By request I am reviewing these books myself, and I welcome the opportunity of stating the new and true theory of medieval Latin glossaries. Until the last ten years or so my notion of a glossary was taken from Loewe’s *Prodromus* and Goetz’s Pauly-encyclopedia article *Glossographie*, and this notion seemed to be shared by everyone. We all thought that each glossary was the work of a learned man of (say) the 7th century or earlier, who diligently read a large number of learned works—commentaries, grammars, etc.—of the ancient world (works now lost) and embodied in his glossary the lore which he had extracted from their pages. Each statement in a glossary seemed worthy of our respect. It seemed to be *ancient lore.*

And certainly the originators of the great German undertaking, the Latin Thesaurus, must have believed this with all their hearts, when they decided to include medieval glosses in this dictionary of Latin earlier than 600 A.D. Until quite recently the practice apparently was to include every gloss which happened to be mentioned in Goetz’s index to his *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Whether the glossary from which it came was of Charlemagne’s time or some centuries later, no matter; provided that it was mentioned in Goetz’s index, that secured for it an *entrée* to the great Latin Thesaurus.

Really, I must drop my pen for a moment and have a good laugh at the absurdity of all this. Here is a ludicrous example of the result to the Thesaurus. The Irishman, Martin, was Greek teacher at Laon in the second half of the ninth century. He was an Irishman, every inch of him, and amused himself and mystified his pupils by some weird Greek etymologies. The wine-jug (O. H. G. *hanapf*, O. Fr. *hanap*) was called in monastery-Latin *hanappus*. Martin derived the word from *ἀνά* and *ζόγ* and declared that it should be spelled *anaphus*. A Laon MS. in the Regina collection in the Vatican Library contains notes of Martin’s lectures (Vat. Reg. 215, foll. 112r-119r). Loewe, in his glossary-hunting tour, transcribed some of these notes, and Goetz published these extracts in vol. V of his *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (p. 583-586). Accordingly
the word *anaphus* appears in his index. Some guileless young member of the Thesaurus staff transferred it to p. 18 of vol. II of the Thesaurus (*anaphus*, *vas vinarium*, etc.). And, no doubt, *anaphus* will, sooner or later, appear in a German dissertation as an example of « Latin U for Greek Omega ».

Sooner or later a German dissertation on Latin Adjectives in *-du*s will include (on the authority of the Thesaurus) 'fibidus' (from *fido*). Here is the history of the word. In the Corpus Goetz has printed extracts from the huge Glossarium Ansileubi. One of them is:

*Figida tela : eo quod omnibus sint contraria; a figendo.*

Unluckily Goetz did not extract the gloss which immediately precedes it in the Glossarium Ansileubi:

*Figida Sathurnia stella : quod omnibus sit contraria.*

The two are merely variants of a gloss on Virg. Geo. I, 336:

*Frigida Saturni sese quo stella receptet.*

How annoying that the fair fame of the Thesaurus should be tarnished by such absurdities! Please understand that Goetz is not to blame. On the contrary, his Corpus has laid a solid foundation on which all future studies in Latin glossography will be based. He would indeed be to blame if he claimed that his treatment of Latin Glossaries was final, that his Corpus told us all that was worth knowing about them. But he makes no such claim. He acknowledges that he has not *edited* any glossary; he has left it to others to edit them. And Prof. Laistner has edited (in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, VII, p. 421-456) these amusing notes of Martin’s lectures (they are not a ‘glossary’; but of course Goetz could not be expected to know that). And the Glossarium Ansileubi is now edited in vol. I of Glossaria Latina.

Nor can we blame the Thesaurus-staff. They merely carried out the orders to transfer to the pages of the Thesaurus every item of Goetz’ index. The fact is that this false notion of medieval Latin glossaries was ‘in the air’. Everyone, from Ritschl’s time onwards, believed that they transmitted (some how or other) ancient lore. Any gloss, any item in Goetz’ index was believed to contain ancient lore.

Towards the end of last century a hint came from Henry Bradshaw, a hint which seems to have fallen on deaf ears in Germany. We all know that Germans have a habit of ignoring books written outside Germany (or Austria, or Switzerland, or Sweden). Probably none of the German authorities on Latin glosses had taken the trouble to read Bradshaw. If they had, they would have seen that the key which opens the secrets of medieval Latin Glossaries, the magic ‘Open Sesame’, is not *ancient lore*, but *glossae collectae*.

