M. J. Dewar: Guex, Ps.-Claudien, Laus Herculis

proves to have been familiar with the standard canonical authors, above all Virgil, Ovid, and Statius, as well as the latter-day colossus Claudian. Guex effectively reveals his equal familiarity with the *Hercules Furens* of Seneca, and makes a decent case for his having known Silius. Strikingly, she twice makes the attractive suggestion that he also knew Servius auctus (vv. 122 and 133 nn.), something that would fit with the general schoolroom atmosphere. The commentary succeeds in bringing out the encroachment of Vulgar Latin syntax and idiom on the literary language even as it demonstrates this continuing familiarity with the canon of Latin poetry. The direct influence of Greek literature is all but absent. I doubt this really adds up to much that will surprise those well acquainted with the Latin literature of the fifth and sixth centuries, but the basic picture has been given added colour and vibrancy by an excellent piece of scholarship that deserves commendation for its learning and its balanced good judgement. Whoever composed this piece of late-antique doggerel, he has found in Sophie Guex a critic far beyond his deserts.
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This book owes its existence to a deep and long-lasting fascination that dates back to 1982, when Schenkeveld first happened to read Romanus. As he tells us in his preface, he «became ‘addicted’ to this text and decided to write a monograph on the subject» (p. viii), but for various reasons this desire was not fulfilled until the beginning of the 21st century. Better late than never, I would say, because regardless of all criticism that this book will meet with (also in this review) it is beyond question to me that it is of some value for everyone who is interested in ancient linguistics.

Our knowledge about Romanus is rather weak – in fact, there is hardly anything certain to say about his person and life, and moreover, his work was handed down to us neither directly nor complete. All we have is a set of excerpts contained in the work of a later grammarian called Flavius Sosipater Charisius; as a consequence, Sch. has at first to deal with this «transmitter of grammatical theory» (ch. I, pp. 1–28). But we are scarcely better off for Charisius than for Romanus himself. Again, external evidence is lacking, and the only source of information, his *ars grammatica* consisting of five books, has survived in such a bad condition that the constitution of the text is connected with lots of serious difficulties (some of which concern the text investigated by Sch.; see below). However, the major part of the text is preserved, so that to some extent it is possible to give well-founded statements about its making, its structure, its place in the grammatical tradition, its sources, and its intentions. Sch. sketches these subjects with both broad reference to recently done researches (e.g. by Vivian Law, Robert A. Kaster, and Mario De Nonno) and due reluctance to rather speculative inferences that are typical not only for Karl Barwick and his ‘Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica’ published in 1922; surprisingly, however, he
avoids a comment on the ill-founded views of Mazhuga about the relationship between the grammarians Diomedes and Charisius (p. 21 n. 68).

Charisius is important for Sch. not in itself but because of «the result of the compilatory work he has done. Without this work (…) our knowledge of earlier grammatical theory would be considerably less.» (28). Consequently, Sch. does not deal with him in a too exhaustive manner but is soon passing to Romanus (ch. II, pp. 29–53). Because of the almost total lack of information any dating and locating of this man cannot be but vague and approximate. Sch. puts him about 270 A.D. (29) but refuses to take for sure that he lived in Italy (30). Some of Romanus’ formulations might give (and in fact gave) rise to the opinion that he was no grammarian by profession, for instance when he rejects preposterous views of grammatici about aspects of the nominal declension (164.30ff and 168.23ff). But by pointing to 150–200, where «the opinion of Fl. Caper (who was a grammarian himself!) is preferred to that of grammatici» (30), Sch. can show that such formulations are of no significance (and he could have pointed to similar phrases at, for instance, Diom. gramm. 1.338.7 or 1.338.30f).

Sch. then tries to reconstruct at least the outlines of Romanus’ complete work (entitled ‘Aforma’). In opposition to Peter Lebrecht Schmidt, who supposed that it has covered all eight parts of speech (Schmidt 1997, 236f; cited p. 33), and by making use of a truly ingenious conjecture by Taifacos (Taifacos 1983; reference on p. 33) Sch. can make it plausible that Romanus «did not discuss all parts of speech but made a selection» (37). As it seems, his work was one of the so-called regulae grammars that «give the impression of being reference works intended for consultation rather than school textbooks designed for systematic study» (Law 1986, 366; cited p. 36). Therefore, it is no surprise that Romanus does not always state clearly why something is the case or not. His intended audience is not pupils, but conoscentes (not «conoscenti», as Sch. writes on p. 63 and p. 120).

