

tions are intended to produce. Seek, therefore, on every possible occasion, to weaken and destroy it. The practised eye will not fail to discern such opportunities. Such passages, for instance, as *Matt. 17: 24—27. 21: 10.* etc., you will not suffer to pass unimproved for this purpose. In particular, I would remind you, that the cross on Golgotha is the place where the Saviour of men was mocked eighteen hundred years ago, and where it will be specially seemly to renew that derision, if any one has a disposition for it at the present day. Go thou now and do in like manner. "I will give thee the whole world, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. And your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall become as gods." *Probatum est.*

ARTICLE IV.

PRINCIPLES OF LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.

Translated by Professor T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

[The first part of the Latin dictionary of Wilhelm Freund, of Breslau appeared in 1834, and contained the letters A—C. The second part was published in two numbers, in 1836, and 1844, and went from D to K. The fourth part, (R—Z) was published in 1836, and the third part has been announced as about to appear in 1844. We believe that this lexicon will take a very high rank, probably before any other Latin, and certainly before any Greek one in existence. The preface, containing the author's views of lexicography and an account of his method, has a bearing by no means confined to the Latin or to any particular set of languages, and is, we think, calculated to be useful to all whose labors are directed to lexicography as well as to scholars in general. A translation of this preface is now laid before the reader.—TR.]

BETWEEN the first publication of the Latin lexicons of Forcellini, Gesner, and Scheller, and the appearance of the present work, more than fifty years have elapsed; and during just this interval, classical philology has met with so thorough a transformation that for this very reason the attempt to bring out a dictionary of the Latin tongue, which shall better correspond with the altered standpoint of the philological sciences, requires no excuse. Still it is

the duty of the author to make known what is the problem he has proposed to himself, and by what means he has tried to solve it: to do this as completely as possible is the aim of the ensuing lines. In order, however, to take the necessary survey where the vastness of the subject almost precludes its being surveyed, it is advisable to arrange it under particular rubrics; and therefore in what follows we shall treat, (1) of the idea and elements of Latin Lexicography, (2) of the compass of the present dictionary, (3) of the method of handling the several articles, (4) of the arrangement of the articles, (5) of the signs and technical terms employed in the work, and (6) of the aids in composing it.

I. *Of the idea and elements of Latin Lexicography.*

§ 1. If Lexicography in general is that science whose task it is to set forth the nature of every single word of a language through all the periods of its existence, it is the task of Latin lexicography in particular to set forth the nature of every single word of the Latin language, as it makes itself known in all the periods of the existence of that language; or more succinctly expressed, it is the object of Latin lexicography to give the history of every single word of the Latin language. It is, therefore, a purely objective science, and although by its aid the understanding of works written in Latin is promoted, still it does not acknowledge this to be its end, but like every objective science it is its own end.

§ 2. The history of a word consists in unfolding its outer nature, that is, its form, class, syntactical connections and the like, together with its inner nature or meaning. But since in Latin, just as in all cultivated languages, every word has not a particular form peculiar to itself, but belongs to a distinct class of words, whose forms it adopts; and since the doctrine of the forms of classes of words and their alterations is the subject matter of grammar, it is not required of lexicography to make known all the forms of each particular word in its various relations and connections; on the contrary, it needs merely to designate the class to which a word belongs, and only then when a word has assumed a form peculiar to itself to mark this as an exception. When the lexicographer adds *ae* to the word *mensa*, this is nothing but a convenient abbreviation which grammar renders intelligible to all, and by means of which the enumeration of all the inflections of this word becomes unnecessary. On the other hand, as the form *capis* of the word *capio* deviates from the regular form of

kindred words, the lexicon must necessarily give notice of that fact, because otherwise the external history of the word *capio* will be incomplete. This is the *grammatical element of lexicography*.

‡ 3. The greatest number of words in Latin, as in every cultivated language, is derived from others termed radical or ground-words. It is the duty, therefore, of the external history of words, in the case of every word which is not underived, to indicate the root from which it springs. This is the *etymological element of lexicography*.

‡ 4. The internal history of a word consists, as has been mentioned, in the exhibition of its meaning. This is the *exegetical element of lexicography*. Inasmuch as every word has its own distinct and peculiar meaning, to make this known is the peculiar and distinct province of lexicography, and grammar invades the field of its sister science, whenever, besides giving an account of the forms and connections of classes of words, she treats also of the meanings of single words, which exert no influence upon their grammatical relations,—a mode of proceeding which many Latin grammars adopt in regard to the meanings of the pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions.

‡ 5. In Latin, as in other languages, many words have in their meanings so much resemblance to one another, that a superficial examination can hardly distinguish them. It is the duty, therefore, of the internal history of words to hold up the meaning of such words over against one another; to compare and to distinguish them. This is the *synonymous element of lexicography*.

‡ 6. Only a very few words, forms of words and meanings were alike in use through all the periods of the life of the Latin language; most of them had a much shorter duration; many did not even outlive a single period. The history of a word there—as far as extant materials allow—must let us know to what time a word, a form or a meaning belongs. This I name the *special-historical, or chronological element of lexicography*.

‡ 7. In like manner, there are but a few words of the Latin language—and those containing the most general notions—which were equally in use in all kinds of style. The history of words, therefore, must inform us to what kind of composition a word, a form or a meaning belongs; whether to prose or poetry, to the higher prose of the orator, or the lower of the people, or to the language of art, as a technical term of religion, of oeconomy, of rhetoric, of philosophy, and so on. I call this the *rhetorical element of lexicography*.

‡ 8. Finally, the Latin, like every polished dialect, has certain favorite words which it willingly and often uses; and again a number of words, of which it makes use but seldom, or perhaps only once. It is incumbent then on the historian of words, under each word to notice its frequent or rare occurrence. I name this the *statistical element of lexicography*.

II. *Of the extent of the present Lexicon.*

‡ 1. As Latin lexicography has to do with the history of all the words of the Latin language, and as the number of words in this language varies according as we consider it to be in a narrower sense the dialect of the Romans, or in a wider sense, that both of the Romans and of the learned afterwards, in the middle ages, it becomes necessary to say, in which of these spheres the present lexicon has chosen to move. We confine ourselves, then, to Latin as the national language of the Romans, and accordingly give the history of all those words which occur in the written remains of the Romans, from the earliest times to the fall of the West-Roman empire. Within this period, the work of every Latin writer, whether he was a born Roman or not, a heathen or a Christian, will be held to belong to the Latin literature, and will receive attention in proportion as the modes of expression current in it have any peculiar bearing upon the history of words.

‡ 2. But in the materials furnished by the writings of the ancient Romans to the lexicographer, a separation of the greatest importance for the trustworthiness of the history of words must be made between such as lie before our eyes in the extant works of the Latin classics, and those of whose existence at one time we are informed by the old grammarians and lexicographers. In the case of the former, our own inspection, our own judgment is allowed to us; the others we must take on credit and authority. We have, therefore, in the present work represented to the eye by capitals, those words and forms, for the knowledge of which we are indebted only to old grammarians and glossators; and which are, as it were, the isolated remains of an ancient world of words. For example:

“ABAMBULANTES abscedentes.” Festus, p. 22.