Bradshaw shewed that it was a practice of any medieval monastery-
teacher to transcribe for the benefit of his own pupils the marginal annotation in a neighbouring monastery’s MS. of Virgil or the Bible or any book used in monastery-teaching. In course of time, as has been explained in the Bulletin Du Cange (ALMA, I, 16), these ‘glossae collectae’ were arranged alphabetically. When that happened, a ‘glossarium’ was the result.

Now this marginal annotation was usually the mere work of some previous (or contemporary) monastery-teacher, the mere attempt of a half-educated man to explain to his pupils the difficult words in Virgil, the Bible, etc. It emanated from the brain of that teacher and was not (as a rule) transmitted from ancient times. The Latin Thesaurus therefore is merely soiling its pages by its painfully conscientious record of these worthless glosses.

It was not until I edited the Corpus Glossary (Latin-English) that the scales fell from my eyes. Luckily a Leyden Latin-English Glossary records the sources from which the Corpus glosses were taken, the authors whose ‘glossae collectae’ were arranged in alphabetical order and produced the ‘glossarium’. No one could edit the Corpus Glossary without perceiving that glossae collectae, not ancient lore, was the ‘Open Sesame’. How unfortunate that Goetz left this glossary (practically) untouched! (An apograph of the MS. in Corpus Christi College Library had been published in England by Hessels).

It was now clear to me that the false notion of medieval Latin glossaries could be dispelled only by editing as many of them as possible, and that the edition should, if possible, trace each gloss to its source: ‘This gloss was originally a marginal explanation of such and such a line of Virgil; that gloss was originally a marginal explanation of such and such a verse of the Bible, etc.’ But where were editors to be found? Who would finance the editions?

The opportunity came when the International Academic Union undertook a new Du Cange, a Thesaurus of Medieval Latin. Du Cange based his work greatly on Bishop Salomo’s glossary; the bishop had used an epitome of the Glossarium Ansileubi; the first thing for me to do was to get Ansileubus’ huge glossary edited. The British Academy’s patronage procured collaborators; the publication was financed by it and by the Association Guillaume Budé. And now, after many years of toil, vol. I of the Glossaria Latina (iussu Academiae Britanniae edita; publiés sous le patronage de l’Association Guillaume Budé) provides an edition of this monumental lexicon. Ansileubus (if he really was the compiler) was a worthy predecessor of Du Cange. Probably Adelhard, the famous abbot of Corbie, should get the credit; for apparently the compilation was made at Corbie in Adelhard’s time. And what a huge compilation it is!
(It fills, even with all our compression, over 600 printed octavo pages). What a noble record of French learning in Charlemagne's time! Really, my collaborators have cause to congratulate themselves on having provided for students a full (practically full) presentation of so glorious a national heirloom. It is true that the chaff greatly outnumbers the grain. But even in the chaff, even in these mere medieval interpretations, Romance-students will find interest. A gloss like

Serere : seminare,

shews *seminare* (Fr. *semer*) as the new substitute for *serere* (cf. Bulletin Du Cange, I, 16).

Every rule has an exception. And though, as a rule, medieval Latin glosses are worthless to the student of ancient Latin, one set of glosses in the Glossarium Ansileubi comes from a collection of Virgil-scholia based (mainly or at least partly) on Donatus' Commentary. By their help we shall recover much of that lost work of Donatus; but this will take some time, for the scholia have been split up into as many small glosses as could be made out of them. On Aen. 4, 335 (promeritam), Donatus (cf. Serv. auct. ad loc.) seems to have written something like this:

*Promeritus apud antiques dicebatur qui quid bene fecisset. Ergo promeritarn 'profuisse', 'praestitisse'. Contra commeritus qui aliquid deliquit, ut Terentius [Andr. 139] « quid conmerui aut peccavi, pater? ».*

Ansileubus (or shall we say Adelhard?) had ordered his staff to break up every item into as many small items as possible, the ideal item being that whose interpretation was of the minimum length. This scholiuim (or this part of it) accordingly furnished three small items, which were widely separated when a strict alphabetical arrangement was introduced:

- **CO 397** Commberitus : qui deliquit ut « quid (!)
- **CO 1167** Conmerui : aut peccavi, pater » (!)
- **PR 2354** Promeritus etc.

