THE PARIS « PLACIDUS »

1. The Paris Glossary. Gundermann first drew attention to the eleventh century Paris MS. (lat. nouv. acq. 1298, subsequently referred to as Par.) and Goetz has printed it under the title of Placidus Codicis Parisini (Corp. Gloss. Lat., V, p. 104-158). The following pages will indicate, amongst other things, how extravagant and misleading that title is.

In his monograph Der Liber Glossarum (p. 62) and in the preface to C. G. Lat., V, Goetz has dealt briefly with the glossary. He regards it as the descendant of a glossary which was also used by the compiler of the Liber Glossarum (for convenience, Lib.). In Par. Goetz sees three types of item (1) those culled from the Abstrusa glossary (2) items containing quotations from authors and (3) Placidus glosses. To this view nothing is added in the recently published vol. I of the C. G. Lat. Goetz indeed had done nearly all that could be done for a time. The Liber Glossarum was presented only in excerpts (C. G. Lat., V, p. 161-255), which, as the event has shown, frequently obscure the true facts. Wessner however, with a refreshing disregard of Goetz' title, has discussed this glossary again under the equally surprising heading of De Glossis Vergilianis (C. G. Lat., I, p. 369-382). Goetz had at least seen and examined several MSS. of Lib.; but Wessner is bold enough to base conclusions on the published excerpts which amount to less than one tenth of

2. Gundermann's apograph was checked by Goetz for publication in the Corpus and wherever I have tested it by the MS. I found it accurate. In this article references are to Goetz' pagination of Abstrusa and Abolita in vol. IV, p. 3-198; of Placidus in vol. V, p. 3-43; of Par. in vol. V, p. 104-158 of C. G. Lat.
3. Professor Lindsay gives a qualified approval of this view in Journ. Phil., 38, 265 and Dr. H. J. Thomson in Journ. Phil. 35, 277. In his study of Lib. (Class. Quart., XI, 129) however, Lindsay of set purpose avoids any reference to Par.
the whole of *Lib*. It is only after a detailed examination of the various MSS. of *Lib*. that any satisfactory study of *Par.* can be conducted. It is to be regretted that Wessner's ill-considered pages should find a place in a work of the permanence of the *C. G. Lat.*

That there is material demanding investigation is at once clear from the fact that of the 2500 items of *Par.* all but 280 are to be found in *Lib*. Of these common items 900 are not to be found with certainty in any demonstrable source of *Lib*. and more than 750 are not to be found at all in any other existing glossary whatsoever.

II. The Arrangement of *Par.* Before discussing the division of the material of *Par.* into three parts, it is important to realise that as regards arrangement the glossary consists of two well-defined parts, a Placidus part and a non-Placidus part. The Placidus items appear at the end of each AB-section and are themselves arranged according to the first two letters of the words (unlike the Placidus glosses of the Roman MSS. which are arranged according to the first letter only). Apart from the fulfilment of this condition however, the Placidus items appear normally in the same order as in the Roman MSS., as the following list will show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Plac.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126,48</td>
<td>= 35,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126,49</td>
<td>= 35,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126,50</td>
<td>= 35,9 + 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,1</td>
<td>= 35,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,2</td>
<td>= 35,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,3</td>
<td>= 36,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,4</td>
<td>= 36,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Plac.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127,5</td>
<td>= 36,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,6</td>
<td>= 36,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,7</td>
<td>= 36,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,8</td>
<td>= 36,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,9</td>
<td>= 36,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127,10</td>
<td>= 37,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compiler of *Par.* (or of its parent, if there ever was a parent) then, had a Placidus MS. not differing materially as regards order from the Roman MSS; from it he excerpted all the items beginning with the same two letters and added them at the end of his AB-sections (cf. 115,39-116,14; and 118,36-119,6). Sometimes he made a slip and commenced to copy out his Placidus too soon (cf. 114,8-7; 28-31); but it is rare that Placidus items are found out of their proper place.

The alphabetical arrangement of the non-Placidus sections is much stricter. Some sections (e.g. Pal-, Par-, Pat-, Per-), go by ABCD, though some (e.g. Na-), only by AB. But the great bulk of this part of the gloss-

---

1. In his text of *Par*. Goetz professes to put asterisks against items which are also found in the Roman MSS. or in his haphazard Placidus Libri Glossarum (*C. G. Lat.*, V, 44-104). On this principle there should have been asterisks at o. g. 107,27; 108,12; 110,6; 110,26; 111,35; 111,43; 129,17; 135,26; 137,6; 140,24; 147,15; 148,11; 156,42, etc.
sary has regard to the first three letters of the items. There are of course mistakes as in inevitable in such a work. Just as a stray Placidus item appears in a non-Placidus part, so a non-Placidus item appears in the midst of a Placidus group or at the end (e.g. 107,10; 112,38; 136,32; 152,7). When we discount these slight slips, one fact emerges quite clearly: Par. is a juxtaposition of Placidus and another glossary (or glossaries). It is also quite clear from the fact that the non-Placidus sections have normally a stricter alphabetical arrangement that they were so arranged at the time when they came into the compiler's hands. If the compiler had in front of him a mass of heterogeneous material including Placidus and non-Placidus items, the cleavage between the Placidus glosses and the others would be inexplicable. Consequently it must be held that if the non-Placidus items are themselves derived not from a single glossary but from several smaller glossaries, the fusion of those smaller glossaries (for fusion and not juxtaposition is the proper term to use in this case) took place at an earlier stage than the compilation of Par. (or its parent).

III. The Material of Par. It may at once be stated that Goetz' tripartite division of the material used in the compilation of Par. was the merest scratching of the surface. Wessner has seen further but even his analysis of Par. is not sufficiently full and accurate. The following list is based on a careful examination of every item:

(a) Placidus items found also in the Roman MSS. 320 (13 not in Lib.).
(b) Abstrusa items 560 (25 not in Lib.).
(c) Abolita items 190 (10 not in Lib.).
(d) Items containing quotations 82 (5 not in Lib.).
(e) Items labelled Virgili in Lib. 50
(f) Items found in Lib. and in works of Isidore 34
(g) Items found in Lib. and in Eucherius 13
(h) Remainder (many labelled De Glossis in Lib.) 1140 (230 not in Lib.).