Apollo,-inis (earlier APELLO, as hemo for homo. Festus, p. 19.

‡ 3. The case is the same with words and forms found only in inscriptions, since for the most part we know neither the person

making use of them, nor the time when they were used. These also are, therefore, designated by capital letters. For example,

ARCHIBVCVLVS. (BVCOL.) -i, m, an upper priest of Bacchus. Inscr. Orell. No. 2235, 2351, 2352. [*ἀρχι-βουκόλος.*]

Apollo, -inis, (. . . APOLONES = Apollini, in a very old inscription, VICESIMA. PARTI APOLONES. DEDERI i e. vicesimam partem Apollini dedere. Inscr. Orell. No. 1433, etc.).

‡4. The limits of the lexicon, again, are to be determined not merely with respect to time, but also with respect to the origin of the words which it contains. The Latin language, as is well known, like that of every nation which has had intercourse with other nations, has not kept itself free from foreign words. The question now arises whether Latin lexicography ought to embrace words adopted into Latin from other languages, or whether it should confine itself to its own unmixed stores. The latter procedure we have seen used in German; so that peculiar dictionaries have been composed for words borrowed from abroad. Is this advisable also for the Latin? It is right that the decision here should not rest upon considerations of convenience, and of what is customary; but simply and solely upon the more or less scientific character of the two courses. The adoption of a foreign word into a language, assumes of course the real or supposed want of a corresponding native word denoting the same idea. Now the foreign word, in taking upon itself the function of a fully synonymous but not existing native word, and in representing a peculiar notion, ceases, as far as actual use is concerned, to be foreign, although at its origin it was really such. But the duty of general Latin lexicography, with which we are alone concerned, unlike that of special etymological lexicography, requires it to give the sum total of Latin words, considered as conveying the notions of persons speaking this language, and not considered as indigenous expressions of ideas; whence it follows, that a place on the list of Latin words cannot be refused to such as are borrowed from foreign tongues and by means of written Latin characters had full citizenship conceded to them.

‡5. On the other hand, from the circumstance that one language needs to borrow from another, arises the necessity of making a distinction between those words which a nation finds in its own language adequate to the expression of its thoughts, and those which it is forced to invite out of foreign parts. This distinction is made in the present work by crosses prefixed to all words which originally were not of the Latin stock. In doing

this the author has deemed the following discriminations to be important.

A. *Words borrowed from the Greek.* And as such we understand only those which passed over, after the Latin had separated itself etymologically from its sister language, and had taken an independent place. For those which, on account of the relationship of the two dialects, have the same or a similar sound, ought not to be regarded as the property of the Greek but as the common possession of both languages. Hence in this dictionary, *ab, alius, ager, ago, fero*, etc. are represented as only etymologically allied with *ἀπό, ἄλλος, ἀγρός, ἄγω, φέρω*, etc.; but *aegoceros, aliptes, blitum, ceruchè, chelys*, etc. as borrowed from the Greek. But of this latter class a number of words have become mongrels, or in grammatical phrase *voces hibridae*, through a purely Latin termination, or through composition with a purely Latin word; for this reason a discrimination is necessary, which is effected in the lexicon, in the case of Greek words unchanged in form, or no more essentially varied than with *vs*; put for *os*, *a* for *η* or *ης*, etc., by prefixing a † to them, and placing the sign = before the original word printed in Greek letters. Hybrid forms, on the contrary, while they retain the † are denoted by [] including the original word. For example:

† aenigma, -atis, *n.* = ἀίγνμα, etc.

† aliptes or alipta, -ae, *m.* = ἀλείπτῃς, etc.

† apologatio, -onis, *f.* [from ἀπόλογος, with the Lat. ending -atio.]

† chamae-tortus, -a, -um, *adj.* [vox hibrida from χαμαί and tortus.]

Remark 1. The attention paid to Greek literature among the Romans, from the Augustan age onward, led to the use, in the Latin written style, of a considerable number of Greek terms of art, sometimes in Greek and sometimes in Latin characters. - It is clear that lexicography can take notices only of those words of this sort, which are written in Latin letters. Now it is known that later transcribers gave a Latin dress to many words in the classics which were at first written in Greek, and hence in different editions of the classics, according to the manuscripts which are followed, the same word now appears in the letters of the one language and now of the other. Such cases bring the lexicographer into perplexity, and he finds the difficulty of having one consistent rule the greater, owing to the fact that in all probability some writers had no one rule of their own, just as we Germans, in spite of the many and earnest remonstrances of purists, have not yet ceased to write foreign terms of art at one time in German

and at another in Latin letters. Thus in Celsus (5, 28. No. 2), *cacoethes* appears by the side of *κακόηθες* (ib. *bis*), whilst in editions of Pliny, even the Greek plural *κακοήθη* is never written otherwise than in Latin characters; and indeed in the manuscripts and editions of this latter author the practice of using Roman letters prevails even in cases where the annexed words, "Graece vocant," render the Latin use of the word doubtful. And in like manner we find in Quintilian, who generally writes Greek technical terms in Greek letters, *κακοζήλον* (8. 3, 56) and *κακοζήλια* (8. 6, 73), but *cacozelia* (2. 3, 9). Modern editors of Latin authors seem to follow the rule that in the earlier writers except Pliny, as Cicero, Varro, Quintilian, Celsus, Donatus, etc. Greek letters are to be preferred; but Latin, on the contrary, in such as Servius, Priscian, Isidore, and the like; and in truth this is a convenient principle in a subject so fluctuating as this, and so important for the criticism of the text. But whether it will guide us safely in every case, and even against the authority of the best manuscripts, has as yet not been decided, and needs to be put to a careful proof.

Remark 2. When the lexicographer refers latinized words to their Greek source, he not unfrequently meets with Greek words which are sought for in vain in collections of extant Greek words, owing probably to their not being preserved in the extant literature of that language. The precious stone *Borsycites*, for example, mentioned by Pliny, (37, 11, 73) as all will admit, is of Greek extraction; but where is the corresponding original word to be found? The case is the same with *botryitis*, *botryon*, *brabyla*, (*ae.*) *brya*, *brochon*, *bucardia*, *caesapon*, *cachla*, *catastema*, together with many others; and here rich gleanings for Greek lexicography may be expected. In the present dictionary, such not extant Greek words are only then supposed, when there is no serious doubt concerning the way of writing them. On the other hand, words like *brochon* must remain without the original word, and are indicated to be of Greek origin only by a cross.

B. *Words borrowed from other languages*: the Celtic, Gallic, Iberian, Hebrew, Persian, etc. To these, two crosses are prefixed: for the most part it cannot be said what was the form or the way of writing the original word; and therefore our usual rule in such cases is to annex in brackets merely the language from which the foreign word is borrowed. For example:

†† *candosoccus*, -i, *m.* [Gallic word], etc.

†† *ballux* (*bal.*), -ucis, *f.* [Spanish word], etc.

†† *bascauda*, -ae, *f.* [British word], etc.

†† *Bagoas*, -i, and *Bagoas*, -ae, *m.* *Βαγῶος* and *Βαγῶας* [Persian word], etc.