The next few years will, I hope, find students in all countries engaged on the task of piecing together these scattered relics of Donatus-scholia. Age, disiecta collige membra : habebis Absyrtum (Pref., p. 9).

In vol. II, I give the first place to a fragmentary glossary (A-F), the Arma Glossary, because it makes a good introduction to the study of Latin glossaries. Its alphabetical re-arrangement has not proceeded further than the A-stage (i.e. the recognition of the initial letter only). So the 'glossae collectae' which compose it retain plain trace of their original order. What is the result? We can assign each and every gloss to its source without any difficulty. The largest part of the material comes from (worthless) annotation of Virgil. For example, the glossary begins thus:

*Arma : bellum, id est pugna (Aen. I, 1).*
Aequora: mare vel planities (Aen. I, 43).

It was a lucky accident that Goetz had not room for Arma in his Corpus. Otherwise, all these worthless interpretations would have disfigured the pages of the Thesaurus. Other material was taken from two previous glossaries (Abstrusa and Abolita); the rest from a few 'glossae collectae' from a (lost) MS. of Terence (of the G-family), containing Andr. Ad. Eug., from a MS. of Lucan, from a MS. of Prudentius, etc.

Second in vol. II is the Abavus Glossary, well edited by Prof. Mountford. He shews that its material comes from (1) Abstrusa (2) Abolita (3) Philoxenus (a Latin version, though the Greek interpretations often remain along with the Latin). I could have wished that he had made it more clear that the peculiar feature of Abavus is its habit of repeating a gloss in reverse form. Thus it takes from Philoxenus (Apertularius: θυρησιονονκτης), the item

AP 1 Apercularius: offractor
and repeats it in reverse form

OF 6 Offractor: apercularius.

Any gloss peculiar to Abavus is likely to be a mere 'reverse' like this, and (though he mentions this practice of Abavus) I could have wished that he had laid more stress on it. And I could have wished that he had studied and explained to us the connexion of Abavus with the Cologne fragments published by Goetz in the Corpus and with the (much later) AA Glossary.

In the last glossary of vol. II, Philoxenus, I regret to find (from Goetz' review in Gnomon) that the editor, Prof. Laistner, has been inaccurate here and there in transcribing the apograph published in vol. II of the Corpus. Still, in my opinion, the chief thing is the tracing of each gloss to its source, and that has been (as Goetz in his review allows) well done. Laistner has shewn (far better than Dammann) how large a part of the material was 'glossae collectae' from Festus de Verborum Significatu. Practically everything in Festus that could be utilized for a glossary of this kind (designed as a class-book for the joint study of Greek and Latin) has been included. It reveals to us, if we read 'between the lines', a MS. of Festus of (say) the 7th century (why does Goetz ascribe Philoxenus to the 5th century?), a MS. in which a Greek monastery-teacher (in S. Italy?) had written (in the margins or between the lines) Greek interpretations of Festus' words. I could have wished that Laistner had refer-
red even more glosses to this source. For example, Paulus Diaconus’ epitome of Festus (65, 1) has:

Dilectus militum et is qui significatur amatus a legendo dicti sunt.

Why does not Laistner ascribe to this source the Philoxenus-item

DI 103 Dilectus : ἅγαπηθος, καὶ στρατολογια?

And I could have wished that Laistner had made more use of Cyrilus to correct and expand Philoxenus.

For all that, we have at last an edition of Philoxenus that is worthy of the name. We see at last how the compilation was made, and the source from which the compiler took each of his items.

In vol. III appear the two favourite glossaries of medieval times, whose glosses were borrowed by nearly every subsequent compilation, Abstrusa and Abolita. The edition was made possible by the edition of the Glossarium Ansileubi in vol. I; for Ansileubus used much better MSS. of these two glossaries than are now extant. If any critic is inclined to cavil « To what purpose is this waste? Why this edition of these glossaries after Goetz had published an apograph of the composite glossary of Vat. lat. 3324? », the reply is easy: « Look on that picture and on this. Compare the edition with the apograph ».

Prof. Thomson, who edits Abstrusa, refutes Wessner’s denial that Virgil-scholia provided most of the material, and refutes Goetz’ theory that Terence-glosses appear in Abstrusa. The two main sources seem to be Virgil-scholia and Bible-glosses.

