

MÉLANGES

BARO

The late Professor Reid has a learned note on this word in his edition of Cicero *de Finibus* (p. 187) and cites various Latin glossaries in evidence. Like everyone who cites glossaries, he regards each glossary as an independent witness. And certainly Goetz' apographs of the oldest MS. of each glossary in volumes II-V of his *Corpus Glossariorum Latino-rum* and his Index (in *C. G. L.*, VI-VII) to these four volumes leave this impression on the reader.

But this, the old notion, is quite wrong. Most glossaries borrow their material from previous glossaries and capriciously alter it in the borrowing. Any future writer of a note like that of Prof. Reid must turn to my *Glossaria Latina* (Paris, Société les Belles-Lettres, 1926 sqq.), where editions of glossaries — not mere slavish *apographs* of MSS., such as Goetz published — are presented to the reader, and where a new and true account of the origin of each glossary is, for the first time, stated. The title of Goetz' last published volume (vol. I of *C. G. L.*): *De Glossariorum Latinorum Origine et Fatis* (1923), seems indeed to promise this information. But any one who consult it (at least for the history of glossaries of the ninth century and earlier) will find little more than the old crude notion, the notion seized from a superficial study of glossaries, the notion hastily adopted by the earliest workers in this field, and never improved in all the long interval between Loewe's *Prodromus* and Goetz', *C. G. L.*, I.

One collection in which *baro* appears is the Philoxenus Glossary, edited by Laistner in vol. II of *Glossaria Latina*. Laistner enumerates in his preface the sources (e. g. Festus; Charisius; marginal annotation in a MS. of Horace, Juvenal, Persius) from which the compiler of this bilingual glossary drew material. His suggestion that the material came from the library of some South Italian monastery (e. g. Vivarium, Cassiodore's foundation at Squillace) receives some support from the interesting statement by Rohlf's (*Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*, 1924, p. 150) that *σπανός* (Philox. MA 42 Malebarbis : *σπανός*) is South Italian

Greek for a man with little or no hair on his face. If Rudolf Beer's bold theory be true, that Columban acquired for Bobbio in 614 the Vivarium MSS., I would conjecture that the Philoxenus Glossary was compiled at Bobbio as a text-book for the study of Greek. I cannot divine why Goetz takes for granted that the compilation must have been earlier than Cassiodore (*Gnomon*, 2, 603) : « Aber im Kloster Vivarium, dessen Gründung durch Cassiodor doch erst in das sechste Jahrhundert fällt, möchte ich den Verfasser nicht suchen. Da er den Charisius benutzt hat und sich mit dem von Cassiodor erwähnten Martyrius berührt (vgl. *C. G. L.*, I, 46 f.), möchte man ihn doch wohl schon etwas früher unterbringen. » Bede used Charisius. Are we then to argue : « da er den Charisius benutzt hat », Bede must have lived in Charisius time? When I turn to *C. G. L.*, I, 46 sq., I find no argument worthy of the name. Goetz is obsessed by the erroneous notion that medieval glossaries are ancient and contain ancient lore.

Only one MS. of the Philoxenus Glossary survives, a mere ninth or tenth century. MS. (of Laon, I think; where Greek was taught by Martin the Irishman about that time); and Laistner shews that it presents the glossary not merely in epitome, but in a very degenerate form, items being often chopped up and the chopped parts whisked off to different sections or pages. When therefore we find in the unique Laon MS. two items :

BA 3 Baro : *απηρ* (*lege ανήρ*),

BA 29 Barbo (*lege baro*) : *βακηλος*,

we have to reckon with the possibility that the original glossary had only one item :

Baro : *ανήρ βακηλος*.

If Reid had recognized this, he would not have written : « Sometimes *baro* is glossed by *ανήρ*. » At least, he should have appealed to Heraeus *Sprache des Petronius*, p. 12.

Laistner suggests that the gloss originally was a Greek (South Italian) monastery-teacher's marginal or interlinear explanation of *baro* in Persius, 5, 138. He also hints at the possibility of its having been a Greek (South Italian) monastery-teacher's explanation in a MS. of Festus (442, 5), where the word — not explained by Festus — occurs in a Lucilius-quotation :

Squarrosi a squamarum similitudine dicti... Lucilius « varonum ac rupieum squarrosa incondita rostra ».

But since Lucilius has the Plural, and Persius — like the Philoxenus-gloss — the Singular, I prefer to find the source in a Persius-adscript, the suprascript explanation of Persius' *baro*, written by a monastery-teacher at (say) Vivarium for the benefit of his Greek-speaking pupils.