But, on the contrary,

†† *burdo*, -onis, *m.* = *βῦρδ*

†† *camelus*, -i, *m.* *κάμηλος* = *ἕρμ*

‡ 6. Foreign names which have been carried over together with foreign historical data into the Latin literature, although there expressed in Latin letters, yet properly cannot be held to be incorporated into that language, because their reception, being occasioned merely by the historical narratives where they occur, is only an external one; and in all languages, like hieroglyphics, they must preserve the same form. Yet so far as such words are (so to speak) the carriers of knowledge derived by the Romans from abroad, they ought not, as we have seen above, to be shut out from Latin lexicography. Only the etymological element has no claim upon them, and therefore their original words are immediately annexed without any sign. As for example:

Aeolus, -i, *m.* *Αἰόλος*, (1) the god of the winds, etc.

Aaron, *m.* *Ἄαρὼν*, brother of Moses, etc.

Remark. From what was just now said it follows, that the Latin lexicography of such foreign names must look only at the relations given by Latin authors, even when these accounts are at open variance with those of original authors, as is, for instance, frequently the case in the departments of mythology, geography, and history. Compare *Aeaea*, *Calypso*, etc.

III. *Of the Method of handling the several Articles.*

‡ 1. Every article of a Latin lexicon forms a monography of that Latin word to which it is devoted; and therefore according to L ‡ 2, it must trace the history of the inner and outer nature of that word through the whole period of its existence in the Latin language. Now according to L ‡ 2—8, whatever appertains to such a history may be reduced to seven elements; we have therefore to show, in this place, how the present lexicon, in giving the history of each single article, has had respect to each of these elements.

A.) *Grammatical element.* In conformity with the limits drawn above (L ‡ 2), an account as complete as possible of extant anomalies has been inserted in a parenthesis to accompany what is said of the grammatical formation, construction, etc. For example, *capio, cepi, captum*, 3. (antiquated form of the exact future *capsio*),

Plaut. Bacch. 4. 4, 61. *capsit*, id. Pseud. 4. 3, 6; Attius in Nonius Marcell. 483, 12; comp. Festus, p. 44. *capsimus*, Plaut. Rud. 2, 1, 15. CAPSIS, according to Cic. Or. 45, 154, erroneously taken by him to be contracted out of *cape si bis*; comp. Quintil. Inst. 1, 5, 66 Spalding. — Old way of writing the perf. CEPET = *cepit* as, EXEMET, DEDET, etc.; Columna Rostrata, etc.

Arbor, -oris (poetic secondary form, *arbos*, like *labos*, *colos*, *honos*, etc. Lucret. 1, 774; 6, 787, etc. Also the accus. ARBOSEM, Fest. p. 13. Comp. Schneider, Gram. etc.)

Avis, -is, *f.* (abl. sing. both *avi* and *ave*; comp. Varro, de Ling. Lat. 8, 37, 120; Priscian, p. 765 Putsch, Rhemn. Palaem.* p. 1374. 16; Schneid. Gram. 2. 227, in the religious use more frequently *avi* . . .; but in Varro L. L. 7. 5. 99 *ave* is a gloss. See Spengel on the passage), etc.

Ad, praep. with the accus. (on account of the hard pronunciation of *d* sometimes written *at*. See *at*. Old form *ar*, as in *arveho*, arbiter, for *adveho*, *adbiter* from *arbitere* = *albitere*. So *ar me advenias*, Plaut. Truc. 2, 2, 17. and in inscriptions *arfuerunt*, *arfuisse*. Comp. Prisc. p. 699. Putsch, etc.), and so on. Here the difficulty not uncommonly presents itself that a word which must be taken as the basis of an article, occurs in several forms. In such cases prevalent usage alone can decide, and accordingly many words have another ground-form given to them [in the present work] than they have hitherto had in the lexicons. Thus, for example, more and better authorities are found for the neuter form *baculum*, -i, than for the received masculine *baculus*; which requires us to shape the article in the lexicon as follows:

Baculum, -i, *n.* (*baculus*, -i, *m.* very seldom), etc.

In like manner *biga*, the singular, which came into vogue after the Augustan age, has been put behind the plural form, *bigae*; and so in many other cases.

Often, too, linguistic analogy is brought into conflict with historical dates. Here, in obedience to the excellent remarks in the eighth book of Varro's *Lingua Latina*, the historical takes precedence; because it is the duty of the author of monographs to insert only real matters of fact into his sketches. For this reason it is, that no adjective, *bicorniger*, -era, -erum,—which nowhere occurs—has been admitted into the lexicon, but only *Bicorniger*, -eri, *m.* [a title of Bacchus.] And if hereafter a catalogue of extant supines shall be made with critical accuracy, a lexicon will be

* Q Rhemnius Fannius Palaemon, a grammarian who flourished under Claudius.—TR.

obliged to separate all such forms known to exist, from merely hypothetical ones.

B. *Etymological element.* This has a very easy and an extremely difficult side. To tell whence words like *accipio*, *concupio*, *excipio*, etc. come—what can be easier? But scientific etymology seeks also to discover the origin of words like *capio* itself; and this, as is well known, is the problem, to the solution of which a body of the ablest linguists in our days have devoted all their energies and their acuteness; which many believe themselves to have solved, whilst others deride it as the arena for the useless play of empty combinations. Hazardous as it still is, in the violent contest of two parties to try to keep a strict neutrality, yet the author of the present lexicon, who can neither speak insincerely against his convictions, nor meanly avoid declaring his opinion where it is looked for, feels obliged here openly to avow that he can share neither in the sweet faith of the former party, nor in the cold contempt of the latter. He cherishes firm trust in the amazing power of the human mind to penetrate even into the secret laboratory where words were formed, seeing it has succeeded in unveiling the mystery of the formation of worlds. He follows, therefore, the progress of these zealous efforts in every line [which they indite] with love and with a joyous feeling of high and simple delight; and refuses not to bestow upon the unwearied investigators this strengthening hope, that they are but a small remove from the very topmost point toward which they aspire. But he cannot suppress his apprehension that what seemed, when seen from afar the summit, will prove but the boundary line of a lower region, beyond which new chains of mountains tower in their vastness to the heavens; and for this reason he is afraid as yet to join in the triumphal jubilee. Indeed the question of the origin of the Latin language is beginning at this moment to be far more involved than many are willing to believe: Germanism is opposing the Sanscrit with powerful weapons, and urges its claims to be the origin of Latin. The author feels, therefore, that he would be called over hasty if he allowed the Sanscrit or the German element to have the predominance in his work.