The edition of Abolita is by the reviewer, who can hardly be expected to say unkind things about himself! The ‘glossae collectae’ come from Festus, from Virgil, from Terence and apparently (but certainty has not been reached) from Apuleius. However this review has been unconscionably long, and the necessity of bringing it to a close relieves the reviewer from embarrassment.

W. M. Lindsay.


Nel catalogo dei manoscritti della biblioteca Angelica dovuto a Enrico Narducci, al n. 1408 è registrato un codice pergamenaceo palinsesto, la cui scrittura superiore si riferisce a materia medica, l’inferiore a materia sacra. Della scrittura superiore ebbe ad occuparsi il Giacosa nel suoi *Magistri Salernitani nondum editi* distinguendovi due trattati: il *Liber aureus* di Giovanni Afflacio di Monte Cassino (ff. 1-16) e un trattato delle cure (ff. 20-59) che risalirebbe per una parte, la prima, al così detto
Passionario di Garisponto. Ora il Mohlberg ha fatto oggetto del suo studio la scrittura inferiore, e vi ha scoperto un Sacramentario palinsesto che per la grafia mista di onciali, semifonciali ed elementi corsivi può essere ascrivito a quella forma di scrittura che noi chiamiamo precarolina. A dir vero, questo non basterebbe per assegnare al codice una età troppo determinata. Ma agli elementi paleografici di giudizio soccorre un altro elemento di carattere interno più sicuro. Le messe, cioè, per i Giovedì della Quaresima, che troviamo nel Sacramentario, furono interdette da Gregorio II (+731). Tutto sommato, crede dunque il Mohlberg di non andare errato attribuendo il nostro palinsesto alla metà circa del secolo VIII.

Eguamente peculiarità grafiche e abbreviazioni caratteristiche concorrono ad assegnare al Sacramentario per patria l'Italia: così ancora la commemorazione celebrata nello stesso giorno, 25 marzo, della Adnuntiatio e della Passio Dni. A una ulteriore determinazione locale si arriva per via di altre considerazioni: il trattato di medicina dato dalla scrittura superiore accenna ai dintorni di Monte Cassino dove Giovanni Afflacchio fu monaco, e a quelli di Salerno, dove egli insegnò. Una filigrana di rime in favore di Salerno l'incertezza che potrebbe nascere tra le due possibili provenienze.

Stabilita la patria e l'età del Sacramentario, passa il Mohlberg a studiarne i rapporti con gli altri Sacramentarii e propriamente con i vani tipi dei Gelasiani, ai quali il nostro sembra accostarsi più da vicino. La limitazione a una sola delle formule della Secreta e il sistema per la indicazione delle domeniche dopo la Pentecoste: Dom. I post Ntl. Apostolorum, Dom. post Octabas Apostolorum inducono il Mohlberg a raggruppare il Sacramentario dell'Angelica col Liber Sacramentorum excarplus della Nazionale di Parigi, lat. 2296, e il manoscritto dello stesso nome della Biblioteca reale di Bruxelles, 10137-44, soprattutto col codice F 1/100 della biblioteca di Monza.

Alla interessante indagine segue la ricostruzione del testo, come suole avvenire nei palinsesti, lacunoso. Basta pensare che al principio manca tutta la parte che va dell'inizio dell'anno ecclesiastico fino alla Praefatio della prima domenica di Quaresima. D'altra parte con l'inizio della Colletta della festa dei SS. Felicissimo ed Agata il palinsesto è troncato. Pur tuttavia anche così mutilo il testo dell'Angelica offre un frammento importantissimo contenente circa 300 formule.

V. U.

Joseph Patrick Christopher. S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis (sic) episcopi De cathechizandis rudibus liber unus. (Thèse de

1. Cette forme est celle qu'à employée Goldbacher dans son édition critique des
doctorat de l'Université catholique de Washington.) Washington, D. C., 1926 (I-xxii, 1-365 p.).

Cette publication est un peu en dehors des ouvrages dont nous devrions exclusivement rendre compte, puisque le traité *De cathechisandis rudibus*, ayant été composé entre les années 400 et 405 de notre ère, appartient au VIe siècle, et non pas au Vr, époque à laquelle nous commençons notre enquête lexicographique et grammaticale. Mais les raisons que j'ai précédemment données (v. *ALMA*, t. II, p. 212), je puis les invoquer ici encore exceptionnellement.