To clear away misapprehensions it is necessary to discuss these various types of material in some detail.

(a). The use of a MS. of Placidus in the compilation of Par. is quite clear but some mention must be made of Goetz' suggestion (C. G. Lat., V, p. xii) that all glosses found in a Placidus section of Par., even if they are not found in the Roman MSS. of Placidus, are genuine. The theory would be more impressive if the arrangement of Par. had been

1. For Abstrusa and Abolita items I give round numbers since it is impossible in some cases to decide how an item is to be classified e.g. 119,48 is a mixture of Abstrusa and Abolita. In any case the position I hope to establish is not at the mercy of a digit.
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quite perfect. As the case stands there are a number of items in Placidus sections which are demonstrably not Placidus glosses; for example Abstrusa items may be found at 107,10; 120,44; 155,13 and Abolita items at 111,2; 113,25. It is true that an item which is not only in a Placidus section of Par. but appears also in Lib. with the marginal label Placidi, has a greater claim to consideration. Yet even this convergence of evidence is not a safe and infallible criterion since the labels Placidi and De Glossis are sometimes confused in Lib. Thus 118,3 comes from Abstrusa and 116,42 from Abolita even though Lib. labels them as Placidi. The position of an item in Par. and its labelling in Lib. only afford prima facie evidence for attributing it to Placidus.

(b) and (c). Goetz has recognised the presence of Abstrusa items; and his unwillingness to recognise Abolita items also is probably a result of his unwillingness to draw any distinction between Abstrusa and Abolita. Wessner (C. G. Lat., I, p. 375) thinks of a glossary contaminated from Abstrusa and Abolita as being the source from which these items were derived by Par. (or its parent). The fact however that some items of Par. are a mixture of Abstrusa and Abolita (e.g. 119,48) may be the result of compression on the part of the scribe of Par.\footnote{1}

(d). The quotation items are held by Goetz to have formed a separate glossary. I have elsewhere indicated (Class. Quart., XV, 192) the likelihood that these items have been taken from the original, fuller form of Abstrusa (Abstrusa maius) of which our existing MSS. are only an epitome; and in a subsequent investigation I hope to show in detail that the great majority of these items could have come from such Vergil scholia as we know to have been the foundation of Abstrusa maius. Wessner (loc. cit.) is not attracted by the idea of a fuller form of Abstrusa and is forced to explain these items by referring them to Vergil scholia (directly and not via Abstrusa), Lucan scholia, Statius scholia, Glossae Terentianae and the notes taken by the compiler as he read through Plautus, Cicero, Sallust, Solinus, Dracontius and Sedulius. To this view there are two serious objections. In the first place it increases (unnecessarily, I believe) the number of original sources on which Par. is based immediately. « Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem. » In the second place it assumes that the compiler was a learned man who read widely and critically with a view to making his glossary. That mediaeval glossaries did not come into being in that way should have been clear from the very first paragraph of Lindsay's Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries. Of course the lemma of a quotation item is not always a Vergilian word; but that does not mean that the item is

\footnote{1}{Conversely 133,34 = Plac. 39,6 even though its label in Lib. is de glossis.}

\footnote{2}{In a similar way the scribe of the Tours MS. (No. 861) of the Liber Glossarum has avoided the repetition of a lemma word in order to save space.}
not derived from a Vergil scholium by way of Abstrusa maius (cf. my note on Fungeretur in Class. Quart., XV, 192).

If Wessner's theory is not satisfactory, that of Goetz has only one point which might be pressed in its favour. At 145,27-9 a reader will find a cluster of quotation glosses where the alphabetical arrangement is only by the first two letters (cf. 156,43-4). Though a warning might be given against laying too much stress on groups of items in a glossary which has reached the AB-stage, Goetz would have had some justification in adducing these groups (had he noticed them) in favour of his view. But the groups in fact do not prove his case; for they may quite as well be groups of items from Abstrusa maius as groups from a separate quotation glossary. For the rest, Goetz has not attempted to define the limits of this supposed glossary nor has he satisfactorily indicated the purpose of its composition; and there is nothing in the new volume of C. G. Lat. to refute the view I previously expressed (loc. cit.).

(e). The items which appear also in Lib. with the label Virgili are all trivial and of little worth (e. g. 110,12; 114,13; 116,48; 119,37; 132,4; 140,38; 148,20). They are of a very different nature from the learned and quotation items which are derived from Vergil scholia by way of Abstrusa maius; they seem rather to have come from glossae collectae which originated in the margin of a copy of Vergil. When we get a group of them we find that they come in the order of the lines of Vergil (141,34 from Aen. 2, 374; 141,35 from Aen. 2, 545) In Lib. these trivial Vergilian items normally occur in pairs, both referring to the same line of Vergil; and it would seem that the compiler of Lib. had at his disposal not only a set of glossae collectae similar to that used by Par. but a second set of minor Vergilian glosses. The strict alphabetical arrangement of Lib. has mechanically brought the pairs together. It should be stated that there is no such pair of items in Par. and we may safely conclude that only one set of these minor glosses was used in its compilation.

(f). Wessner's account of the Isidore items (C. G. Lat., I, p. 375) is worthless. There are nearly twice as many Isidore glosses in Par. as Wessner discovered; and not three of then, but all of them are to be found in Lib.\(^1\). It is also difficult to believe that one of Wessner's three

---

1. The following Isidore items of Par. appear in Lib. with the label Esideri : 112,13 (= Et. 9, 2, 94); 117,1 (= Et. 10, 177); 119,16 (= Et. 14, 8, 38); 120,40 (= Et. 10, 187); 123,6 (= Et. 10, 196); 132,28 (= Et. 10, 231); 137,25 (= Et. 10, 218); 137,31 (= Et. 10, 221); 137,34 (= Et. 14, 9, 4); 139,6 (= Et. 10, 231); 143,36 (= Et. 10, 237); 143,28 (= Et. 10, 235); 151,21 (= Et. 10, 244); 154,32 (= Et. 10, 249); 155,23 (= Et. 10, 266).