There is, however, a mode of treating etymology in a lexicon, which leaves the controversy just mentioned out of sight, and yet does justice to the demand of the higher comparison of languages. We see this pursued by Gesenius in the Latin revision of his excellent Hebrew lexicon; where, for instance, it is said under פָּרָה
 "(1) *ferre* (Praeter veterum Semitarum linguam haec radix late

regnat in linguis Indogerm. ; v. Sanscr. *bhri* ferre ; pers. *bār* onus ; Armen. *bier-il* ferre ; Gr. *φέρω, βάρος, βαρῦς* ; Lat. *fero, porto* ; Goth. *bair-an* ; Angl. to *bear*, trans. to *burden* ; Germ. ant. *bären*, etc.)” In this way, the question whether *fero* is derived immediately from *bhri* or from *bären* can be omitted altogether in a Latin dictionary, and yet under the article *fero* the connection be made known between this word and roots in cognate languages. But after all I cannot decide to travel this road, which previous labors have already rendered quite smooth and level. For in my opinion, such a comparative method passes beyond the bounds of a lexicon designed for a single language, and belongs exclusively and solely to comparative or universal lexicography. For, if every special lexicon is to institute this comparison of roots, the same parenthesis which is attached to the Hebrew root פָּרַח must be repeated in the Greek, Latin, Gothic, English or German lexicon ; so that all that is peculiar to the single lexicon will be taken away. Just as little as we would expect of the Latin grammar to place the Sanscrit *asmi* by the side of *semi*, or the Gothic and old high German declensions by the side of the Latin, notwithstanding the insight into the grammatical structure would be helped in this way ; just so little, in my judgment, ought it to be made the duty of the Latin lexicon to accompany every Latin word with all the equivalent words in other languages that can be collected together. The very interesting nature of such combinations, and the novelty of the truly wonderful discoveries to which they have led, seem in this matter to have produced in many a want of due regard for the laws of scientific and well defined lexicography ; so that the strong impression of the *special* threatens almost wholly to disappear under the influence of such generalizations. To this very swallowing up of the special by the general, is it no doubt to be ascribed, that the soil itself, where the Latin reached its bloom, has been hitherto so little explored ; although this soil acted powerfully upon the earliest condition of the foreign plant, and in many cases altered it so that it can no longer be recognized. Besides, many of the modern etymologists start in their comparisons with the form which a Latin word had at the Ciceronian period : the smaller number, who like a more rational course, go back to the times of Ennius and Pacuvius ; having recourse likewise, perhaps, to the oldest forms of many words preserved by the grammarians. But even to hold these oldest forms to be the original ones, as they existed at the separation of the Latin from its parent stock, will, I think, be a hazardous position, till it

can be shown, that the Latin remained so unaltered from that epoch of separation down to the time to which appertain single forms yet extant,—that is, through at least five hundred years,—that the original forms are adequately represented to us by these yet extant ones. This difficulty, and many like it, (among which that of finding the laws for the union and change of sounds in Latin, is, in truth, not the least,) must be set aside, before the materials used in instituting the comparative process shall be well enough fitted for that purpose.

C. *Exegetical element.* This, as being the main element of lexicography (comp. I § 4), must meet with especial attention. But as the exhibition of the meanings of a word must take various shapes according to the nature of the word itself, it is impossible to develop, to their whole extent, the fundamental principles of this branch: the single articles must testify for themselves. A few words, therefore, relating to the chief rules which have served to guide us, must suffice.

First of all it has been laid down as a settled principle, that among several significations of a word, that which is obtained by its etymology may be assumed as the original one. Simple and obvious as this maxim is, it has nevertheless been followed with little strictness in Latin lexicons hitherto. And this is owing to two causes. In the first place, they have usually had the pedagogical object in view of facilitating the study of the classics; and they therefore gave precedence to the most current significations which are rarely the earliest. In the second place, because, for the most part, they had to do only with the usages of speech in the most read, and best known classics, they have paid almost no attention to the oldest fragments of the Latin tongue; to the *Leges Regiae*, the fragments of the twelve tables, the remains of Ennius, Pacuvius, Cato, and so on down to those of Attius and Sisenna; and extremely little to the latinity of Plautus, Terence, Lucretius and Varro; and for this reason just those passages lay out of their sight in which most of the words still preserved their primitive sense. The more to be regretted this fault was, the more earnestly has the author striven to furnish a cure for it. He therefore made it his first aim to introduce into the circle of lexical materials all the critically certain remains of old latinity from the *Leges Regiae*, the fragments of the twelve tables, and the broken inscriptions on the *Columna rostrata* down to Lucretius and Varro; and to assign to these, as the oldest, the first place in the lexicon. In this way three advantages are gain-

ed. In the first place, the history of words has thus its earliest period removed backwards; then many words disclose their primitive meaning by this process; and thirdly, many peculiarities of the later style are here recognized in their nascent state, so that what formerly was regarded as innovation on the part of Virgil or Ovid, now appears to be only borrowed from Ennius, Nævius or Lucretius.

It happens, however, not unfrequently in Latin lexicography, that no examples are extant of that signification which etymology shows to be the primitive one. In such a case this meaning, being indispensable for the etymological understanding of the others, is put down indeed, but it is expressly distinguished from the others by another mode of printing, as not known to have been in actual use.

The second principle laid down, and one about the correctness of which there exists no doubt, is that in the order of meanings the proper meaning, as the original one, must precede the tropical as being derived. But besides this, it has been deemed necessary to bring subdivisions into the notion of the tropical; which in its wide extent seemed not fitted to draw a line between significations with sufficient clearness. An example will make this obvious. The substantive *arena* changes its sense in the four following passages: (1) *Magnus congestus arenae*, Lucr. 6, 724. (2) *Missum in arenam aprum jaculis desuper petiit*, Suet. Tib. 72. (3) *Vectio Prisco, quantum plurimum potuero, præstabo, præsertim in arena mea, hoc est, apud Centumviros*, Plin. Ep. 6, 12, 2. (4) *Quid facies, Oenone? Quid arenae semina mandas?* Ov. Her. 5, 115. In the first passage it is *actual sand*, in the second the *amphitheatre*, in the third *the sphere of one's calling*, in the fourth a proverbial expression for something *unfruitful*, etc. If we should divide the meanings between the literal and tropical, as these terms have been hitherto applied in the lexicons, we should have one literal and three tropical meanings, somewhat as follows: (1) lit. sand. (2) trop., (a) the amphitheatre; (b) the sphere of one's calling; (c) proverb. for something unfruitful. But in the first place the meaning, sphere of one's calling or place of contest, is obviously borrowed from that of the amphitheatre, and therefore not coördinate with it but subordinate and consequently forming a trope within a trope; and in the second place, the derived notion *amphitheatre*, has quite another relation to the simple one *sand*, from that of one's *sphere* to *amphitheatre*. In the former case, the general notion *sand* is individualized into a defi-

nite sandy place or sand-path, etc., but not taken out of the class of concretes; whilst in the latter the concrete notion of *amphitheatre* is spiritualized into the abstract notion of a place of contest, or exercise, sphere of avocations, etc.