The third chapter (54–79) focuses on the introduction to the liber de adverbio of Romanus. First, some preliminary remarks show that «what Romanus offers his reader is not a real survey of the adverbial theory, as we have it in other artes, but something quite different» (56). In fact, it is not only different, but also difficult in both style and structure. So, in order to elucidate Romanus’ text, Sch. makes a survey of its division and then proceeds to discuss Romanus’ argument step by step. His useful and informative explanations shed much light on the single details as well as on the argument as a whole and point out that Romanus «focuses his whole introduction on two subjects, viz. the relationship between adverb and interjection on the one hand, and the correctness of the endings in -e and -o on the other» (69). Additional subchapters deal with Romanus’ ornate and artificial style, namely his excessive employment of rhetorical devices (hendiadys, figures etc.) and his accurate use of clausulae according to the so-called cursus mixtus, an intermediate stage between the old metrical system and the later accentual one. A detailed analysis shows that «Romanus is another early representative of this usage» (75). Finally then, Sch. tries to detect the function of Romanus’ introduction, unusually elaborate as it is, and to characterize it in literary terms; but since «an exact parallel in Greek and Latin literature … is lacking» (79) there seems to be no suitable term for this «totally unique» (77) piece of literature.
After that follows the central part of the book: the edition and translation of Romanus’ text, followed by a philological commentary. Throughout the Latin text the line division of Barwick’s edition (Leipzig 1925/1964) has been preserved (except for two minor faults at 247.21 and 250.15f), so that the reader does not need to consult Barwick’s edition just in order to give correct references. Notwithstanding, he will do good to have it at hand, too, for Sch.’s apparatus criticus is selective ("discussions of the text in my commentary have been the main criterion of selection" p. 81) and does not even mention all those readings that are discussed in the commentary.

The apparatus does not inform us that, for instance, at 248.6 C not only has adunxerit (instead of N’s adunxet) but also potuerit (instead of N’s potuit – see below) and that expediter in 249.4 is a (reasonable) conjecture by Sch. – to recognize this we have to read the commentary.

Apart from the selective character of the apparatus there are other difficulties. Usually, modern editors use italics only to distinguish their own words from the different readings of the MS tradition, which are always printed regular. In Sch.’s apparatus, however, italics are sometimes used for the same purpose as in the text of the edition itself: in order to mark examples in meta-language sentences.

This makes it difficult to decipher e.g. the information on 249.14 (est del. Wint. an <aut>, aut facet sive an, aut fecit Christ proposuit), where the words aut facit and fecit are meant to be meta-language examples, whereas sive and Christ proposuit is the editor’s voice. Furthermore it would have been helpful to let more space between notes concerning different phrases in the same line (e.g. between «pandectes est» and «concessaque Cauch.» [on 252.30]); and finally (but this concerns the whole book) it appears that the proof-reading could have been more accurate; for instance, the words «aequitus ed. pr.» (on 248.16) are to be put before «ut non Lind.», and the words «transposuit» (on 251.23–252.1) and «Kroll» (on 252.18) are to be italicized (whereas «Titinius» [on 251.5–7] is not).

The Latin text as constituted by Sch. is quite different from that in Barwick’s edition.

There are some 40 deviations, five of which appear to be simple typographical errors: 246.23 est in instead of est et in, 248.18 enim instead of etenim, 248.21 putaverim instead of putaveram (cf. the translation ‘I had thought so’), 249.19 putavi instead of putavit (transl. ‘he thought’), and 250.12 Helenius Acro (whereas the commentary ad loc. has the correct Helenius Acron).

Taking into account that the whole text fills in only 7 Teubner pages, these numbers are not as small as it might seem at first sight.

In many cases Sch.’s decisions will find great acceptance, for instance when he adopts Keil’s conjecture dixerint in 246.27 (refused by Barwick) or contrarily refuses Lachmann’s conjecture dubio in 248.27 (adopted by Barwick), or when he puts the word rhetorius (250.4) outside the quotation from Cicero (Att. 16.3.1). At other points certainty will hardly ever be gained. Do we, for instance, have to read occulto (with C) or subito (with N) at 247.6? Both readings can well be explained, but since subito has already been used as an example in the preceding line, Sch. thinks that it ‘looks suspect’ (100), and I do agree with him. His conjecture parti before partitum in 247.23 looks very attractive, too.

