Doriana Corazza’s (C.) book is the tenth volume of the Collectanea Grammatica Latina, the Weidmann series that aims to provide modern readers with (new) editions of late antique grammatical texts.\(^1\)

The book, written in Italian, is divided into four main parts: an introduction (XXXIX–CXLIII) that presents the results of the textual research underpinning the editorial work; the text and apparatus of the main treatise (*Commentarium de ratione metrorum*), followed by a translation (1–88) and a commentary (89–161); an appendix (163–181) with the text and apparatus of five other shorter treatises; a second appendix collecting lists of further textual material (183–231). The volume is framed by a bibliography (IX–XXXVIII) and three indexes and the table of contents (235–248).

The texts edited by C. mainly consist of prosodic rules concerning the quantity of syllables and aimed to help understanding and reproducing classical metre. Late antique students and scholars of Latin classical poetry had to deal with verses displaying prosodic patterns which were not immediately comprehensible. Some prosodic features of classical metre were already artificial, because they were inherited from earlier practice or Greek prosody, or because they were purely metrical conventions, and could only be learnt as technicalities. Other phenomena of classical metre reflected a prosodic system which had become obsolete in late antiquity. In particular, in late Latin the quantities of vowels were no longer clearly perceived by speakers, since the quantitative system of earlier Latin was gradually developing into a qualitative system, in which vowel length did not have a phonemic value. Consequently, Latin users needed external guidelines to help them to establish or remember the length of vowels and syllables, in order to scan or compose a line according to the rules of classical metre.

These prosodic and metrical guidelines probably originated as individual notes, of different quality and genesis, intercalated into other works as prosodic and metric additions. These notes were eventually collected into treatises, after having undergone varying degrees of editorial work, often attributed to some authoritative grammarian, imaginary or not. Collections of this kind proliferated in late antiquity, and were exposed to further re-editing, abridgements, or expan-

---

\(^1\) Bibliography quoted:
- Carnoy, A.J. (1906), Le latin d’Espagne d’après les inscriptions: étude linguistique, 2nd ed. (Brussels).
The didactic nature of these texts favoured reciprocal contamination, a situation complicated by the alterations in the textual transmission. The result of this is a *mare magnum* of texts and manuscripts, in which it is often difficult to establish chronological relations, or even just to distinguish between treatises and sections of treatises, between different works and different versions of the same work.

C.’s work is a further stage in this complex editorial history and a (successful) attempt at making some order out of a chaotic tradition. The main texts she collects under the name of *Commentarium de ratione metrorum* were already edited by Keil in his monumental work *Grammatici latini* (GL): a work known in GL as *De ratione metrorum commentarius* (GL 6.216–228) attributed to an otherwise unknown Maximus Victorinus, presumably a fictitious figure associated with the famous grammarian Marius Victorinus; and a treatise *De finalibus* [*metrorii*] (= *De finalibus metrorum*, GL 6.229–240.10)¹ ascribed in some manuscripts to an elusive Metrorius, a name which looks like an orthographical corruption of the title (*metrorum > metrorius*).

In her book C. offers a new critical edition of these works (5–64), based on a fresh and comprehensive collation of all the manuscripts (c. forty), only a few of which had been used by Keil. This research has been done with care and expertise, and its outcomes include:

- a new text, which is generally superior to that of Keil, although the differences do not always change the meaning significantly (the full comparison of the two editions is given by C. in the appendix at 224–231);
- a rich apparatus (perhaps occasionally a bit too rich), complemented in the appendix by a long list of *lectiones singulares* (183–218) and orthographical variations (219–223);
- a convincing stemma of the tradition, presented in the introduction (XLIV–L), and based on a careful collection of conjunctive and separative errors (listed at CXVI–CXL);
- a description of the manuscripts preserving the text or parts of it, including both those used for the *constitutio textus* (LXXXVI–CXIII) and those excluded as *descripti* (CXIII–CXVI);

C.’s most important and exciting editorial contribution, however, concerns the history of the formation of the collection, which is at the basis of her decision to assemble the texts under a single heading (*Commentarium de ratione metrorum*), and also to print two versions of the text on facing pages (36–63), for a large extent of the *De finalibus* [*metrorii*] (sections XVI–XXV = GL 6.231.4–239).

The reconstruction of this editorial history is presented in the introduction (XXXIX–LXXI), and is generally clear although at times the reader risks to be confounded by the density of the presentation and by the several homonymies (e.g. the heading *De finalibus* has more than five potential referents). I will not enter into the details of the underpinning evidence, but C. reconstructs two main editorial interventions in the history of the text, both dated by her to the 5th century (cf. XLII and LXVI).

