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/bni094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

S. turns in Chapter 2 to Romanus himself, assigned to the mid-third century, and in Chapter 3 to the fragment. The work is classed, in Vivien Law's terms, amongst *regulae*, not formal *artes*; Romanus' style is related to the 'archaizing classicism' that emerged in the second century A.D. But archaic and classical vocabulary does not preclude a precious and not always comprehensible diction; Romanus is rather the rhetorician straining to impress than the grammarian aiming to explain. Rhetorical too are his constant changes of stance, and his use of the *cursus mixtus*, usefully explained at pp. 72–4 but not without error: *vocándi respondendíve* is a *cursus velox* and the first syllable of *varia* is short.

The text has been reconsidered, with contributions from Michael Winterbottom and Aad Kleywegt; if it is still not satisfactory, the principal blame may lie with Romanus. If he was capable of writing (e.g.) *interdumve* 251.17 (where not even *-que* would be in place, the following *-que* not being parallel), then he was capable of anything; if not, then Charisius and/or his scribes have wrecked him beyond repair.

Readers will be grateful to S. for his translation and commentary, the latter as often attentive to the *verba* as the *res*; if it rarely focuses on any unit larger than a sentence, S. has already provided in Chapter 3 a general paraphrase of the entire text setting out what he understands to be the argument. By no means are all problems satisfactorily solved, but better solutions are hard to find.

As usual, the mind is sometimes changed in mid-book. At 247.25–248.1 S. reads *ut inter adverbia quoque pergere si iuberet adfectus vel, ut in multis solet, casus adferre* [Cauchius: *adferret* N], *esset impunitas*, and renders (half-darkly) 'in order to ensure that there would be impunity if Greece [understood from *Graeciae* 247.22] ordered that emotions too come under adverbs or, as is often the case, adduce (oblique) cases'; so too in his introduction, p. 60. But on p. 104 *vel* introduces a variant rather than an alternative, *adferre* becomes 'append', and the subject is not *Graecia* but *adfectus*. That implies: 'if predilection should order (interjections) to pass among adverbs too; in other words, as often happens, to append cases'; but may we not retain the chiastic pair *iuberet adfectus . . . casus adferret*, with characteristic, and matching, clausula: 'if predilection should order them to pass among adverbs too, or, as often happens, a case [rather than 'chance'] should put them there'?

The book concludes with an appendix on 'Manuscript C and Johannes Cauchius', plausibly identifying Johan van Cuyck rather than his son Anthonis as the annotator, but admitting that 'personal inspection' of various volumes in Heidelberg is required; why has this not been undertaken? The name Baehr is twice corrupted to the more familiar 'Baehrens'.

A few other minor slips are worth noting, though they do not detract from the edition's overall merit. P. 1: for 'Jordan' read 'Israel' (Skythopolis is the once and future Beth Shean). P. 30: The passage cited from Pliny the Elder on 251.8 has nothing to do with dialect. P. 39: where does Romanus quote Aulus Gellius? P. 85: 'held that [certain interjections] were to be called'; the Latin (247.24–5) is not *dicenda* but *dici . . . aestimaverunt*. Pp. 89, 109: a *fideicommissum* is less a will than a trust. P. 91: 'reason or thing' renders *causae reive* (250.13), where *causae* (= *cosa*, *chose*) is a mere synonym of *rei*; the pairing permits a dicretic clausula and a *cursus tardus*. P. 129, end of 252.15–19 n.: to stop to do something is not at all the same as to stop doing it. P. 139: contrary to S.'s claim, the choice between *votis . . . comparem* and *voti . . . compotem* (248.29) is not discussed in his commentary

Oxford LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni094

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni094 Published online by Cambridge University Press