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In 1989 a colloquium on concepts of Greek identity was organized at the university of Strasbourg and the proceedings were published in 1991 (see this journal 48 (1995), 124-8). In 1990 the same university brought together some 25 scholars who gave papers and discussed the subject of Roman identity. This time, however, all contributions were geared to the question of the romanité, the Roman quality, as it appeared in grammar and rhetoric. Accord-
ingly, five interrelated themes were taken up: (1) Roman scholarship and Greek tradition, (2) Roman grammatical studies, (3) Roman rhetoric, (4) Grammar and rhetoric at Rome and (5) The practice of translation at Rome, as the editor states it in her introduction. The papers are apparently arranged into these groups and the individual groups are separated by one blank page, but sometimes the division eludes me and the index keeps to the alphabet order of the names of the contributors. It takes time to find out the intricacies of this arrangement and I have not always been successful, I must confess.

The papers are often full of interesting data and analyses: (1) Jürgen Blaensdorf, *Cratès et les débuts de la philologie romaine* compares Suetonius' report on the beginnings of scholarship as initiated by Crates of Mallos in 168 B.C. with what we know about the activities of the early grammarians and scholars. The reality is rather different from what Suetonius suggests. Gérard Freyburger, *Le savoir «philologique» du grammairien Censorinus* is a sound piece of scholarly work about the diverse activities of Censorinus.

In group (2) Frédérique Biville, *Tradition grecque et actualité latine chez les grammairiens latins: l’approche phonique de la langue* collects and discusses the many and various data and approaches of Latin grammarians concerning the pronunciation of their language. In *Signum et les noms latins de la preuve: l’héritage de divers termes grecs* Claude Mousse points out the similarities and, especially, dissimilarities between several Greek words for ‘proof’ and those in Latin, such as *signum*, *argumentum* and *indicium*. Yves Lehmann, *Varron et le grammairien Tyrannion* cautiously discusses Varro’s debt to Tyrannion in the matter of Aristotelian logic and method. Marc Baratin tackles the central theme of this volume in his paper *Remarques sur la place et le rôle du concept de latinité dans les grammaires latines antiques*. According to him, the original plan of the *ars grammatica* had two parts, one containing instruction on letters and words, the other dealing with *latinitas*, correct Latin. This plan, taken over from Greek τέχνη (S.E. M 1.91–3), has gradually been changed, witness the plan of the works of Sacerdos, Donatus, Charisius, and Diomedes, whereas at the end of Antiquity Priscian adopts a new model, that of phonetics, morphology and syntax. This change is connected with the concept of