The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Festus Glosses in a Monte Cassino Ms. (No. 90)

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 31 / Issue 5-6 / August 1917, pp 130 - 132

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00009045, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00009045

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1917). The Festus Glosses in a Monte Cassino Ms. (No. 90). The Classical Review, 31, pp 130-132 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00009045

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Virgil - commentary (by Donatus ?) Bovinatur: tricatur, insidiatur. The last word, curtailed (in glossary fashion) to *insidi*, has become 'insidiat' and 'insidiosus' (as well as 'insidiatur') in MSS. of Abstrusa and in the various glossaries which borrowed from Abstrusa. The first word often appears as Bovinator.

Which interpretation is right? I plump for *conviciari* 'to bellow abuse'; for 'Donatus' may have invented for the verb an interpretation to suit his (erroneous) interpretation of the noun. The case stands as follows. For the verb *bovinari* we have two witnesses, Verrius and ps.-Placidus, to the interpretation *conviciari*. And this interpretation suits the obvious derivation of the word from *bos*. For the noun we have two independent witnesses, ps.-Placidus and 'Donatus,' to the interpretation *inconstans*. I try to explain this away as a mistake produced by a marginal gloss on the preceding word in Lucilius' line, *tricosus*. Will those

who refuse to explain it away let us know how they in their turn explain away the patent connexion of the verb *bovinari* with the noun *bovinator*.

But we have also evidence for the interpretation of the noun *bovinator* as 'conviciator' or 'clamans' or the like. The Philoxenus Glossary, which drew a considerable part of its material from Festus, shows *Bovinatores*: *θορυβοιοί, θρῦλον ποιούντες ἢ παραχῆν*. This calls up the picture (a mere imaginary picture) of a Festus lemma like this: 'Bovinari: conviciari, ut' (here follows a quotation of a line of, let us say, Lucilius); 'unde bovinator: conviciator apud Lucilium (417): si tricosus bovinatorque ore improbus duro. Nam bovinatores dicebantur qui clamorem faciebant,' etc. Anyone who prefers to believe Paulus' *Boviniatur: conviciatur* to be a mere misreading of Festus' *Bovinator: conviciator* may abandon the first half of this imaginary lemma.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE FESTUS GLOSSES IN A MONTE CASSINO MS. (No. 90).

THE Oxford Palaeography Lecturer, by clearing up one dark spot of Latin palaeography, the South Italian MSS., has set in a new light some of the glossaries used by Goetz for vol. V. of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Cass. 90 we now know (cf. Loew, *Beneventan Script*, p. 343) to be a mere eleventh-century MS., and (to judge from its use of abbreviation-symbols like *sr* 'super,' *gš* 'gentes') nearer the twelfth century than the tenth. The picture called up by Goetz (*Nova Meletemata Festina* 1887) and Landgraf (*Arch. Lat. Lex.* 9, 169 ff.) of a MS. of Festus at Monte Cassino excerpted by Paulus Diaconus and drawn upon by the compilers of *Vat.* 3321 (with *Cass.* 439) and of *Cass.* 90, all that picture vanishes now that we know the truth about these glossaries (so correct the Teubner Festus, p. xix). Elsewhere I hope to prove that *Vat.* 3321 (written rather in Central Italy in the eighth century, than in Southern Italy in the seventh) was transcribed, mediately or immediately,

from a Spanish exemplar, and owes its Festus glosses to the Spanish compiler of a glossary which I call the 'Abolita Glossary' (the glosses printed within square brackets in *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV. pp. 4-198). Here I will try to strip *Cass.* 90 of its borrowed plumes, plumes that rightly belong, most of them, to *Vat.* 1469. This Vatican MS., written (in Central Italy, I think) in the year 908, does seem to contain a number of Festus glosses transferred directly from a MS. of Festus. Some of them are printed by Goetz in vol. IV., p. xviii, some appear among the Excerpts printed in vol. V., pp. 520-528; but a re-examination of the MS. is necessary before full details can be given. So much however can be asserted here, that the Festus items common to *Vat.* 1469 and *Cass.* 90 must be ascribed to the earlier MS. rather than the later; items like 565, 5-6 'Ceres, frumentum vel panis, Liber vitis vel vinum, Venus libidinem vel olera, Neptunus aqua <m> vel pisces, Vulcanus ignem vel solem

significat; "Cocus ēdit Neptunum, Cererem et Venerem experta<m> Vulcanum, Liberumque pariter obsorbuit": id est, cocus comēdit pisces et panem et olera cocta ad ignem et vinum pariter bibit' (cf. Paul. Fest. 51, 11).