Le livre de M. Christopher est matériellement un fort bel ouvrage, qui, comme toutes les publications de l'Université catholique d'Amérique, se recommande par la qualité de l'impression et du papier, ce qui, par le temps qui court, n'est pas un mince éloge. Mais le fond n'en est peut-être pas tout à fait aussi satisfaisant que la forme. Dès l'abord, on peut faire grief à l'auteur de sa bibliographie, qui est à la fois trop abondante et incomplète : on y trouve maints ouvrages qui n'ont qu'un rapport fort éloigné avec le traité étudié et on constate l'absence de livres et de mémoires où l'auteur aurait puisé des renseignements utiles.

Après une introduction de douze pages où sont étudiées les diverses questions que soulève le traité, notamment l'occasion et la date de la composition, les sources du traité, son importance, etc., M. Christopher publie le texte fondé, non pas directement sur la tradition manuscrite, mais vraisemblablement (car cela n'est dit nulle part) sur l'édition princeps (Bâle, 1506), sur l'édition de Louvain (Anvers, 1577) et surtout sur celle des Bénédictins de Saint-Maur (Paris, 1679) ; il est inutile de souligner les inconvénients et les dangers du procédé.

En regard du texte, se trouve la traduction due à M. Christopher lui-même, traduction qui me paraît en général exacte et fidèle, mais sur laquelle ma connaissance insuffisante de la langue anglaise ne me permet pas de porter un jugement raisonné et solide.

Vient ensuite le commentaire proprement dit, établi chapitre par chapitre, et auquel renvoient les numéros concernant chaque chapitre. C'est une suite de notes exégétiques, philologiques, grammaticales et littéraires, qui ont le grave inconvénient de ne pas offrir une idée d'ensemble de la langue ni du style d'Augustin dans le *De Cathechisandis rudibus*, mais qui, sans lien entre elles, présentent en les morcelant les observations suggérées par la lecture du texte ; ce système entraîne d'ailleurs à des redites, auxquelles on ne peut échapper qu'en encourant le reproche d'être incomplet. Je n'insiste pas sur la gène imposée au lecteur par la nécessité où il se trouve de feuilleter constamment le livre pour trouver...
dans le commentaire le renseignement dont il a besoin. Les notes constituant le commentaire sont d'ailleurs rédigées avec soin et d'après les données fournies par les ouvrages qui font autorité en matière de latinité chrétienne; malheureusement, on n'y trouve pas seulement l'essentiel, mais beaucoup de superflu; et j'entends par superflu ce qui est par trop connu, par trop élémentaire. Bien que touffu, le commentaire a paru incomplet à la lecture, puisque l'auteur l'a fait suivre de notes additionnelles (p. 325-338).

Si le corps de l'ouvrage composé par M. Christopher prête à quelques critiques, en revanche les Indices dont il est suivi sont très bien conçus et rendront de grands services.

Il y en a quatre (I. Subjects; II. Scriptures Texts; III. Latin Words and Phrases in the commentary; IV. General index to additional notes and appendix), qui rendent les recherches tout à fait aisées.

H. G.

E. A. Love. A New Manuscript Fragment of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica. (The English Historical Review, XLI, p. 244 sqq.)

Il Love informa, notizia certo interessante per gli studiosi di Beda, che si trova ora in possesso di A. Chester Beatty, proveniente dalla famosa collezione di Sir Thomas Phillips, un frammento di un manoscritto di Beda, sfuggito così alla diligenza dello Schenkl nella sua Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica, come a quella di posteriori ricercatori. Il frammento che viene ad arricchire per la Historia Ecclesiastica il numero delle testimonianze dell' 8° secolo, disgraziatamente consta di un foglio solo, contenendo solo parte della lettera di papa Vitaliano al re Oswy (III, 29) a cominciare dalle parole munuscula a vestrâ celsitudine, e il successivo capitolo 30. Una collazione con la edizione del Plummer dimostra la parentela del manoscritto con M, cioè Kk, V, 16 della Cambridge University Library, che è quasi contemporaneo dell'autore, se il manoscritto risale al 737 e Beda morì nel 735.

V. U.


L'opuscule du médecin Anthimus De observatione ciborum constitue, comme on sait, un document des plus importants pour l'étude du latin du moyen âge. M. Groen a bien mérité de la science en nous donnant un lexique complet de la langue d'Anthimus. Nous nous faisons un devoir et un plaisir de signaler à l'attention de nos lecteurs ce travail conscien-