The monastery-teacher — for all that we can know — merely guessed from the context the meaning of the word. We dare not assume that he had any Persius-scholia, any *ancient* marginal annotation to help him. (Cf. Lehmann in *Philologus*, 83 [1927], 194). The value therefore — to my mind — of the Philoxenus-item :

Baro : ἀνήρ βάρηλος,

is precisely *nil*. We must disabuse our minds (and *Glossaria Latina* will help us) of the notion that all medieval glossaries contain ancient lore. The only value of the gloss is that βάρηλος is shewn (hardly 'proved') to be South Italian Greek for foolish, fatuous, loutish. Whether the Lexicon of Liddell and Scott (new edition) gives precisely the right nuance of meaning in its 'womanish' is open to doubt.

Laisner demonstrates that the degenerate form of a Philoxenus gloss in the Laon MS. may often be improved with the help of (1) the Cyrillus Glossary, of which only one MS., perhaps of the middle of the eighth century, survives, (2) the Abavus Glossary and other collections which, like Abavus, have borrowed Philoxenus glosses and translated the Greek interpretations into Latin. For Abavus and these others used older MSS. of Philoxenus.

Cyrillus here gives us no help. But Abavus (edited by Mountford in *Glossaria Latina*, II) has :

BA 17 Baruo (*lege* baro) : barunculus (misquoted by Reid),

VA 37 Varunculus : varuo.

Now Mountford has shewn in his Preface that the great peculiarity of Abavus is its habit of reversing glosses, i. e. making the interpretation and the lemma change places. Therefore we have here rather one gloss than two. And that gloss was, unless I err, in its original form :

Baro : barunculus.

The intrusive *u* I refer to an adscript indicating a variant *varo*. If the remark in *Gramm. Lat.*, V, 572, 17, comes from Caper, then Caper preferred the spelling with *b*. And this gloss looks like a Charisius-gloss in Philoxenus. Charisius had probably cited (among examples of Diminutives like *latro*, *latrunculus*) *baro*, *barunculus*. But, whatever be the source of the gloss, it throws no light on the meaning of *baro*.

However another glossary with Philoxenus-material, known as the Third Amplonian Glossary or *Glossae Nominum*, has :

Baramer : cemarius (*lege* Baro : mercennarius)

I venture a guess — but it is not much more than a guess — that Philoxenus (i. e. the compiler of the full Philoxenus Glossary, whoever he was) took the bilingual original of this all-Latin item from a MS. of Festus. For Isidore, in the *Etymologiae*, has much Festus-material. And he says (*Etym.*, 9, 4, 31) :

Mercennarii sunt qui serviunt accepta mercede. Idem et barones

Graeco nomine, quod sint fortes in laboribus. βαρὺς enim dicitur gravis, quod est fortis; cui contrarius est levis, id est infirmus.

The Greek etymology is absurd; but Verrius Flaccus was quite capable of admitting it to his huge encyclopaedia, which Festus epitomized. I marvel at Reid's acceptance of this etymology and his attribution to Lucilius and Persius of an error like *bāro* for 'bāro'.

Isidore however gets his ancient lore from Virgil scholia too — of Donatus, as well as Servius —, not merely from Festus. So my guess may be wrong; though the combination Isidore-Philoxenus usually points to Festus as source. Certainly the explanation *baro* : *mercennarius* does suggest ancient lore. The Persius scholiast, who has much that is good, though too often in a perverted form, offers (5, 138) :

Barones dicuntur servi militum, qui utique stultissimi sunt, servi scilicet servorum.

And my summary of the evidence would be : « *Baro* meant either a paid labourer or a soldier's servant. »

Reid should not add : « *Baro* occurs in other glosses, being explained by *fortis* », if he refers to the *Glossae Scaligeri*, printed in *C. G. L.*, V. For these are a late 'omnium gatherum' collectio by Scaliger and his contemporaries, which should be ignored; though unfortunately the great Latin *Thesaurus* has not ignored them. The Scaliger gloss :

Bargines : fortes in bello,

is an error, no doubt, for :

Barones : fortes in bello;

but this is a mere concoction by some modern reader of the Isidore-passage quoted above. Equally late and negligible is the bilingual lexicon of Loisel (*C. G. L.*, III). Its explanation of *baro* as *μισθωτός* looks like a mere translation into Greek of *Baro* : *mercennarius*. But I could argue that a gloss found in more than one glossary :

Bacerus : baro, fatuus,

was originally :

βάρηλος : baro, fatuus,

and was a mere re-cast of the Philoxenus gloss, were it not that the digression would make this article unconscionably long.

If any one has had patience to wade through it all, let him now take from me the moral. Do not regard each glossary as an independent witness. Seek the original gloss which has been borrowed by other glossaries, and try to discover its source. And do not believe that the gloss contains ancient lore, unless the track leads back to Festus or to Virgil scholia.