Some decisions, however, at first seem to be based on solid arguments, but become questionable on examination. I would like to briefly discuss 3 points here:
1. Itaque … interiectionem … cachinnum gemi tumve dici … aestimaverunt, ut inter adverbia quoque pergere si iberet adfectus vel … casus adferre, esset inpunitas. (247.23–248.1)

adferre C adferret N

Sch. adopts the reading of C, «which makes affectus, not Graecia, the subject of the expression» (104). Accordingly, his translation runs: «… in order to ensure that there would be impunity if Greece ordered that emotions too come under adverbs or … adduce (oblique) cases.» (85). This sentence is part of a passage that «offers many problems» (60) and therefore demands some explanations. These are given on p. 60ff in a fairly clear and lucid manner – and opened with a translation that renders the phrase concerned with a little but significant difference: «… if Greece ordered that emotions too come under adverbs or … adduced (oblique) cases.» Here Sch. takes for granted the reading of N, viz. adferret.

Which translation is correct now? Neither, I think. The crucial point is what shall be regarded as the subject of the conditional clause. Sch. thinks of Graecia, because it has been mentioned some lines before (247.23); but this happened only by means of a genitive attribute which is nowhere taken up in all that follows (e.g. by means of a pronoun like illa). Moreover, how should either Greece or some affectus adduce oblique cases? What Romanus wants to say, I think, is that it is the interiectio that can do this; on p. 61, Sch. himself correctly explains: «Even these interjections can become adverbs when they attract (oblique) cases.» For these reasons I consider affectus to be a genitive governed by adversia; subject of the conditional clause is the interiectio; for iberet I suggest to write ubertur (cf. 249.4 expedit N expeditus coni. Sch.); with N we should read adferre; and finally, it should be noted that quoque is placed not behind affectus but behind adversia: «… in order to ensure that there would be impunity if it [sc. the interjection] was ordered to come under adverbs of sentiment, too, or adduced oblique cases.»

2. Quis enim vocandi heus vel olei respondendive <heu> non potius nominibus adiuuxerit? Nec verbis potuit, licet mallet. (248.5–7)

adiuuxerit C adiunxerit N

Sch. rightly remarks that the reading of C is «very welcome» (p. 105 on 248.5[!]), but in contradiction to that he translates «who did not rather construe» (= quis non potius adiuuxerit) instead of «who would not rather construe». Furthermore, C not only has adiuuxerit instead of adiunxerit, but potuerit instead of poteuit as well (which is mentioned not in the apparatus, but only in the commentary). I fail to see why the first reading should be «very welcome» and «the other one not» (105). If I am not wrong, the words nec verbis potuerit, licet mallet are meant to continue the rhetorical question: «For who would not rather construe the adverbs of addressing (like heus or olei) or those of responding (like heu) with nouns and be unable to do so with verbs, even if he preferred this?»

3. praeferrendi, magis potest, potius [est] credere. (249.13f).

Following a suggestion made by Winterbottom, Sch. deletes est, because «potius est seems impossible in Latin» (112). Why, then, does he translate It is preferable to believe? Once again I have the impression that he did at first translate the text as presented by Barwick and then went on to alter Barwick’s text without accordingly altering his own translation, too (by the way: the same is the case in 247.16, where Sch. adopts the reading of N eam but translates the one of C eandum adopted by Barwick). But regardless of that, his argument seems to be rather weak. Of course potius est credere is no ‘good’ Latin; but that could be said of quite a lot of Romanus’ formulations. Furthermore, we have to regard that in all examples given by Romanus the adverbium either stands alone or is combined with a finite verb – never with an infinitive. For these reasons I would retain est and explain it as being a Grecism (that can be found elsewhere in Late antiquity; cf. Vulg. 2 Macc 7.14, Dion. gramm. 1.467.20) – be it deliberate or not.

As for the layout, there are clear improvements upon Barwick’s edition. The text appears no longer as a daunting, unstructured crowd of words, but is divided into several paragraphs; moreover, italics are being used to mark meta-language examples. All this results in a far greater clarity and readability. Notwith-
standing, the text is still hard to understand. So a translation and commentary are not only very welcome but very necessary as well; but translation and commentary are two different things and serve different purposes—at least they should, I think. A translation should be a faithful rendering of what the original text contains, free from both shortenings and additions; if the original is redundant, this redundancy should be reflected in the translation, and if the translation, by means of explanatory notes, tries to be more clear and distinct as the original, it tends to be no longer a translation but a mixture of translation and commentary.