The following Isidore items of Par. appear in Lib. unlabelled : 105,14 (= Diff. 211); 106,25 (= Et. 10, 112); 107,12 (= Et. 19, 22, 3); 110,8 (= Et. 10, 115); 119,34 (= Diff. 300) but Goetz attributed it to Placidus); 120,35 (= Et. 10, 187); 124,28 (= Et. 10, 197); 130,26 (= Et. 10, 221); 131,40 (= Et. 10, 251); 141,37 (= Et. 10, 255); 142,46 (= Et. 10, 234); 145,46 (= Et. 10, 252); 147,19 (= Et. 10, 253); 148,1 (= Diff.
examples (i.e. 142,49) did actually come direct from a text of Isidore especially since Lib. labels the item de glossis. Let us turn to the question: was Isidore a source of Par.? The majority of the items in question coincide with Book X of the Etymologies; but the field is wider than that one book and extends to the Differentiae as well as to the other books of the Etymologies. Now if all these 34 items are taken, as Wessner holds, immediately from the works of Isidore, it is surprising that so wide a field has yielded so little. It is true that the Orosius glosses of the Leyden Glossary, for example, form only a small proportion of the total; but they are confined to Books I-II of Orosius, and are therefore not strictly analogous to these Isidore items of Par. Even if it be admitted that Par. is only an epitome of its presumptive parent, 1 Isidore item in 70 is still a low proportion when we consider the enormous amount of material in Isidore which a glossary compiler would scarcely be able to resist. Furthermore the coincidence of a glossary item with some part of Isidore is always liable to misinterpretation since Isidore himself used not only Placidus but Vergil scholia such as may have appeared also in Abstrusa maius. There is consequently no small amount of probability and cogency in the view that here in Par. we have some items which have come ultimately from the same source as the Isidore passages but have reached Par. by way of Abstrusa rather than immediately from the text of Isidore. Indeed very definite indications are not wanting that such was the case; and two items of Par. which I have not included in my list of Isidore glosses will serve to strengthen my argument:

Par. 142,49.

Remex quomodo tubex dicitur nominativo casu; non autem tubex sed tubicen dicendus est ut [tubicen] cornicem.

Isid. Et. 19, 4, 6.

Remex vocatus quod remum gerit; sic autem remex quomodo tubex dicitur nominativo casu.

1. Goetz and Wessner, believing that there is a common parent of Par. and Lib, quite logically regard Par. as an epitome. Some of the items in Par. are certainly compressed versions e.g.

106,39 Gripes quadrupedes dicuntur grippides... Par.; but — Gripes quadrupedes volucres Donatus ait grippides... Lib.

107,2 Grossus suas id est fico... Par.; but — Grossus suas de fico ait id est... Lib.


158,1 Tipo figura vel draco Par.; but — Tipo figura and Typho draco Lib.

All such compressions however only indicate that the compiler has not used all the material he had in front of him. Whether that material were a single huge glossary or a number of smaller ones remains an open question.

2. For example, 312,5 = Plac. 31,7 = Is. Et. 15, 8, 6 (unlabelled in Lib.) and
Where did Par. get its additional matter? Certainly not from a text of Isidore; and it is too learned to be attributed easily to a glossary compiler. On Aeneid 4, 588 a scholiast, we may suppose, had made the comment « Remex, quomodo tubex, dicitur nominativo casu »; then one of his successors or some teacher using his commentary had corrected his absurd mistake thus: « Non autem tubex sed tubicen dicendus est, ut cornicen. » Par. and Isidore are both drawing on the same source but the correction has survived only in the glossary.


Prodigium ut Varro ait unum de quinque rebus est quae sunt ostentum, portentum, prodigium, miraculum, martirum.

Here again the items are not close enough to one another for Par. to have copied from Isidore; but they are sufficiently close for us to see that behind them there is a common source; and that common source was almost certainly Vergil scholia.

These difficulties nevertheless do not compel us to assert that all the Isidore items of Par. are derived from Isidore’s source rather than from his own works. Such a position would not easily be maintained. Indeed I regard it as fairly certain that Book X of Isidore was made use of by the compiler. It is a book which is easily detachable from the rest of the Etymologies and one which would be very useful in every monastery. I submit however, in view of the small number of items from the other parts of Isidore (2 from Et. IX; 3 from Et. XIV; 4 from Et. XIX and 3 from Diff.) and in view of the two items of Par. discussed above, that the items outside Et. X were with almost equal certainty derived by way of Abstrusa maius from those Vergil scholia which Isidore himself had chanced to use1.

The fact that some of these items are found in Lib. with the label Esidori need not cause any difficulties since we know that Lib. used Isidore directly as one of its’ sources. The compiler of Lib., when confronted with two versions of the same item, one from his copy of Isidore and the other from the same kind of source as that from which Par. has derived some of its items (i.e. Abstrusa maius), took the obvious course and referred the item to the more definite source2.

115,40 = Plac. 31,20 = Is. Et. 17, 7, 6 (labelled Placidii in Lib.). Wessner (p. 380) admits Isidore’s use of Vergil commentaries.

1. Of these items the following are close to Servius: 105,14 (Aen. 2, 407); 119,16 (Aen. 11, 326); 137,34 (Aen. 1, 58). These look very like scholia: 107,12 (Geo. 1, 52); 119,34 (Geo. 1, 137); 148,1 (Geo. 2, 256); 156,9 (Aen. 3, 689). But 112,13 and 156,9 are to be regarded as excerpts from scholia.