This last distinction between individualizing a general notion, and spiritualizing a physical, seemed of too much weight to the author to be left out of sight in the exegetical management of the articles in the dictionary; and he has, therefore, given to the signification arising in the former way the name of metonymic; to the latter that of tropical. In this way the first three senses of *arena* take the following order: (1) lit. sand; (2) metonym. the place of contest in the amphitheatre bestrewed with sand. Therefore (b) tropic. every place of contest, place of exhibiting any kind of activity, place of exercise, etc. And so, for example, *arbor = navis* is a metonymy while *calor = amor* is a trope; because in the former the physical meaning is only individualized, while in the latter it passes into an abstract and spiritual one. In the case of *arena* it still remains to specify the place which its proverbial use should occupy in a lexical arrangement of meanings. My opinion is that, in judging of proverbial expressions, lexicography and rhetoric must follow different rules. The latter of these arts, as it weighs the sense of the whole expression, can only class such forms of speech with those which are tropical and not literal. Lexicography, on the other hand, which has to do, not with the sense of a whole expression, but only with that of a single word, finds nothing in the word used proverbially, which removes it from the sphere of the literal. Thus, to adhere to the example given above, the word *arena* in the proverbial phrase—*arenae semina mandare*—has received no signification originally foreign, such as it contains in the words, *Vectio Prisco praestabo in arena mea*. These two words cannot denote *my sand*; but *arenae semina mandere*, means always to commit seed to the sand. It must remain, as has been said, an indifferent thing for the judgment passed by the lexicon on the word *arena*, if the whole thought, through its application to something not of the nature of husbandry, has received an unliteral sense. For this reason, in the present lexicon, the proverbial is arranged not under the tropical but under the literal sense.

It seemed necessary, moreover, if the various derived meanings were to be characterized, to specify the auxiliary notions, through the accession of which to the original meanings, these derived significations arose. This side of exegetical lexicography

deserves the greater attention, since without it the changeful play of meanings back and forth must often remain an enigmatical occurrence. We have, therefore, specially noticed the departments of the subjective and objective, general and special, of space, time and number, of purpose, of definite aim, of a pregnant and a hostile sense, etc., whenever they modify the original meaning of the word; and if the genetic connection between the original and the modified sense was not quite obvious, we have made it clear by pointing out the intermediate notion, which formed their bond of union. Sometimes, also, it seemed of use for taking a view of the ramified meanings of a word, to give a summary and condensed statement of the principal ones at the beginning of the article, and to treat the rest as the special part of the explanation. This has been done particularly in the case of the particles, whose meanings are so very numerous. As regards the interpretation, strictly so called, of the Latin word in its various divisions and subdivisions, the aim has been to represent the notion in the original, by expressions completely answering to it and making it known in all its parts. This very endeavor has often made it necessary to transgress the usual law of lexicography, by which every Latin word must be turned into a German one. I am afraid that this law is not so much dictated by scientific lexicography, as by the pedagogical apprehension, that the scholar will be brought into perplexities by the want of a single correspondent term. Every linguist knows that, besides the general notions which are common to all nations, such as father, mother, brother and the like, there are but few words which in all languages move in just the same sphere. The locality, the public and domestic life, the state of scientific refinement, the religion and many similar causes attach notions to words, which are often entirely wanting to those, by which they are commonly translated in other languages; while these latter words again fill another circle, from which the former are far removed. He, therefore, who is sparing of his words in the translations of the lexicon, runs the risk of expressing a thought of his own, instead of the foreign notion which he wishes to reproduce. The word *canere*, for instance, is translated in the lexicons by *singen* [to sing], and the scholar has certainly thus obtained a word to which he can adhere in reading Latin. But our *singen* by no means exhausts the senses of the Latin *canere*. For the Roman *frogs* were as little used to *singing* as German ones; the Roman *tibia* no more sung than our *flute*. The signal for retreat was as little sung in the Roman army as

in our own ; and yet in all these cases *canere* is used by the Romans. What good then does even the pupil get from his definition *singen*? not to say that the scientific endeavor to comprehend the notion which the Romans united with their word in this way comes to nought. In translating the Latin particles, an interpreter who is sparing of his words, can at the best produce scarcely the most remote perception of their meaning in the mind of his reader. Hence while I have, as in duty bound, avoided accumulating useless explanations in the German part of the articles of the lexicon, I have, notwithstanding, not scrupled to sacrifice brevity to clearness and intelligibleness where a single German word failed of exhausting the sense of the Latin. The same wish to give the notion of the Latin words exegetically in their full comprehension, has been the reason why those articles which are concerned with Roman antiquities,—taking this term in its widest sense, and including art also,—have more space devoted to them than has been customary hitherto. That I have embraced art within this range will not be disapproved of by those who are really acquainted with the ancient classics. In regard to passages cited from Latin authors, as supports of the definitions, the principle has been, in the first place, to arrange them,—with the exception of the *locus classicus*, which ought to be put first,—in the order of age, that the imitations in later authors may clearly appear to be such ; in the second place, in the case of prose words and meanings, to arrange proof-passages from the poets behind those from prose-writers ; but in the case of purely poetic words and significations to take the opposite course ; in the third place, to abstain as far as possible from quoting writings decidedly not genuine ;—among which, however, I by no means reckon the fourth oration against Catiline, and the Orator of Tacitus ; but if it was necessary to make citations from them, to assign to such passages the very last place.

In order to make more clear the origin of many significations, the author has thought it best to compare the usage in other languages. It is evident of itself that on account of the great influence of the Greek upon the Roman literature, the usages of that language ought to be brought into the comparison, wherever they had influence ; indeed in many cases even whole passages out of Greek authors might be named, from which the corresponding Latin ones are either literal translations, or at least borrowed as it regards the thought. The German language also, the French and the English, have been called upon for aid, when they furnished

the desired analogies. But although all these languages supply materials in sufficient quantity for such comparisons, yet by their means, the Lexicographer can only make it appear, that the nations which sustained literary relations with the Romans had the same usages of speech, and followed the same analogies; and by this process those usages of speech are not thoroughly explained as to their origin. For if, for example, we point to the English word *city* in illustrating the use of the Latin *civitas* for *urbs*, we do not show that any other people has developed in the same way as the Romans, the notion of a city as a *place* from that of a *community*, because the English *city* is only a repetition of the Latin *civitas*. We need therefore for our lexical comparisons, besides those languages which are of the same stock with the Latin, another also which had no connection with it either etymological or literary; in order that, if we discover the same analogies in both, the process manifested in unfolding the same notion and in assigning to it similar relations may appear to belong to the human mind generally, and not to be restricted to a definite class of languages. For this purpose no language, lying so near the usual circle of studies, as the Hebrew, offered itself. And accordingly the author has always made use of it, where it afforded the desired analogies; for example, in the case of *Calendae*, as the Roman *proclamation-day*, of the Hebrew קָרָא בְּקָרָא; in that of the phrase *in capita* (for every man) of the Hebrew לְגִלְגָּלָה (for every skull); in that of the syntactic connection of the verb *cavere*, of the construction of the Hebrew הִשָּׁמֵר, which is perfectly similar, even down to the unusual *cavere cum aliquo*. Sometimes even the right explanation of expressions hitherto misunderstood, resulted from this comparison; for example, *bidens* can no longer be allowed to mean a sacrificial victim with two long front teeth,¹ but one which has two entire rows of teeth; for which the parallel is found in the Hebrew שְׁנֵי שָׁנִים, dual of שֵׁן tooth, [denoting the two rows of teeth].—Moreover, the Hebrew stands as near to the Latin as the Greek, though on another side, I mean in relation to the Latinity of the fathers. In this regard, it was no less a duty to bring the Hebrew into comparison, than the Greek in regard to the Latinity of Ennius and Pacuvius; for not unfrequently the meanings of words in patristic Latin are complete copies of Hebrew words. Compare *bene dicere* = בְּרַב, (Lexicon, benedico, No. 2.) Even traces of rabbinical idiotisms are not wanting.