This is what happens here. Sch. seems to have been unhappy and discontent with just translating Romanus, probably because a mere translation would inevitably have been as difficult to understand as the Latin text; so in order to avoid that he inserts annotations like «[i.e. the Greeks]» (81), «(a special kind of will)» (87) or «(as its child)» (89), which I would expect to be given in the commentary, not in the translation. On the other hand the commentary contains translations as well (which is no reproach, of course); but these partial renderings are sometimes different from what has been printed a few pages above within the continuous translation of the whole Latin text (cf. to 247.15 unde maxime confidit, 247.23–25 utaque ... aestimaverunt, 248.3 ratio subtilior, 248.4–5 interiectionis sensibis reseratavt, 248.23 ece ... adissit'). Such inconsistencies, however, correspond to similar cases within the preceding chapters (cf. e.g. the translation of 248.1ff with p. 57, of 251.1ff with p. 45 n. 52, and of 248.1 with p. 60 [see above]) and even within the translation itself, where Sch., in doubt about the correct rendering, presents two alternative versions (cf. to 247.21 orationem and 249.27 obscundet).

What is most strange to me is Sch.'s attempt to 'translate' even the examples used by Romanus, for instance when he renders the sentence Locis numque si fuerit adversarium, velut illic, istic, hoc, huc, illo, illuc, istoc, istuc, per se nihil faciet ... (248.9–11) as «Let us suppose that there is an adverb of place, for instance there, yonder, hither, to this place, thither, to that place, and thereto. Taken by itself it will achieve nothing ...». It is not only that one of the eight Latin adverbs is omitted (probably illoc because this one is absent on p. 62, too) and that the expressions 'to this place' and 'to that place' can hardly be classified as adverbs (but as adverbial phrases), so that the English phrase looks a bit peculiar where the Latin one does not. Even if there were equivalent English adverbs for all the eight Latin ones—the main point is this: Meta-language is language about a certain language with reference to this very language; Romanus is speaking about the Latin words illic, istic etc., not about the English words 'there', 'yonder' etc., and this is why it is not only sometimes difficult, but basically questionable (if not impossible) to 'translate' the meta-language elements of such texts: simply because such a 'translation' would not only be a change of the signifier, but at the same time a change of the referent. The limits of this line of approach become palpable ever and anon.

Two examples may suffice: 1. At 249.14 Romanus lists some so-called adversa dubitandi, viz. num, fortasse, and an—now how can these words be 'translated'? The English thesaurus is very rich, but there are simply no equivalents for num and an. Nonetheless Sch. tries to 'translate' them and gets the following result: «Is it? Perhaps, (question word)». Does this really make sense?

2. At 249.27ff, in order to demonstrate the phenomenon of collatio adversarium, Romanus says: iustus etenim factu iustus, dein iustus; superlatio iustissimae factum eis profitebatur. Sch. translates «For iustus (right) makes iustus, then iustus; the process of making a superlative will openly declare that iustissime has been created», thus conceding (as it seems) that a translation like «For right makes rightly, then more rightly etc.» would be inappropriate. Nonetheless he does not wholly abandon his usual method; but does he really suppose that there will be any reader of his book who needs to be told the lexical meaning of iustus? (And if so, shouldn't we say 'just' instead of 'right'?)

I have already pointed at some inconsistencies between the continuous translation and extracts from it that are cited in other chapters. Surprisingly, a similar
incongruity concerns this method of translating; because whenever parts of the translation are taken up in ch. II and ch. III (e.g. on p. 38), the Latin examples are always retained and never replaced by English equivalents … I wish this procedure had been observed throughout the whole book.

Finally, there are a few details in his translation (and in the commentary) that seem to be based on misinterpretations of the Latin text:

1. *qui tamen nullis sunt* (247.22f). Sch.'s translation («which attacks, however, are of no account») would be truly appropriate if the Latin text went *qui tamen nullius sunt*; in this case, however, I would prefer to write «which, however, don't exist».

2. *per se nihil facet* (sc. loci adverbium) *nec ullam poterit significationsis expedire caligem nisi cum verbo velut quaedam lux clarior et facies antevervetat* (248.11–13).

 «Taken by itself it will achieve nothing and will be unable at all to dissipate the mist in front of the meaning, unless it is coupled with a verb as if in the darkness some clear light is held in front of faces.» (Sch.).

A difficult sentence, as it seems. The main problem is whether *cum* should be regarded as being a preposition (a) or a conjunction (b). Sch. is unwilling to accept (b), because in this case *lux clarior et facies* must be a hendiadys, «but what is the meaning of *facies* here (‘shape’)?» (107). Now it has been suggested (by O. Hey in ThLL s.v. *facies* 44.72f) to alter the text by the slight conjecture *faces* instead of *facies*, but Sch. does only mention this without further discussion (which is all the more astonishing as in his commentary on 247.19 he does in fact take *lux clarior et facies* as a congeries and an example for Romanus’ redundant style). However, he disapproves (b) in favour of (a). In consequence, he has to disregard the conjunction *et* and to take *antevertet* as being used transitive, which is very, very unusual, but according to Sch. this construction is «possible, see L.–S. s.v.» (107).

