

Re: Latin descended through creolization

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-12/msg01211.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Dec 2007 10:24:59 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 23, 11:22 am, Joachim Pense <s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Am Sun, 23 Dec 2007 05:14:08 -0800 (PST) schrieb Peter T. Daniels:

On Dec 23, 8:20 am, Joachim Pense <s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

The convention is to use <u> in lowercase,
<V> in capitals, thus uidua
or VIDVA depending whether you're
transcribing a manuscript or an
inscription respectively..

I have been wondering if this convention is something
peculiar to
English-speaking countries. In Latin those texts by German
publishers
(mostly for school usage, though) I know, the convention is
to use V
whenever it is supposed to be a semivowel, and u when it's a
full vowel;
for both upper and lower case.

So I memorized the perfect forms "monui", but "delevi".

Don't you remember the fight about the phonemic status of the vowel
vs. the glide? And that there's no warrant whatsoever for dividing the
single letter used by the Romans into two different symbols according
to its allophonic appearance in any particular item?

Re: Latin descended through creolization

I do remember that fight, but I don't care about it now. Be it appropriate or not, is it right or wrong that in some academic traditions outside the English-speaking world Latin classic texts are published as I described it, or is that a thing of the past?

Sorry, but high school (~ Gymnasium) textbooks are not "academic tradition." My high school Latin book (actually we started Latin in 7th grade, two years before high school) also uses u and v as if it were spelling English.

You can spell your [phonetic transcription] however you want, but when you're simply providing the <written text>, you can't make such an alteration.

BTW the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae is edited and published in Germany.