2. 122,17 and 133,3 are wrongly labelled Esidori in Lib. The labels Ciceronis at 122,27 and Galani at 133,26 are also errors in Lib.
(g). The Eucherius items, not recognised by Wessner (unless his reference to Sacred Scripture on p. 380 is an unlucky guess at them), all come from Book II of the Instructiones. It might be held that 132,3 comes really from a Graeco-Latin glossary; or that 132,30 is an Itala-item of Abstrusa maius; or that all of them are derived from interpolations in the MSS. of Abolita (cf. Lindsay, *Journ. Phil.*, 34, 278). But seven of the items appear in groups: 141,8-9; 144,45-6; 145,41-3. The last group where the ABC-arrangement is broken is suggestive and it is highly probable that Eucherius, *Instruc.* II was drawn upon. But, someone is sure to ask, why do you accept Eucherius and yet refuse to accept all Isidore as a direct source? Firstly the presence of groups is strongly in favour of the view that these items came direct from Eucherius, whereas the only genuine group of Isidore items (154,36-7) consists of two glosses from Book X. Secondly the Eucherius items have all come from a well defined area, Book II, whereas the Isidore items are spread over the Etymologies and Differentiae. Thirdly there are no items which would lead us to suppose that we have to do with the sources of Eucherius rather than with Eucherius himself.

(h). There remains over for consideration a large number of items which cannot at once be claimed for any of the preceding classes; and the majority of them are not to be found anywhere else except in *Lib.* They fall however into three quite distinct groups:

1. A number of items, generally long and learned, come from Abstrusa maius. Dr. H. J. Thomson (*Journ. Phil.*, 35, 269 seqq.) has already pointed out the lines along which we can safely work in reclaiming lost Abstrusa items; and after weighing his arguments and Wessner's objections I can see no alternative to accepting Thomson's position. He has already pointed to some items of *Par.* which are probably derived from this source, e.g. 128,30; 141,16; 147,22; 149,2; 151,49; 153,26. But there are others for which an equally strong claim can be made:

(a). Items which contain the name of Donatus and may therefore have come from a set of scholia based on Donatus, e.g. 114,4; 123,14; 149,14. We should also add 106,39 and 128,41 where *Par.* but not *Lib.* has omitted the name.

(b). Items which are similar to existing Vergil scholia and therefore may have appeared in Abstrusa maius. Thus with 129,62 (omitted by *Lib.*), *Patulum dicitur quo naturaliter pateat*, we should compare Servius in Ecl. 1, 1 *TU PATULAE patulum dicimus quod patet naturaliter.* With

---

1. The following are labelled *Eucherius* in *Lib.*: 109,16 (= Eu. 160,10); 129,1 (= Eu. 148,8); 132,3 (= Eu. 149,11); 132,30 (= E. 143,21); 141,8 (= E. 141,12); 144,46 (= E. 144,16); 144,46 (= E. 146,23); 145,41 (= E. 140,12); 145,42 (= E. 147,23); 146,43 (= E. 150,16).

The following are unlabelled: 119,27 (= E. 147,15); 120,17 (= E. 160,15); 141,9 (= E. 146,31).
147,22 (omitted by Lib.) Scipiones duo avus et nepos. alter vi\textless c\textgreater tae Cartaginini legem dedit, alter eam diruit et aravit qui et postea Numantiam c[o]epit, compare Servius in Geo. 2, 170 Scipiones autem duo fuerunt, avus et nepos; quorum unus leges victae Cartaginini imposuit, alter eanden diruit. With 150,30 (a quotation item, be it noticed) Sinus, sinum \textless \textit{n}\textgreater \ textit{fuit antiquitus. Virgilius « sinum lactis et haec te \textless \textit{liba}, Priape, quodannis expectare sat est »}. Varro quidem dixit tribus hunc a Romanis nominibus vocitari: primo lepriscam deinde galenum tertio sinum; pro quibus nunc acrataforum nominant iuxta graecum. nam Plautus (Curt. 82) « eine hic sinus fertur » analyse Servius etc. in Ecl. 7, 33 \textit{SINUM LACTIS} sinus genus est vasis... Varro de vita populi Romani aut lepestam aut galeolam aut sinum dicebant: tria enim \textit{haec similia sunt}, pro quibus nunc acrataforon dicitur.

(\textit{\textsection}). Learned items which, though not found in Servius or other extant scholia, nevertheless suggest a commentary may also be claimed to have come from Abstrusa maius. Thus 107,17 from a scholium on Aen. 4, 73; 112,15 from a scholium on Geo. 2, 4; 128,38 from a scholium on Geo. 1, 448 and 147,23 from a scholium on Aen. 1, 200.

(\textsection). Items which are not in our MSS. of Abstrusa but appear in derivative glossaries such as Sangall and Affatim. Thus with 119,23 (Naviter : studiose vel fortiter) compare Sangall (IV, 260,220 : Naviter : strenue studiose fortiter utiliter) and Affatim (IV, 540,19 : Naviter : studioseae). With 119,26 (Navere : strenue officium facere) compare Sangall (IV, 260,34 : Navere : strenue officium facere) and Affatim (IV, 540,21 : Navere : strenue officium facere).

If then we speak of Abstrusa as a source of \textit{Par.} we must bear in mind that there are present in \textit{Par.} not only items found in our existing MSS. of Abstrusa but many items (including quotation glosses) which formed part of Abstrusa maius.

2. It is also quite clear that \textit{Par.} contains a number of items derived from insignificant Vergil marginalia (\textit{not} scholia), even though these items are not labelled \textit{Virgili} in \textit{Lib.} Some indeed are one of pair which we find in \textit{Lib.} and there is no doubt of their origin. For example, 104,18 (cf. Aen. 2, 472); 134,40 (cf. Aen. 1, 728); 134,55 (cf. Aen. 9, 276); 145,24 (cf. Aen. 11, 487). There are others which, though they stand alone in \textit{Lib.} and are neither labelled nor coupled with similar glosses, are clearly from the same source, e. g. 137,37 (cf. Aen. 1, 2); 138,17 (Aen. 2, 17); 138,48 (Aen. 5, 269); 139,27 (Aen. 7, 509). A group not to be found in \textit{Lib.} is of some interest, i. e. 137,2 (Aen. 1, 470); 137,3 (Aen. 1, 488); 137,4 (Aen. 2, 403); 137,5 (Aen. 2, 760).
3. Finally there are items which seem to have come from a Graeco-Latin glossary. Normally they are short (e.g. 130,35 Pege : fons graece) but in some cases they run to greater length and seem based upon a formula (e.g. 104,19 Fronimos sapiens graece; bene ergo fronomyn<notat>us sapientissimus. cf. 106,33; 106,36; 116,21; 150,8; 155,26). Some of these items may have come from Abstrusa or Abolita; but the presence of groups (e.g. 116,19-20; 148,8-9) and the stereotyped formula justify us in thinking of them as extracts from a separate glossary of the Hermeneumata type.