¹ The author has the support of Festus for this explanation, besides that of the Hebrew analogy.

pare *cidaris* as the high-priest's head-dress with the rabbin. קָרָר קָרָרָא, etc.

D. *Synonymous Element*. Here far less can be brought under particular rules than in the exegetical part. The aim has been to make known clearly and intelligibly the points in which notions connected together on the one side differ on the other; and if the ancients have made just discriminations in this respect,—as is well known to be the case in the philosophical and rhetorical works of Cicero, and with special frequency in the Tusculan Questions and the work *De Inventione*—these, as *loci classici*, have been added to the German explanation of the author. In many instances, however, the synonymous connection of one word with others is attributable to the usual vague mode of turning it into German; and has disappeared before the precise and full explanation of the *one* notion which we have assigned to the word. (Comp. what was said under the last head). Often, also, it appeared by means of the special historical element of lexicography, (comp. E.) that the distinction between two words of kindred sense is a purely historical one; that the one word was used alone at one period, and the other at another, to mark the same idea. In such cases we have noticed this fact, instead of drawing distinctions between synonyms.

E. *Special-historical or Chronological Element*. According to L § 6, the space of time must be made known, within which a word or a signification was in use. In general this is manifest by examples from the classics, without further remark; but the exegetical element makes it necessary to distribute these examples under the various meanings; and hence passages chronologically connected must not unfrequently be disjoined from one another. Hence it happens that it becomes difficult to take a chronological survey of the article; and important to insert a short notice for this special end. With this object in view, we have arranged the body of Latin writings *first* into the following main periods. 1. Ante-classical, from the oldest fragments to Lucretius and Varro. 2. Classical, from Cicero and Caesar to Tacitus, Suetonius, and the younger Pliny inclusive. 3. Post-classical, from that time to the fifth century of our era. The classical Latinity again is divided into (a) Ciceronian, (b) Augustan, (c) post-Augustan. The post-classical Latinity, however, notwithstanding the length of its age, has not been subdivided into periods determined by the progress of decay. Only in order to repair this deficiency in some degree we have given the title of Late Latin to the language of

the fourth and fifth centuries, as contrasted with the less irregular and barbarous post-classical style, taken in a narrower sense. According to these divisions, every word, and if different meanings of a word belong to different ages, each single meaning has appended to it either the general remark—in all periods—or the special,—*ante-classical—Ciceronian—Augustan—post-Augustan—post-classical—late-Latin*;—and as it very often happens that words and significations current through one age, have sunk into disuse in the next, and then at the end of this period have come back into life, (comp. Hor. A. P. 60 seq., 70 seq.), it is hence readily understood, why we have also made such remarks as *ante* and *post-classical—ante-classical* and *post-Augustan*—and the like.

In order, however, to determine with accuracy the life-time of a word or meaning, it is necessary to say whether a writer uses it of himself, or whether it belongs to an earlier author. There are frequent mistakes in the best lexicons as it regards this point. That which Cicero quotes in his writings from the old poems of Ennius, Pacuvius, Attius, etc. (and all know that the number of these quotations is quite considerable)—that also which is found among Cicero's letters, from the pens of Caelius, Plancus, Brutus and Cassius, Pompey and others,—all this has been ascribed to Cicero himself; and ascribed too sometimes, even when Cicero in the passage where the word occurs, brands the expression as bad and unusual. For example, *bimaritus* passes for a Ciceronian word, although in the place of his writings where it is found, (pro Planc. 12, 30) he says to Laterensis, the accuser of Plancus, "Jacis adulteria, quae nemo, non modo nomine, sed ne suspicione quidem, possit agnoscere: bimaritum appellas, ut verba etiam fingas, non solum crimina." The author has taken pains to assign the true originator in every case; and where his name is not known at least, to describe him in general as "Auct. apud," etc. "old poet cited by," etc.

Sometimes it is impossible to decide whether a passage, placed by one writer to the account of another, is actually in the words of the latter or merely represents his thought. Take for examples the words ascribed by Cicero, in his orations to the opposite party; the discussions of learned men in Gallius, and the numerous statements of suits at law in Quintilian, etc. In such cases it has been thought advisable to impute to the author himself the words cited by him.

F. *Rhetorical element.* The specification of the kind of composition ought not, any more than the preceding element, to be left

to be gathered from the citations. We have therefore every where attached such remarks as *in prose and poetry—only in prose-poetical—in the poets or in the higher kinds of prose—peculiar to the comic style—or to the epistolary style*; and these appendages are omitted, only when the meaning of itself presupposes universal employment of the word in all kinds of writing.

The *termini technici*, however, deserve very especial notice. No where does the purely practical tendency of the Roman mind show itself in so clear a light, as when we look at the great number of terms of art, which are found in the best productions of Roman literature, as well in poetry as in prose. The provinces of religion, and public life, of the tribunal, of the camp, and of oeconomy, cross with their lines all the other relations of life, and carry along with them also the expressions which they employ. The technical terms, *arbiter*, *arguere*, *ascriptus*, *assignare*, *addicere*, *ad-dictus*, *asserere*, *vicem peragere*, and the like, occur in the best poets. Hence many Latin words take a circular path in the historical progress of their meanings. From common every-day life they pass over into a definite practical sphere; and after almost losing their identity by means of the secondary notions attached to them, are taken up again by common life and employed in quite other than their original import. The word *arbiter*, e. g. denotes etymologically¹ (*arbitere-adire*) an eye-witness. Together with this signification, which was in use through all periods and in all kinds of style, it obtained in the language of the law, even as early as the twelve tables, that of an *umpire*; from this legal sphere the poetry of the Augustan age adopted it in the sense of a *commander* or *master* and imparted it in this sense to the post-Augustan prose.²

If we would draw an exact line between the kinds of style, we must let it be known of a writer, who has attempted both prose and verse, from which division of his works a citation is taken. Sometimes this is told by the name of the work itself, as when we quote Cic. *Arat.* [frag. of transt. of Aratus.] Where this is not the case, the name of the author has the word *poeta* following it; as Varro *poeta*, Cicero *poeta*, Columella *poeta*.

G. *Statistic element.* It is plain that, until a Latin concordance exists, the facts relating to the rare or frequent occurrence of a word or a signification cannot be expressed by numerical signs.

¹ [ar = ad, and bitere or betere = ire, cognate with βαινω. Comp. ἀμφο-βητέιν.—Tr.]

² See the genetic connection of these meanings in the lexicon under *arbiter*.

It must suffice if the remarks—*very frequent*—*frequent*—*rare*—*very rare*—and the like, proximately express the amount of use of a word. Only in the case of the ἀπαξ εἰρημένα, so called, it is of importance to be precise. A separate sign has therefore been chosen for them—the star, *—which is applied to mark three gradations. (1) * prefixed to an article, shows that the word so marked is only once used. (2) * prefixed to a meaning, shows that the word occurs only once in this meaning. (3) * before an author's name shows that he has used the word only once.