Unfortunately, this reference to Lewis/Short leads into a dead end, because there is not a single evidence shown for the alleged (and desired) transitive use of *antevertere*. So it is a case of Hobson’s choice – we have to take *cum* as being a conjunction and therefore (by adopting Hey’s alteration of *facies* into *faces*) translate «unless when it precedes the verb like some sort of very bright light and torch in the dark.» (It may be noted that in the Latin examples constructed by Romanus the adverb does in fact always precede the verb.)

3. *et prius illud praevverbium an adverbium dici debeat disputemus* (252.21). Sch. translates «And let us first discuss whether this word (*saepenumero*) should be called preverb or adverb», because «as the text stands, *illud* must refer to the word *saepenumero*» (130). This is unsustainable. Indeed, some lines above Romanus had casually brought up the employment of *saepenumero*. But why should he therefore be interested in discussing whether this single word should be called ‘preverb’ or ‘adverb’? What he wants to (and afterwards effectively does) discuss is the nomenclature itself: How should the part of speech under investigation (the adverb) be called? So the pronoun *illud* is not anaphorically related to the word *saepenumero* but cataphorically to the following question (*praeverbium an adverbium dici debeat*); and an appropriate translation would be «and let us first discuss which term should be used: *praeverbium* or *adverbium*?»

Notwithstanding these objections, the commentary contains without question a lot of useful (and sometimes desperately needed) information to the single details of the text, and every reader will also appreciate that Sch. frankly admits when he does not succeed in resolving a certain problem (cf. to 247.22 *exitus*). It is also very welcome that in an appendix (133–140) Sch. thoroughly informs us about the Manuscript C and Johannes Cauchius, since this thread of transmission of Romanus’ text turns out to be quite intricate. The book is rounded off by a bibliography and a general index. But as I said before: the proof-reading should
have been more careful, because here of all parts (in the bibliography) quite a number of (not only typographical) errors have been overlooked.\footnote{References: V. Law, Late Latin Grammars in the Middle Ages. A Typological Study, HL 13, 1986, 365–380; P. L. Schmidt, Art. Grammatik. In: K. Sallmann (Hrsg.): Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike (= Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 8), Vol. 4: Die Literatur des Umbruchs. Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur (117 bis 284 n. Chr.), München 1997, 218–261; I. Taifacos, On a Citation of Julius Romanus in Charisius, CLPh 78, 1983, 148–149.}


Classical Elis had, by Greek standards, a very large territory, including the sanctuary at Olympia, and in addition established intermittent domination over a farther large area occupied by neighbours in the western Peloponnese. A sizeable academic literature has developed on its history, and on related archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic questions, but works of synthesis have been few, and that of Ruggeri (R.) is welcome. Such a work however faces the problem that evidence is patchy, and R.’s response is to concentrate on a period defined by two of the episodes for which we have somewhat better evidence: the Spartan-Elean war of c. 400 at one end and at the other the Peloponnesian conflicts that broke out in the aftermath of the battle of Leuktra in 371 and continued until the battle of Mantinea in 362.

By the end of the fifth century Elis had established control of the entire area of the western Peloponnese that was bounded by Achaia to the north, Arkadia to the east, and Messenia to the south: some of this area was made up of Elean territory proper, and the rest of a number of communities bound to Elis as subordinate allies and commonly referred to in modern scholarship as perioikoi of Elis. At the end of the Spartan-Elean war (for which R. accepts the date 400, while recognising that it is disputed) Sparta compelled Elis to free all the perioikoi, and there followed a period in which Elis tried, with limited success, to recover control of its lost allies, while they in their turn reacted in various ways to the recovery of freedom and to the political vicissitudes of the time. The developments of this period both in Elis itself and among the perioikoi form the subject of R.’s book.

Her work, an adaptation of a Vienna dissertation, is meticulously organised. A first section deals with Elis itself, and a second with the various perioic communities in turn (Triphylia, Akroreia, Lasion, the three communities of Letrinoi, Amphidoloi, and Marganeis, and finally Pisatis). The book closes with a concluding chapter drawing together main themes from the earlier sections. The main sections are subdivided into relatively brief numbered subsections so that the argument, both in detail and in its overall development, is presented with great clarity. Inevitably some pieces of evidence and some problems of interpretation are relevant to more than one subsection of the argument, and there is a certain amount of repetition, but it is generally limited by careful cross-referencing. R.