---

¹ Cf. below p. 326 n. 1.
Accordingly, the first editorial intervention produced the core part of the section *De finalibus [metrorii] (31–64)*, which is an outline of the length of final syllables for the eight parts of speech (noun, pronoun, verb, etc.). This outline (36–63) was presumably created by someone collecting individual notes, pre-existing as prosodic additions to the *artes* of Donatus, into a unitary and independent school manual, itself referred to by C. as *De finalibus*. A descendant of this manual is found in ten manuscripts and its reconstructed text is printed by C. in the even pages of 36–63 (= GL 6.231.4–239).

The second editorial intervention produced the treatise which C. labels *Commentarium de ratione metrorum*: according to C.’s convincing reconstruction, at a certain point someone merged the independent manual *De finalibus* (36–63 = GL 6.231.4–239) with some other prosodic and metrical material, in order to fabricate a sort of comprehensive treatise on the prosody of classical poetry, for didactic purposes. This resultant treatise includes: a discussion of some prosodic phenomena of Latin metre (sections I–VI), such as (in modern terms) sigmatic eclipsis, *muta cum liquida*, shortening in hiatus, lengthening before *caesura*, and the prosody of Greek and personal names; some metrical notes, concerning proceleusmatics (section VII), hypermeters (section VIII), and *caesurae* (section XXVI); a section on the length of syllables, both final (sections IX–X.1) and internal or initial (X.2–X.4), the former type outlined in tables (in a pattern different from that of *De finalibus*), the latter explicated with the help of examples and the *paenultima*-rule; a general account of letters and syllables (sections XI–XV); finally, the manual *De finalibus* itself (sections XVI–XXV = GL 6.231.4–239), in a redaction which however presents some textual features distinguishing it from the autonomous version, and which C. prints in the odd pages of 36–63. ¹ C. identifies also some connecting and summarising sections (X.5, XI.1, XV), presumably inserted by the compiler in order to give unity to the treatise. The identity of the compiler is uncertain and the spurious name of Maximus Victorinus may simply suggest that some of the added material originated as additions to the *Ars* of Marius Victorinus.

C.’s reconstruction sheds light on the genesis of late antique grammatical treatises and is a significant step forward from previous editions (outlined at LI–LVI), especially in so far as it emphasises the unity of the *Commentarium de ratione metrorum*, which was not recognised by Keil. One could perhaps dispute the choice of printing on facing pages the two versions of *De finalibus*, on the left page the autonomous manual, on the right the components of the *Commentarium de ratione metrorum* (sections XVI–XXV); the textual differences between the two versions are not always significant and perhaps could have been laid out in the apparatus and analysed in the commentary, not least because the book is

¹ This version of the manual *De finalibus* (sections XVI–XXV), the general prosodic account (sections XI–XV), and the section on *caesurae* (section XXVI) are together referred to as *De finalibus [metrorii]*, and were edited by Keil as a single treatise (*De finalibus metrorum*, GL 6.229–242). In Keil’s edition this treatise also includes the section *Ad Basilium amicum Sergii* (GL 6.240.11–242), which is excluded by C. for reasons discussed in the introduction (LXXI–LXXVII).
presented as an edition of the whole Commentarium de ratione metrorum, and not of the De finalibus.

Besides her editorial work, C. offers an accurate and useful translation of the Commentarium (65–88) and a commentary on the text (89–161). The commentary is mainly a collection of parallels from other late antique grammatical texts, often quoted at length. C. is rightly cautious about attempting to establish chronological relations; one of the exceptions is the emphasised dependence of the Commentarium on the Anonymous ad Caelenitum.

However, the reader cannot help but wish that C. had extended her useful and detailed analysis beyond the grammatical corpus: in fact, C. rarely comments extensively on the phenomena considered in the treatise and on their significance for the study of late antique language and culture. I will give a few examples.

Section I.2 deals with the prosodic omission of final -i (sigmatic echlipsis). Although the phenomenon is explicitly linked to earlier Latin (antiqui ... utebantur) ‘Victorinus’ seems also to associate it with a contemporary, new and vulgar use (inerudita adhuc noutate). C.’s brief note at 93 talks of a «fenomeno riemerso nel sermo plebeus fin dall’epoca post-classica». The situation is more complex and would have deserved a longer discussion. The evidence for the loss of final -i in late antiquity is scanty and problematic, at least until the fourth century (cf. e.g. Carnoy 1966: 79–99, Viānānem 1966: 77–81), and later is regionally diversified. Moreover, sigmatic echlipsis in late antique texts looks like a conscious archaisms rather than a vulgarism (cf. e.g. Butterfield 2008: 188 n.2), as C. seems to suggest.