Those words resemble ἀπαξ εἰρημένα, which, though occurring more than once, are found in but one writer. These also should be pointed out by a peculiar sign. But the author, finding this path wholly untravelled, has been the first to pursue it; he therefore did not venture to pronounce in all cases with decided confidence, and, wherever he thought himself right, preferred to satisfy the demand upon him by the remark—*only in such an author*—leaving the rest to the future advances and extension of this difficult branch of lexicography. Like other kinds of statistics, this element in regard to words can reach a degree of certainty and credibility only by continued improvement and correction.

‡ 2. Lexicography, owing to its historic nature, only allows us to give the results, which have been obtained by the researches we have pursued; and prevents us from showing the way itself in which we have reached our conclusions. Hence our views, especially if differing from the prevailing ones, are bereft of their supports; and the mind of the reader often feels a suspicion of the correctness of what is asserted. The author of the present dictionary, therefore, in order to render an account of the path which his lexical inquiries have followed, until they reached the results given in the work itself, has sketched the plan, if God shall grant him health, after the printing of the fourth volume of the dictionary shall have been completed, of issuing, as a sequel to the lexicon and commentary upon it, a work with the title of "Lexicalische Scholica, [lexical scholia] a specimen of which accompanies this preface, as an appendix. But here and there, in the lexicon itself, must single positions be supported by at least a few words, because they would be unintelligible, if destitute of all explanation. See, for example, the articles *assentior*, *assuesco*, *assimulo*.¹

¹ To prevent all possible misapprehension, let me here remark, that the notice relating to *assimulo*, in Jahn's Jahrbücher, (Vol. VII. No. 2. p. 234) was borrowed in an abridged form from the present lexicon.

[The author here refers, (1) to his observations under *assentior*, where he

IV. *Of the Arrangement of the Articles.*

‡ 1. As every article of a Latin lexicon (according to No. III. ‡ 1) is the monography of a Latin word, and every word forms an independent whole, it follows that the single articles of a Latin lexicon bear no inward relation to one another, and hence that the mode of their arrangement in the dictionary, as a collection of these monographies, is purely arbitrary.

Remark. It is sometimes asserted that the articles devoted to derived words in the lexicon, ought to stand by good right under those of their roots. This error rests on a confusion of notions. It is true, indeed, that every word, which is not primitive, stands originally in connection with its primitive; and that its nature, without a knowledge of this primitive, can be but imperfectly comprehended. And hence the etymology of every derived word is given in a lexicon, just as a biography begins with telling who were the ancestors of its subject. But this connection subsists only at the origin of the word. With the moment when it forms a part of language, the bond is severed; it unfolds the nature received from the primitive in an independent way. It preserves its independent being as long as it exists, and performs its part as the sign of an idea, on the same footing with its root, not *under* but *by the side of* the root; as the independent son, in the sphere of his activity is no longer a *son*, but a *man*, like his father. The same relation which the subject-matter of the one science bears to that of the other, that same relation do these objects compared bear to one another. Hence the single articles of a lexicon, as monographies of independent words, are themselves not subject to one another, but independent.

‡ 2. It is, however, desirable, for the easier consultation of the separate articles, that they should not be thrown together without a plan, but be arranged according to some principle, which may serve as a guide in finding what we seek. Now there are a number of such principles. A lexicon may be conceived of, which

shows that the deponent or middle form was alone in use so early as Varro's time, and accounts for this fact from the meaning of the word; (2) to his defence of the construction of *assuesco* with an ablative, against some remarks of Wunder; (3) to his doctrine in regard to the spelling of *assimulo*, rather than *assimilo*, that Latin euphony required *u* and *i*, when on the two sides of *l*, to take the forms *ilis* or *ulus*. The few exceptions, *mutilus*, *nubilus*, *pumilus*, *rutilus*, are, he thinks, owing to the first *u*. Hence difficult, but *difficilis* from *facul-tas*, *similis* from *simul*, but *simulo*, *dis-as-simulo*.—Tr.]

shall arrange its articles according to the several parts of speech, with subordinate divisions furnished by the different changes of form and of construction. Another might classify them by the significations, as the well known vocabularies in modern grammars bring their words under separate heads, like those "relating to God and divine things," those relating to "human bodies," etc.; a third might select the national extraction of the words as its guiding principle. (See II † 4.) Nor could any objection, in a scientific respect, be brought against either of these methods; for the very reason that the classification of the words is indifferent to science, and left by it to the free choice of the lexicographer.

† 3. Among possible principles, three have for centuries been more particularly applied in practice; the *purely alphabetical*, that which is *partly alphabetical and partly genealogical*, and that which is *partly alphabetical and partly etymological*. The first places all the words after one another in an alphabetical row, determined by the initial letters of each word; the second assigns such an order to the roots, but musters derivatives and compounds behind their primitives; while the third places roots and compounds in the order of the alphabet, but bids derivatives follow their roots. The first method aims singly and alone at convenience in finding the articles. The two others sacrifice a part of this convenience to scientific objects; the genealogical, endeavoring to bring into view together the whole family-circle of Latin words; and the etymological, stopping short of this at the derivations.

As to the last named method, which is well known to be pursued in Gesner's Thesaurus, we may ask why, in bringing the articles together, we should pay such especial attention to the etymological element of lexicography, which is neither the only nor the most important one. If the objects of lexicography can be attained after sacrificing a share of convenience, then every other element has as good a claim as the etymological to give law to classification. For, acceptable as it may be to the linguist, if you take one element into view, to be able to survey all the derivatives from a word, it may be equally so, in respect to another element, to see all the deponent verbs, or all the supines, or all the nouns of the fourth declension brought together; and no less so, in relation to a third element, to have a union in the same place of all the technical terms of the language, of religion, war, or oeconomy, all purely poetical expressions, and the like. Thus the grammatical and the rhetorical modes of arrangement have as much to say for themselves as the etymological; so that an ex-

clusive regard to the latter must appear partial and one-sided. Better reasons seem to exist in favor of the genealogical method. For, as no element of lexicography can present a rival claim to it, because the genealogy of words lies quite out of that sphere, he who makes it the rule of his arrangement is not guilty of partiality, and makes amends for the inconvenience of searching for a word twice, by giving a survey of families of words,—a thing of great interest to a philologist. But here arises another question; if the genealogy of words, as we have regarded it hitherto, lies out of the circle of lexicography, why should this science arrange its materials to suit the purposes of a science foreign to it. Is the reason that this foreign science has no other field to occupy? In this very fact now lies the fault. Scientific genealogy of words is needed, but hitherto has not been formed into a separate department of the general science of language and therefore lexicography must do its duties. Now every one readily perceives that this is not the right way to satisfy the demands of science. In time there must, and will without doubt, be formed a genealogy of words which shall take its place, as a science by the side of lexicography; and which, by means of tables exhibiting the relationship of words belonging to the same family in their various degrees of descent, shall make that clear on inspection, of which only an imperfect idea can be formed by putting words together in the lexicon. The author has made for himself a number of such genealogies; and will perhaps hereafter append one or two of them, accompanied with remarks to his Scholia. The family of CAPIO numbers a hundred and twenty words and over. If we allow to each of these on the average one page of the dictionary,—and *capio* alone fills four, *accipio* two, and the other compounds of the first degree, *con-ex-in-prae-sus-cipio* take up almost as much room—the whole family, when brought together, will spread itself over a space of more than a hundred and twenty pages: how can it be possible in such a case to take a survey of the family genealogy. But further; a genealogical table makes it plain at the first view, where a form has been passed over in the degrees of descent, or is wanting in the monuments of the language which have come down to us. Of the words growing out of the union of CAPIO with DIS, for example, one of the second degree *discepto* and two of the third *disceptatio* and *disceptor* are extant; but the immediate descendant in the second degree *dis-cipio* is not known to have existed. And so of the union of CAPIO with AVIS,—the word in the fourth degree *aucupatorius*