In the compilation of Par. (or its parent) there were used: (a) a fuller Abstrusa than we now possess; (b) Abolita; (c) Placidus; (d) a collection of glossae collectae from Vergil marginalia; (e) Isidore Etymologies, Book X; (f) Eucherius Instructiones, Book II; (g) a Graeco-Latin glossary. Apart from these sources I can find no other well defined type of item in Par. and how well the items of Par. can be referred to these sources will be clear from the subjoined analyses of the NA-and RA-sections:

119,7 A so-called quotation gloss, derived by way of Abstrusa maius from an idiotic scholium on Verg. Ecl. 2, 46.
119,8 Abstrusa maior, from scholium on Verg. Ecl. 2, 48.
119,9 Graeco-Latin gloss (graece add. Lib.).
119,10 Graeco-Latin gloss (?) (Labelled de glossis in Lib.).
119,11 Graeco-Latin gloss.
119,12 Graeco-Latin gloss [Lib. adds graece and labels de glossis].
119,13 Probably Abstrusa maius. Lib. adds in Cantica Canticorum (cf. Song of Solomon, 1, 11). Compare also the extant Abstrusa item (C. G. Lat., IV, 122,11 = Par. 119,21) of which this present item perhaps was originally a part. Notice this is from a comment on an Itala-text of the Bible and not from a Vergil scholium.
119,14 Abstrusa maius, derived from scholium on Verg. Ecl. 10, 10. Lib. labels as de glossis but Goetz attributes it to Placidus (C. G. Lat., V, 86,4).
119,16 Lib. labels Esidori (Et. 14, 8, 30). Par. gets it from a scholium on Aen. 11, 329 by way of Abstrusa maius.
119,17 Abstrusa 122,6. Lib. labels de glossis. The item coincides with Plac. 35,3 and with Affatim (IV, 540,12).
119,18 Abstrusa 122,10 shortened.
119,19 Abstrusa 122,8 + 9. For similar compressed version cf. Affatim (540,4).
119,20 Abstrusa 122,15.
119,21 Abstrusa 122,11.
119,22 Abstrusa 122,14.
119,25 Abstrusa 122,37 (N. : efficax) together with part of Placidus 35,3. See also Par. 119,35. Lib. omits this form of the items.
119,26 Abstrusa maius. Cf. Sangall (260,34), Affatim (540,21), Amplon. I (374,46) and Amplon. II (312,35). Lib. omits.
119,27 Eucherius, Instruct. II, 147,15.
119,28 Vergil gloss on Aen. 2, 138.
119,29 Plac. 33,32. No label in Lib.
119,30 Plac. 33,34. No label in Lib.
119,31 Plac. 33,37. Lib. labels Placidi.
119,32 Plac. 33,38. Lib. labels Placidi.
119,33 Plac. 34,3. Lib. labels Placidi.
119,34 Abstrusa maius, derived from scholium on Geo. 1, 137. Coincides with Isidore, Diff. 390. No label in Lib. Goetz attributes to Placidus.

A similar analysis of the RA-section follows:

141,4 Vergil gloss on Aen. 6,421.
141,5 Abolita 162,54.
141,6 Abolita 160,12.
141,7 Vergil gloss on Geo. 2, 60. Lib., probably in error, labels de glossis.
141,8 Eucherius, Instruct. II, p. 141,12.
141,9 Eucherius, 146,12. This item also appears in Sangall (IV, 278,5).
141,10 Abstrusa maius? Appears also in Abavus (IV, 384,33).
141,11 Abstrusa maius, derived from a scholium on Geo. 1, 446. Coincides with Isidore, Et. 19, 29, 1. No label in Lib.
141,12 Abstrusa 159,46. Lib. makes two items of this.
141,13 Another version of the preceding. Lib. labels de glossis.
141,14 Abstrusa maius. Cf. Affatim (560,16) and Par. 141,17. Lib. makes into two items.
141,15 Graeco-Latin gloss. Labelled de glossis in Lib.
141,16 Abstrusa maius, derived from scholium on Geo. 1, 155. See Journ Phil. 35,271.
141,17 Abstrusa maius? Cf. note on Par. 141,14 above.
141,18 Abolita 160,13.
141,19 Abstrusa 160,11. Lib. makes two items.
141,20 Abstrusa 160,9.
141,21 Abstrusa 160,4.
141,23 Abolita 160,16.
141,24 Abstrusa 159,50. Lib. omits.
141,25 Abstrusa 160,3.
141,26 Unde? Lib. labels as de glossis.
141,27 Vergil gloss on Aen. 9, 104. Read « immobile ».
141,28 Vergil gloss on Aen. 1, 59.
141,29 Goetz attributes to Placidus, perhaps rightly. Lib. labels Pla-
cidi.
141,30 Lacks an interpretation which may be found in Lib. (See C. G. 
Lat., V, 96,8). Goetz attributes to Placidus in accordance 
with label in Lib. Notice this and preceding gloss break 
the ABC-arrangement and may therefore come from the 
same source.
141,31 Vergil gloss on Aen. 1, 483. Lib., perhaps in error labels de 
glossis.
141,32 Vergil gloss on Aen. 2, 305.
141,33 Vergil gloss on Aen. 2, 356.
141,34 Vergil gloss on Aen. 2, 374. Lib. labels Virgili.
141,35 Vergil gloss on Aen. 2, 545. Notice the items are in the 
sequence of the Vergilian lines.
141,36 Isidore, Et. 10, 237. Lib. labels Isidori.
141,37 Isidore, Et. 10, 235. No label in Lib.