Similarly the Festus items common to the AA Glossary (see the Excerpts in vol. V., pp. 435-490) and Cass. 90 must be ascribed to the AA Glossary rather than to the eleventh-century MS., since we know from Dr. Loew that of the two South Italian MSS. used by Goetz, Cass. 401 and Vat. 3320, the first belongs to the tenth century, the second to the ninth (*Benev. Script.*, pp. 350, 362). This Glossary, a South Italian compilation (to judge from the Greek interpretations in its Virgil glosses), drew from a different MS. of the Abolita Glossary than Vat. 3321 (and Cass. 439) and has preserved many of the Virgil and the Terence glosses of Abolita which are not to be found in Vat. 3321. So we may infer that its new Festus items are merely Festus glosses of Abolita which were omitted by Vat. 3321. (Further details I hope to give elsewhere.) It is therefore rather the compiler of the AA Glossary whom we have to thank for such Festus items of Cass. 90 as 562, 18 'Avillus: agnus recens <n>atus (cf. 442, 10 Avillus: agnus recens natus)'. Indeed the St. Gall Glossary (IV. 201, 11) has the same item, taken either from Abolita or from a full Philoxenus Glossary; and these Italian collections often seem in close touch with the St. Gall Glossary.

Of Vat. 1468 (excerpted by Goetz in vol. V., pp. 490-519) we learn from Dr. Loew (*Benev. Script.*, p. 152) that it was written in the eleventh century not in the usual type of South Italian script, but rather in what he calls the 'Bari type' and locates in 'Dalmatia as well as the south-eastern portion of the Italian peninsula'; so that it too is banished from Monte Cassino. These two eleventh-century MSS., Vat. 1468 and Cass. 90, share that puzzling item which Landgraf too rashly used to complete a Lucilius citation in Festus: 'Remil<Δ>us: repandusius (repandus vis Cass.) remanens per una (ima Cass.) via' (512, 50; 577, 45); but in Vat. it is added by a contemporary hand. The

Festus gloss of Abolita has been preserved in the form 'Remillus: repando, pronulo.' This may represent 'Remillus: repandus, pronulus (or perhaps "prominulus"),' or else 'Remillum: repandum, pronulum (prominulum).' The exemplar common to our two eleventh-century MSS. had probably this Abolita gloss (perhaps with *repandius* corrected to *repandus*) marred by the intrusion of a neighbouring item such as 'Residuus: remanens.'

Since Goetz has published merely excerpts from these glossaries, it is impossible to determine the exact relation in which they stand to each other, or to be certain that an item included in the excerpts from one glossary but not in the excerpts from another is really peculiar to the first. Our knowledge too of the Liber Glossarum is confined to excerpts, so that we cannot be sure that the many Isidore items of Cass. 90 come directly from the Etymologies and not from the Liber Glossarum. Common to the two collections is the lemma 'Taeterrimus' (581, 14) from Isid. *Etym.* 10, 270, where Cass. 90 (but not Lib. Gloss., nor yet Isidore himself) adds two words to the Ennius citation: 'Ennius "tetros elephantos," ad inguinem.' They are clearly an explanatory supplement added by the compiler of Cass. 90: 'tetros, id est ad inguinem.' The Isidore item 578, 3 (= *Etym.* 15, 1, 1) must not be ascribed to Festus; and Romance students should be warned not to take on trust another Isidore item (582, 57) 'Viri soror gallice sororia dicitur,' etc. The *gallice* is merely a perversion of *galos*, the form in which *glos* appears in our MSS. of Isid. *Etym.* 9, 7, 18 'Viri soror galos appellatur,' etc. Fulgentius' *Sermones Antiqui* contributes more items to Cass. 90, etc., than appears from the references in the Thesaurus Glossarum, e.g. the lemma 'Ambiegnae oves' (559, 7). Other Republican Latin items come from the Grammarians, e.g. (560, 47) 'Amasios: amatores' (cf. *Gram. Lat.* I., 343, 11) and (561, 39) 'Argutum: convictum, Plautus' (*Gram. Lat.* II. 505, 1).

