GRAMMATICAL TEXTS

M. De Nonno, P. De Paolis, L. Holtz (edd.): *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 16–23 October 1997, as the 11th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*. In two volumes. Pp. 849, pls. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 88-8317-003-2.

These two volumes are the rich and fascinating product of a week-long seminar, under Franco-Italian direction, at Erice's International School for the Study of Written Records. The success of an earlier conference on lexica and glossaries inspired the concept of this one, the intention being to determine precisely the current state of the related field of grammatica, focusing especially on manuscripts and textual traditions. As they point out in their opening remarks (p. 6), the organizers had originally envisaged a slightly more comprehensive and broader survey of the tradition (chronologically and geographically speaking), but having lined up a glittering array of specialists in the field, the aim was adjusted in order to reflect the work in progress of those participating. Twenty-four contributions are published, and the opening and concluding remarks have also been reproduced as delivered. In addition, the first volume contains a number of illustrative plates (not all of pristine quality, it must be added: are all those depicting leaves from Monte Cassino MS 299 in focus?); while at the end of Volume IIis an index of manuscripts, papyri, and incunabula.

The opening comments of De Nonno and De Paolis include a historical overview of scholarship in the field since Mai's 'scavi ardimentosi'. Among the new approaches—revisions and developments highlighted since WWII, for example—they emphasize the importance of modern re-evaluation of the late antique/early medieval period, now recognized as a fertile time for grammatical studies, being both traditional and innovative. Further, grammatical treatises are especially susceptible to adjustment and reworking over time: in order to map activity in any given time or place, or appreciate the resources available to particular individuals, it is imperative that individual manuscripts and collections be studied for their own sake. The principal aim of this seminar was to 'photograph', as the organizers put it (p. 6), this rich and complex grammatical seam in western literature.

To work this seam, the seminar attracted an impressive array of scholars from Europe and N. America, including a good number of junior scholars, as Holtz remarks (pp. 792–3), five of whom contributed papers. It is no doubt a consequence of the location of this conference that the majority of papers are in Italian (thirteen), with six papers in French, four in English, and one Spanish contribution, but Holtz rightly uses these statistics to pay tribute to the vigour of Italian scholarship in the field of grammatical studies, and the good fortune of Italian scholars in finding national support for their work.

The contributions range in focus from broader studies to highly detailed descriptions of individual manuscripts, and proceed in a more or less chronological arrangement from antiquity to the early modern period. Within this schema, papers cluster around certain topics and texts. The first several papers (with contributions from Vivien Law, Pierre Swiggers and Alfons Wouters, Jean Shneider, Mario De Nonno, Paolo De Paolis, and Michela Rosellini) are a mixture of broader-based

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surveys and more narrowly focused discussions roughly pertaining to the late antique period. Amongst these, it is certainly pleasing to see included studies of Greek material (Shneider, 'Une collection grammaticale de la haute époque byzantine'), and grammatica preserved on papyri (Swiggers-Wouters, 'Grammaires grecques (et latines) sur papyrus'). Papers on the earlier medieval period are dominated by one or more of three themes: (1) Priscian (Marina Passalacqua, 'I codici medievali delle *Partitiones priscianee*'; Rijcklof Hofmann, 'The Irish Tradition of Priscian'); (2) Carolingian court scholars, predominantly Alcuin (Louis Holtz, 'Priscien dans la pédagogie d'Alcuin'), Peter of Pisa (Anneli Luhtala, '*Excerpta* da Prisciano, Diomede e Pompeo compilati da Pietro da Pisa'), and Paul the Deacon (Luigi Munzi, 'Testi grammaticali e *renovatio studiorum carolingia*'); and (3) Monte Cassino (Virginia Brown, '"Where Have All the Grammars Gone?" The Survival of Grammatical Texts in Beneventan Script'; Francesco Magistrale, 'Il manoscritto della grammatica di Ilderico di Montecassino'). Two French scholars then explore the development of medieval linguistic studies, offering papers on university grammars (Irène Rosier-Catach, with a useful bibliography) and on scholastic pedagogy as evinced in later medieval commentaries on Évrard of Béthune's *Graecismus* (Anne Grondeux). Following this, the conference immersed itself in the activity of the humanists, and the next six contributions are all concerned in some way with humanist discoveries of, and interest in grammatical treatises from, earlier periods (contributions from Giuseppe Morelli, Paolo D'Alessandro, Maria Adelaida Andrés Sanz, and Chiara Cignolo), and in collections of grammatical texts (of whatever period) amassed from the fifteenth century onwards (Rossella Bianchi and Silvia Rizzo, 'Manoscritti e opere grammaticali nella Roma di Niccolò V', and Carmen Codoñer, 'Los manuscritos gramaticales en la Universidad de Salamanca'). Of the final three papers, the first (Paola Degni and Alessandra Peri, 'Per un catalogo dei codici grammaticali altomedievali') announces a project, based at the University of Cassino, to catalogue all dated and datable manuscripts with grammatical content, and establish a microfilm collection of them. The final two contributions seem oddly placed. Giorgio Piras' article ('Per la tradizione del *De lingua Latina* di Varrone') has, arguably, humanist leanings, though separated from the other humanist papers by the Degni–Peri contribution; but why has so much distance been placed between Brown's consideration of grammatical codices from the Beneventan area and the final paper, Barbara Maria Tarquini's 'Spunti di riflessione sui codici grammaticali in scrittura beneventana'?