B

We are now in a position to discuss Goetz' theory that there was a 
parent of Par.; that this parent was anterior to Lib.; that its items were 
labelled according to the sources used; that this parent was used by the 
compiler of Lib.¹. It should be quite clearly understood that by a parent 
Goetz means a MS. of which Par. is, if not a facsimile, at least an epi-
tome; and as we have seen when discussing the arrangement of Par., 
that parent must have been similarly arranged into Placidus and non-
Placidus sections. No one can indeed deny that behind Par. there are a 
MS. of Placidus and a glossary compounded out of several smaller glos-
saries. But the real question at issue is whether there existed previous 
to Lib. a glossary similar to Par. in that it contained both Placidus and 
non-Placidus material.

1. That Par. (of the eleventh cent.) is not copied from Lib. is shown by its less 
strict alphabetical arrangement; that it is not copied from an early form of Lib. 
is shown by the number and type of additional items it contains.
I. Relation of Par., Lib. and other Glossaries. The chief argument on which Goetz relies is that behind Par. and Lib. there is a common recension of the Placidus, Abstrusa and Quotation items. In the space at his disposal Goetz did not illustrate his statement and since some corrections are necessary, it will not be out of place here to give some account of the relations of Par. and Lib. when we compare the text of their items with the texts afforded by independent manuscripts.

(a). That the Placidus items of Par. and Lib. are fairly closely connected and depend on a recension which differed somewhat considerably from the archetype of the Roman MSS. of Placidus, in details if not in order, is shown firstly by the fact that Par. and Lib. agree in fusing two items into one or dividing one item into two:

107,34 = 72,20 = 25,4 + 5.
108,43 = 73,23 = 25,31 + 32.
114,29 = 82,7 = 31,14 + 15.
126,50 = 89,4 = 35,9 + 10.
121,10 + 122,24 = 87,4 + 9, = 34,13.
151,36 + 37 = 99,18 + 19 = 41,11.

Many reading also of Par. and Lib. agree with one another and diverge from the Roman MSS. The following groups should be compared:

111,47 = 80,3 = 30,12. 120,45 = 86,25 = 33,35.
114,31 = 82,12 = 29,45. 154,36 = 100,21 = 40,15.
117,19 = 85,10 = 32,6.

Notice also that 133,4 (= 92,5) is a piece of 38,14 which is also found in its full form at 138,37 (= 95,5).

(b). The Abstrusa items of Par. come from a recension similar to that of some of the Abstrusa items of Lib.; and this recension can be identified neither with that of the pure Abstrusa MSS. (c and d) nor with that of the composite Abstrusa-Abolita MSS. (Vat. and a). Goetz (Der Lib. Gloss. p. 63) has declared that the text of Par. is nearer to a than to Vat.; but he seems to have been misled by his failure to distinguish between Abstrusa and Abolita items (cf. supra). The real facts about the Abstrusa items of Par. and Lib. is that on the whole they are nearer to cd than to Vat. a but in a number of cases they are equally at variance with Vat. a and cd. The subjoined selection should make the position clear:

Abstr. 85,40 Heluo : vorax insatiabilis Par. Lib. cd vel luxuriosus
add. Vat. a.
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Latinum : per syncopen latinorum. Lib. per sync. om. Par. (cf. Aen. 1, 6).

Abstr. 109,9 Limpaticius : quasi fanaticus qui ex aqua divinat Vat ad aqua quasi div. Par. Lib. c.


Abstr. 131,43 Officit : infacit aut obest. Vat. a; om. d infecit Par. Lib. c.

Abstr. 136,32 Pantheos deus qui se omnes habet significatores quasi omnium deus Vat. ed Pantheus Lib. a Plateus Par. in se Par. Lib. significationes Par. Lib. a.


Abstr. 174,35 Spectacula ubi omnia publicis visibus provetur Vat.; om. d puplici usibus praebetur a spatio add. c praebet inspectio Par. Lib.

Abstr. 183,18 Tergiversatur : eludunt aut frustratur Vat. elidit Par. elidit Lib. ac.

Lib. however seems to have made use of another Abstrusa MS.; for as Dr. Thomson points out (Journ. Phil., 35, 278) Lib. preserves a longer and a shorter form of the same item. The presence of two streams of Abstrusa glosses will also explain some pairs of items in Lib. which at first sight seem mere doubles due to the insertion of a corrected form side by side with the wrong form. We can now see that in some cases one version has come from the same kind of source as an item found in Par., while the other version has come from the second Abstrusa MS. used by the compiler of Lib. Thus compare:

Plantario : sive pomario sive horto. Par. Lib.

Plantario : horto vel pomario. Lib. Vat. ac.

Refragatur : dissentit aut demutat Vat. dissentiat c aut om. c.

Refragatur : dissentit remutat Par.

Refragatur : dissentiit. demutat remutat Lib. (three items)².

1. Abstr. 160,4 is interesting : Rarescunt : pauci fiunt Vat. ac. In an Abolita section Vat. repeats thus; Rariscunt : rari fiunt vel pauci. In Par. we have the version : Rarescunt : rari fiunt aut parte fiunt. Lib. has several tries at it : Rarescunt : rari fiunt; Rarescunt : pauci fiunt; Rarescunt : patefaciunt; Rariscunt : pauci patefiunt.

