards. As far as I can judge, none of those older collections has ever been very effective, and the Rankian ideas behind them have been discredited. I thus would be inclined myself to see the days of the thematic source collection as over, and not on the rise: what scholars other than classicists and ancient historians produce a comparable amount of comparable books?—Despite these misgivings