Still a Monte Cassino glossary could not fail to draw upon Paulus Diaconus' epitome of Festus; and Cass. 90 offers many Festus items which come, word

for word, from the epitome and which do not appear in the other Italian collections (at least, not in the excerpts published by Goetz). Such are, e.g., 561, 1 'Antes'; 562, 9 'Ausculari'; 566, 49 'Decumanum ovum'; 570, 26 'Igitur'; 573, 24 'Nervum'; 573, 45 'Ob'; 574, 11 'Oletum'; 574, 25 'Opiter.' Since therefore there is no evidence of the direct use of a MS. of Festus (as distinguished from Paulus' epitome) by the compiler of *Cass.* 90, we must harden our hearts against his (561, 34) 'Apaavi: dignum iudicavi testimonium.' If this appeared in *Vat.* 1469 we might claim it for

Plautus *Truc.* 952 (troch. septen.) and read :

Campa <n> s dicit 'šbaavi'. <i> consultum istuc, mi homo ;

for dialectal words are often treated by Festus. (*Campanus*, the Oscan form of *Campanus*, appears also in Plaut. *Trin.* 545.) *Vat.* 1468 has taken some uncouth forms (e.g. 491, 27 and 32) from the *Lex Langobardorum*; but the poverty of my University library prevents me from ascertaining whether *apaavi* can be claimed for Lombard Latin. The *Thes. Gloss.* (s.v. 'Arbitror') gives no hint that it can.

W. M. LINDSAY.

CICERO'S ARGUMENT IN *PRO BALBO*, VIII. 19-22

I ARGUED recently (*J.R.S.*, vol. iv., pt. 1, p. 88) that the words in sect. 21, 'ipsa denique Iulia, qua lege civitas est sociis et Latinis data, qui fundi populi facti non essent, civitatem non haberent,' prove Italian communities, on being enfranchised, to have become subject, or *fundi*, to Roman law. Professor Reid (*J.R.S.*, vol. v., pt. 2, p. 239) denies the validity of this inference, and declares that the words refer only to allied states, which had not become *fundi* to the *lex Iulia* itself. The words should not have been interpreted by either of us apart from their context, and my conclusion at any rate depends on a consideration of Cicero's argument as a whole. I shall therefore try briefly to bring out its salient points. He traces the case of Balbus back to the consular *lex Gellia-Cornelia* of 72 B.C., which legalised the enfranchisement of those persons, 'quos Cn. Pompeius de consili sententia civitate donaverit.' There was evidence that Balbus was among these, and 'accusator fatetur, sed negat ex foederato populo quemquam potuisse, nisi is populus fundus factus esset, in hanc civitatem venire.' In other words, it was contended that Gades, as a *civitas foederata*, could render the *lex Gellia-Cornelia* inoperative, as far as Balbus was concerned, by refusing or neglecting to adopt or become *fundus* to it. Such a pretension certainly seems postposterous, and the

accuser must either have been misled, or must have tried to mislead the court by the analogy of the *lex Iulia*¹ as he perhaps understood it. Cicero's contemptuous apostrophe, therefore, *O praeclarum interpretem iuris*, etc., is not undeserved, but it cannot be said that he makes his point of view precise or clear in continuing, 'qui hanc poenam foederibus adscribat, ut omnium praemiorum beneficiorumque expertes faciat foederatos. Quid enim potuit dici imperitius quam foederatos populos fieri fundos oportere?' What of course Cicero means is that, if the accuser's assertion was correct, individual members of federate states would be liable to lose a well-deserved honour owing to the non-acceptance by their own communities of the law conferring it, and that it was ridiculous to affirm that federate states were bound formally to adopt these laws, if they wished their members to benefit by them. But he says neither of these things, for *poenam foederibus adscribere* implies prejudice to the federate states, and not to the individuals, while the words *fieri fundos*

¹ This is no doubt what Professor Reid means when he represents the argument as being, 'just as the Gaditani could not be made Roman citizens collectively, unless Gades adopted the enfranchising law, so neither could Balbus, unless the *lex Gellia-Cornelia* was adopted.' I am not aware that the former proposition can be established, unless it is by the statement in sect. 21 about the *lex Iulia*.