2. Compare also C. G. Lat., V, 215,18 with Par. 111,22 and 215,17 with the Abstrusa item preserved in acd after 104,33. A group of Abstrusa items in the
(c). The Abolita items of Par. and Lib. (not recognised by Goetz) agree frequently with one another with a distinct tendency to be nearer a than Vat.:

Abol. 85,59 Hedium : pie diuium Vat. a praedium Par. Lib.  
Abol. 106,28 Lena : tota duplex vestis Vat. a toga du. vel vestis regia Par. Lib.  
Abol. 113,7 Manticulant : fraudare vel furare Vat. Manticulam a Manticolare Par. Lib.  
Abol. 121,7 Mutuo : vicissim aut de accepte funere dono Vat. invicem vicissim Par. Lib. a donum a; om. Par. Lib.  
Abol. 140,31 Perflexa : multis conligata modis Vat. a inutilis conligat Par. Lib.  
Abol. 159,27 Quo sub caelo : sub quam partem Vat. a qua caeli parte Par. Lib.  

At Abol. 164,37 (Rite more consuetudine), which Vat. omits, there seems to have been a double entry in the family of MSS. used by Par. and Lib.; for the item appears in two forms in Par. Lib. : more consuetudinis and rome consuetudo (nome Lib.).

(d). For the remaining items there is no standard whereby we can easily compare Par. and Lib.' In the case of Isidore and Eucherius, indeed, any such attempt would be absurd since it is certain that Lib. made use of texts of these authors quite independently of any possible use of a parent of Par. In the case of the so-called quotation items, where Par. and Lib. agree in absurdities, our evidence would only enable us to say that these absurdities were to be found in Vergil scho- lia or in Abstrusa maius; it would not enable us to say that Par. and Lib. were using « the same recension » — for to speak of « recensions » in a case like this is merely nonsense.

NA-section where the alphabetical arrangement has not gone beyond the AB-stage would seem to indicate that the Abstrusa MS. used was not in the same order as Vat. (Par. 119,17-22).

1. I give a few examples of the agreement of Par. and Lib. in absurdities:  
109,14 (illiniantes for Initiantes); 110,28 (a meaningless hoc); 112,15 (ab eo for a leno); 117,47 (raccatur for bacchatum); 128,14 (repeated as 130,2 and 133,14 under the same forms as in Lib.); 131,51 (stant perfossam for Status perfossus); 133,31 (Pediunt for Perduint); 145,29 (altos raperent ruorem tunderem for ceteros ruorem agerem raperem tunderem); 148,9 (meaningless, id est iuxta); 149,14 (Junonis for Didonis); 152,13 (toblite for tribuo; maris and matri for maturis); 156,28 (Tellorem: terrorrem for Tallurem: terram).
II. Weakness of Goetz' Theory. (a). When dealing with glossaries it is much more easy to prove a connexion between two MSS. if it exists, than to demonstrate satisfactorily that the one MS. cannot possibly be derived from the other. The items are disjointed, arranged like a dictionary and not always perspicuous at a glance; and at every stage in their transmission serious errors can and do creep in, largely because the scribe's interest is not aroused. A large number of discrepancies is consistent with a very close connexion between two glossary MSS. To point out divergencies in the readings of Par. and Lib. would therefore prove very little; it certainly could not be held as a final and convincing proof that there was no connexion. It must therefore be borne in mind that in the preceding pages I have been over-emphasising Goetz' case and that these examples of coincidence (the best I could honestly find) will in isolation look more significant than they really are. There is another point also of considerable importance. Our knowledge of the Spanish MSS. of glossaries is very defective. In the early middle ages Spain was one of the homes of learning. Placidus reached Spain before the time of Isidore; but except Par. we have no Spanish MS. of his glossary. Abolita came originally from Spain; but our MSS. are Italian. If therefore we knew more about Spanish MSS. we might easily find that the similarities between Par. and Lib. are not so very remarkable after all. At the same time we may go so far as to admit that Par. and Lib. are both based on similar recensions of Abstrusa, Abolita and Placidus. Concerning the other types of item we can say nothing of the kind. Are we justified in following Goetz when he infers that Par. and the relevant parts of Lib. are related as the descendants of a common parent? If we mean that Par. copied all its items (and Lib. a selection) en bloc from a composite glossary of which Par. is almost a facsimile, the facts just adduced simply do not prove the case. In the first place a common recension can only be postulated in respect of three sets of items; in the second place Par. and Lib. may both have derived their items from similar but separate MSS. of the constituent glossaries. If we mean that Par. and Lib. each took the items from the same MSS. of Abstrusa, Placidus and Abolita, we are not only postulating a strange coincidence but we are still going beyond our facts. All that can safely be said from the evidence is that behind Par. and Lib. there are similar MSS. of Placidus, Abstrusa and

1. That Par. and Lib. are not inseparables may be seen from these few items taken only from the MA-section: 114,41 (id est maior facte om. Lib.); 114,48 (megis autem aut magne puer Lib.); 114,48 (conficit Lib.); 114,66 (no interpretation Lib.); 114,58 (multitudo Lib.); 115,6 (Malacum : medicamenta Lib.); 115,9 (velim Lib.); 115,16 (genus masculinum and ad mones imos Lib.); 115,37 (Maturum et quam graeci Lib.); 115,41 (Maturium et maturissimum Lib. cf. Pluc. 31, 21); 116,12 (habeat and cogitat Lib.); 115,13 (malas movere quasi manducando Lib.).
Abolita. Furthermore our ignorance of Spanish glossary MSS. prevents us from saying how significant that similarity may or may not be.