In other cases, one finds in the treatise some non-classical forms and scansion, linguistically significant, on which C. fails to comment: e.g. the sigmatic forms faxis and fæcitis (X.1 p. 24), the present odio (X.2 p. 27), or the scansiones nāmera, sōdeo (ib.). Occasionally there are interesting divergences in the two versions of De finalibus: e.g. the form cornū is scanned (correctly) cornī in the version of α, while β gives the shortened wrong form cornū. On shortening of final syllables in general one would have expected some extensive discussion somewhere.

In section IV ‘Victorinus’ uses the interesting phrase contra naturam et consuetudinem Latinorum. C.’s note at 106 is not satisfying: she notes that the term consuetudo is used five times in the treatise, but does not discuss its meaning, nor does she comment on the term natura, which may even evoke some naturalistic theory of language. The matter deserves proper attention and cannot be dismissed as a «fossil della disputa tra analogisti (natura) e anomalisti (consuetudo)». First, the association between natura and analogia is not obvious, as often the two concepts are distinguished (cf. e.g. the list of Varro quoted by Diomedes at GL 1.439). Second, the two terms belong to a technical terminology which is standard in late antique treatises (cf. also the concepts of ratio and auctoritas mentioned at XIX.1); it would have been useful to have a full treatment of these notions, or at least some references to relevant literature (e.g. Siebenborn 1976: 56–96).

Finally, in section X.5 the compiler of the treatise justifies the study of prosody as a propaedeutic stage within a didactic path leading to the learning of rhetoric: a description of the school curriculum in late antiquity and of the features and role of the grammarian (cf. e.g. Kaster 1988) would have been useful.

Despite these occasional flaws, the commentary is learned and helpful, and it offers an exhaustive compilation of grammatical material relevant to each topic treated in the Commentarium.

In the appendix of the book C. adds the text and apparatus of five other prosodic treatises, mainly dealing with the length of final syllables: De syllabis; Regulae de finalibus; Coronati scholastici de finalibus; De primis, medisis et ultimis syllabis; and De finalibus syllabis omnium partium. The nature, content, and
genesis of these texts, of which C. is the first modern editor, are discussed in the introduction (LXXI–LXXXV): in conjunction with the Commentarium de ratione metrorum, they contribute to an overview of the learning of metrical prosody in late antiquity.

The volume has been carefully proofread and I have not found grave errors or misprints (some minor points are listed below).

XLIII n. 8: C. mentions a tradition ‘visigotico-insulare’ for De finalibus and ‘continentale’ for the Commentarium de ratione metrorum. These notions recur in the commentary (159) but are not developed and remain unclear to the reader.

XLIV (the stemma): the family labelled ψ in the stemma is referred to as υ later in the introduction (XLVIII second line of the second paragraph).

LIX n. 50: on the loss of perception of vowel quantity as an African vice a reference to Adams 2007 (esp. 260–5) would have been desirable.

LXXVII: I am not sure whether a syntactic divergence such as that between a structure with a concessive + main clause (quamquam … tamen) and that with two coordinates (quidem … tamen) can be taken as evidence for arguing about relations between different treatises.

7 line 6 (text) and 66 (translation): the phrase quorum altera would be better translated in the context as «una delle quali» (one of which) rather than «delle quali la seconda» (the second of which), since in the context the ‘liquid’ (i.e. final -s) is the first consonant, not the second.

120 note on antenouissimus – non potest: apart from Sacerdos, one could also mention the distinction between synaliphe and ectlipsis found in Consentius (28–9 N.), the former apparently involving loss of the first vowel, the latter loss of the second vowel.

In conclusion, C.’s book is a very useful contribution to the study of late antique grammatical texts and an excellent example of editorial work, conducted with expertise and rigour: her volume will remain for long the standard reference work for these texts.

Oxford

Giuseppe Pezzini


With Boethius and Cassiodorus, Ennodius is one of the authors who provide first-hand information about the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy. Annotated editions of this churchman’s Life of Epifanius and Panegyric of Theodoric are essential to the historical literature of Late Antiquity, while canonists and ideologues of Papal power have treasured his Libellus pro Synodo for over a millennium. In contrast, Ennodius’ correspondence has generally been less than appreciatively received save by practitioners of the ars dictaminis. Compared to his explicitly topical compositions, Ennodius’ letters have been little read and less understood in recent centuries because of their consummate literarity and unwavering allusiveness. His devotion to the art of rhetoric and the delectation of his readers wove a shimmering web of words that enveloped even the most mundane concerns and situations while hiving off bulky matters of substance into now-lost