It goes without saying that the presence of a number of specialists in the same field is advantageous for any seminar. The published results can be a little confusing, however, if said specialists offer widely divergent views on similar themes. A quick scan of current scholarly opinion on the date and place of origin of Monte Cassino MS 299, for example, is revealing. Tarquini, whose catalogue of grammatical manuscripts from the Beneventan area is nearing completion (any connection between this and the new Cassino project?), suggests (pp. 774, 788) saec. IX^{1}, Monte Cassino; Brown (p. 410, with further discussion on p. 398) offers saec. IX^{ex}, Benevento?; while Magistrale (pp. 432–3), who also summarizes the conclusions of previous debates on this subject (p. 417), hints at Monte Cassino some time during the abbacy of Bertharius (856–83). Clearly there is no easy way to date and locate early Beneventan hands, but Brown's experience, and careful, reasoned analysis here, lend particular credence to her views, usefully presented in an appendix (pp. 410–14). The omission in the index of manuscripts (pp. 807–42) to practically all references to Tarquini's discussion would seem to confirm my preference. (Although page references in the index are not without mistakes—I noticed problems, for example, with the entries for

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cass. 90 and 218.) One small point needs correcting in Brown's paper, however: Naples Biblioteca Nazionale IV A 3 (*F*) is not a copy of Paul the Deacon's *Epitome* of Festus' *De verborum significatu*, as she claims on p. 394, but the only extant medieval witness to Festus' original text. And yet with regard to *F*, if different scripts, Caroline and Beneventan, coexisted at Monte Cassino in the later eleventh century, as Brown—building on the work of Francis Newton—observes, then perhaps we ought now to reconsider the possible origin of *F* also, written in so-called romanesca during precisely this period, although usually considered to have originated in Rome.

Other papers with a great deal in common—such as the batch concerned with insular and continental Carolingian use of Priscian—likewise have much to offer each other, although traces of any post-paper discussion are hard to find. For example, Luhtala's observations on Peter of Pisa's and Alcuin's *Excerpta* from Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* lead her to suggest tentatively that Peter's *Excerpta* from the first sixteen books might already have been available when Alcuin decided to provide *Excerpta* from the final two (p. 347). Holtz's analysis of Alcuin's *Excerpta*, on the other hand, demonstrates clearly the greater sophistication and rather different purpose of Alcuin's endeavour, which in fact incorporated much material from Books 1–16, and was designed for the more advanced student. It seems to me unlikely that Peter's *Excerpta* influenced Alcuin's, but if any discussion was generated on the topic, there is no record of it here. Without wishing to downplay the undeniable usefulness of this collection of papers, one cannot help thinking it a pity that what is published here does not reflect, strictly speaking, the results of this seminar—in terms of shared knowledge, cross-fertilization of ideas or, in short, advancement of the field—but is rather a 'photograph' of the state of play *before* these individual scholars sat down and began to talk.

Duke University, North Carolina CLARE WOODS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni093

JULIUS ROMANUS

D. M. SCHENKEVELD (ed., trans., comm.): *A Rhetorical Grammar. C. Julius Romanus, Introduction to the* Liber de adverbio *as incorporated in Charisius'* Ars Grammatica *II.13*. Edition with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 247.) Pp. ix + 149, pl. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004. Cased, €80, US$100. ISBN: 90-04-13662-2.

The subject of this study is the introduction to the treatise on the adverb contained in C. Julius Romanus' Ἀφορμαί. This, like his other fragments, is known to us only through being cited by Charisius (246.19–252.31 Barwick), known in the relevant portion from MS Neap. IV A 8 (supplemented where illegible by two apographs) and variants from a lost MS recorded by Cauchius, along with conjectures of his own, in an edition now at Heidelberg. S. presents a substantial introduction, a new text with translation, and a philological commentary; his work is indispensable for anyone desiring to make sense of this strange author.

Having discussed Charisius in Chapter 1, with a critique of Barwick's source-theory,

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni093 Published online by Cambridge University Press