(b). Goetz only considered Abstrusa, Placidus and « Quotation » items. It may be said that his case is strengthened by the presence of Isidore, Eucherius, Vergil and Graeco-Latin items in Lib. and Par. and that something more than coincidence is at work when the sources of Par. are found to have been sources of Lib. too. Yet precisely the same thing might have been said about the relation of the Leyden Glossary to the EE-Glossary and the Corpus Glossary. All three are based on six or seven common sources (Phocas, Rufinus, Orosius, Jerome, Gildas, etc.). It will however be quite clear to the reader of Lindsay's Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries that these glossaries are neither based on one another nor on a common parent; but that each drew on the same kind of available material, each excerpting independently. So far from analogy supporting Goetz' theory, the most striking parallel to the relation of Par. and Lib. is unfavourable. Abstrusa, Abolita and Placidus items we must remember are not confined by any means to Par. and Lib. Copies of these glossaries were common enough in Spain and Aquitaine and were likely to contribute their quota to the compiler of every fresh glossary (e.g. Sangall, Affatim, Amplonian I and II, EE). To think that the presence of Abolita, Abstrusa and Placidus items in Par. and Lib. is a strange coincidence, would be merely to show ignorance of the history of glossaries. Nor was Isidore a rare author in Spain (whence Par. comes); Eucherius even managed to get some of himself interpolated in Abolita MSS. We are only left with a common set of Vergil and Graeco-Latin glosses; and they surely are quite ordinary sources for a compiler. In short the material of Par. is just the ordinary material which any glossary maker in Spain or in the south of France would have within reach; and the presence of the same material in Lib. is the mildest of coincidences. Any argument based on it is more specious than sound.

(c). We find that one item in ten of Par. does not appear in Lib. The compiler of Lib. seems to have set out to create a record for size in the matter of glossary making. So far from desiring to save space wherever he could, he deliberately increased the size of his work by cross references and doublets. If he found an Abstrusa item in two slightly different forms he put both into his glossary. That he should have had the « parent » of Par. before him and have left out 1 item in 10 surely requires some other explanation than exigencies of space or gross carelessness. The most obvious solution of the difficulty would be to suppose that Par. itself has added some items which were not in the « parent » and consequently did not appear in Lib. But of these items omitted by
Lib., 13 are Placidus, 25 are Abstrusa, 10 are Abolita, 5 are "quotation" items and the remainder are not a coherent group. Unless we think the scribe of Par. indulged in original research of a rather extensive kind, we must believe that almost all these items were found in the "parent". We are therefore compelled to fall back on another explanation and think of Lib. as based not on the supposed parent of Par. nor on the identical MSS. from which Par. (by one method or another) has derived its items, but based on MSS. of the various glossaries which, though in some cases belonging to the same family as the sources of Par., differed in details of omission and insertion.

(d). It may be a minor point, but it is certainly significant that Par. has no marginal indications of the source of the various items whereas Lib. has thousands of them. As we shall see in a moment, three MSS. exist which are reported to represent the same glossary as Par. If it is not rash to trust the silence of Goetz (though he knows the importance of stating such evidence if it exists), none of these MSS. have marginal labels attached to the items. Now if Lib. and all these four MSS. are based on a common parent, is it not strange that Lib. alone should have preserved the labels? Scribes did not mind copying out labels as we can see from the 11th. century Vendôme MS. of Lib. which has as many labels as the Paris, Palatine and Tours 9th. century MSS. The obvious inference is that Lib. did not get its labels from the "parent". Nor did the compiler obtain his items from the "parent" and invent the labels. No! He used a separate MS. of Placidus and wrote the label Placidi in the margin as each item was copied out. Each item of the various MSS. of anonymous glossaries, such as Abstrusa, Abolita and the Graeco-Latin collection he labelled de glossis. He had two collections of minor Vergilian glosses, knew their source, and labelled them as Virgili.

(e). Let us consider the position at which we have arrived. We have seen that the similarities of text do not necessarily mean that Par. and Lib. used a common parent in Goetz' sense of the term; and that the analogy of the Leyden and Corpus glossaries shows that the use of common sources does not necessarily imply derivation from a full-grown parent glossary. Thus Goetz' two lines of argument are not conclusive. In addition to this however, the omissions of Lib. are no less difficult to explain than is the presence of labels in Lib., on Goetz' theory. Furthermore it should be noticed that we have hitherto tacitly accepted Goetz' assumption that the "parent" of Par. was anterior to Lib. Had Goetz' main arguments stood the test, we should have been compelled to admit the anterior existence of a parent; for to have denied it would have been illogical. We are now free however to discuss this question without laying ourselves open to the charge of arguing in a circle.

If the "parent" of Par. existed before the compilation of Lib. its
latest possible date would be the year 700. It must also have been arranged like Par., that is to say the into Placidus and non-Placidus sections; for had these sections been fused in the parent, Par. could not have separated them again and would indeed have had no motive for doing so. A glossary was intended for use and its usefulness depended solely on the ease with which a word could be found in it; and that again depended on the strictness of its alphabetical arrangement. It was an inevitable tendency of glossaries therefore to achieve a better arrangement at every transcription. Can we believe that this parent of Par. was an exception and did not undergo alphabetical improvement in transmission between the eighth and eleventh centuries? The easy solution of the difficulty is to say that Par. is copied directly from the parent without any intermediary. In that there is nothing at all impossible; but it is an assumption which must be held to weaken Goetz' general position.

(f). Par. is an eleventh century MS. from Silos in North Spain. A fragment of another copy of this glossary found at Prague by Prof. P. Lehmann is also Spanish of the 11th. century or later. There are also two Paris MSS. (lat. nouv. acq. 1296, 1297) of the 12th. century which contain glosses similar to those of Par. (together with items from Absitus and Jerome) 1. So far then as our evidence goes we cannot say that the glossary of which Par. is a representative existed before the eleventh century.

III. The Real Relation between Par. and Lib. The matter can be put quite concisely. Lib. contains items from Absitus maius, Abolita, Placidus, Eucherius and Isidore together with minor Vergilian and Graeco-Latin glosses; Par. is based on Placidus and another glossary compounded of Absitus maius, Abolita, Eucherius, Isidore, Vergilian and Graeco-Latin glosses. The coincidence is not remarkable. The Absitus, Placidus and Abolita items of Par. and Lib. have probably come from MSS. of the same families but several features of Lib. forbid us to think that Par. and Lib. are descendants of a parent composite glossary. Par. and its associate MSS. are not earlier than the 11th. century and are not far removed from the stage of compilation. No date can be assigned for that compilation, though it is clear that the non-Placidus parts of Par. existed in their present form before they were incorporated in Par. itself.

J. F. Mountford,
The University, Edinburgh.

1. See C. G. Lat., I, p. 305.