is extant, but not its progenitor in the third *auceptor*. A survey like this, the lexicon can in no way afford, because it can neither leave an empty space for the word which is lacking, nor insert that word, any more than others which do not exist, for the sake of its derivative.

‡ 3. Since, therefore, the *etymological* principle in arranging the articles of a lexicon, appeared to the author to be partial, and the *genealogical* to lie beyond the science of lexicography, he has, in his dictionary, pursued the purely alphabetical arrangement.

‡ 4. But we have had to deviate, in the following instances, from the order thus prescribed to the articles.

A. The grammatical element requires, (1) that all the secondary forms of a word should not be separately handled, but be arranged under the main form. Thus, e. g. *aevitas* under *aetas*; *balneae*, *balineum* and *balinaea* under *balneum*; *cors* and *chors* under *cohors*; *coda*, *colis*, *plastrum*, etc. under *cauda*, *caulis*, *plastrum*, etc.; and this, even when the form which deviates from the other had a peculiar meaning attached to it at single periods of the language; as *codex* under *caudex*; in which instances, moreover, the appropriate form must, as is clear of itself, accompany each separate meaning; (2) that derived adverbs should go along with their adjectives, even when the root-vowel is changed; as *bene* with *bonus*; and (3) that participles used in an adjective sense, under the appellation of participial-adjectives (in abbreviation *Pa.*), and printed in italics, should be taken up just after their verbs; whilst, on the contrary, pure participles are not specially considered.

B. The exegetical element requires that adjectives, derived from proper names, should be inserted under their primitives, and in the same article with them; because they would, for the most part, be unintelligible without the whole of the historical information which accompanies the proper names; and to repeat that information would be inadmissible.

Remark. All such words are likewise put down in the alphabetical series, and reference is there made to the place where they are treated of.

V. *Of the Signs and technical Terms employed in the Lexicon.*

‡ 1. This chapter treats of the methods adopted in the external getting-up of the present work. The aim has been clearness in every particular and convenient survey of the whole, even at the expense of room. In the first place, to the words heading the

articles, we have assigned, according to their different rank in the lexicon, either the ordinary Roman or capital letters, or Italics. (See II. § 2, and IV. § 4. Rem. 3.) The proper German translation, again, of the Latin word is pointed out to the eye, in order to distinguish it from the other German explanations by a larger German type [called the Schwabacher schrift]; the rule has been observed, in the longer articles with many meanings, in order that the eye may the more easily be arrested by the signs of subdivision, I. II., A. B., 1, 2, etc., to commence a paragraph with those signs whenever the article fills a whole column. It has been said already, that † denotes words of Greek origin; †† foreign words not of Greek origin; and * ἀπαξ εἰρημέρα. (See II. § 5, A, and B. III. § 1. C.) We add that [] accompany parentheses relating to etymology, and () those of other kinds. The sign of a hand adds a notice at the close of an article; and ~ prevents the necessity of repeating the word in the article devoted to it. For example, under *abduco*: ~ *legiones*, ~ *senatum*, instead of *abducere legiones*, *abducere senatum*, etc.

Compound words at the head of an article, are divided into their parts by a hyphen; and the etymology of that part is given, which, in the composition, has not lost its original form. The alterations in prepositions, however, are not so noticed, because a full account of them is given at the close of the articles on the prepositions themselves.

In quoting Quintilian, together with the book and chapter the paragraph is referred to; but not in the case of other authors (Cicero, Sallust, Livy, etc.), unless the chapter was of too great an extent; the endeavor being always to render the consultation of the passage as easy as possible. The name of an editor placed after a citation (e. g. *Caes. B. G. 2, 3 Herz. Hor., Ep. 2, 1. 20 Schmid*), calls attention to his exegetical remarks. Quotation-marks, accompanying a passage adduced, show that it is a *locus classicus* for the statement which it supports; as are citations from Pliny, in the case of objects of natural history; citations from Varro, Columella, Palladius, etc., in matters pertaining to rural economy.

The correction of the press demands most especial care, and without such care a lexicon so extensive, and consisting of such various elements must be the prey of all conceivable misformations. This duty, the difficulty of which only persons practically acquainted with the subject can estimate, has been performed by the candidate Meinhardt, in Leipzig, with a conscientious pains-

taking, which calls for the most grateful acknowledgement. From the beginning to the end of the volume, not a single sheet has even been set up, until this gentleman had carefully revised the manuscript, communicated to the author any doubts which struck him in regard to the correctness of the copy, and had those doubts removed. If, however, notwithstanding this almost anxious carefulness, all errors of the press have not been avoided; this must find its excuse in human liability to error, from which not even the utmost vigilance can escape. What kind of shape the lexicon would have received in the hands of a less cautious corrector, the last edition of Passow's lexicon shows in a very unfortunate example.

VI. *Of the Aids in preparing the Lexicon.*

§ 1. The Latin authors themselves are naturally the surest and richest mine for the lexicon. But as it would have been utterly impossible to examine, for lexicographical purposes, all the Latin authors, from Livius Andronicus and Ennius down to Jerome and Augustin, in unbroken series, with equal thoroughness, and, so to speak, at one heat; the author has made it his first object to examine the first or ante-classical period (see III. § 1. E); and hopes, with the help of Providence, gradually to press onwards. For the Latinity of this period he had prepared six separate special-lexicons, whose contents were, (1) Earliest Latinity down to Plautus; (2) Latinity of Plautus, to the exclusion of works falsely attributed to him (see III. § 1. C.); (3) Latinity of Terence; (4) Latinity of Lucretius; (5) poetic fragments from the age of Plautus to that of Cicero; (6) Latinity of the prose-writers before Cicero (Cato—*res rustica*; Varro—*res rustica*; and *Ling. Lat.*, Fragments.) From these special-lexicons, the most important passages (if the reading was to be relied upon) have been transferred to the pages of the present work. And in regard to the text it was necessary to use a severe judgment. Every one knows how lamentable the condition of the Fragments of the ante-classical writers, gleaned from the grammarians, yet is; and with how much unsteadiness conjectural criticism staggers about, hither and thither, on this so very slippery soil. But the lexicon needs, more than anything else, to refer to passages critically established; otherwise no sure result can be obtained, either as to the form or the sense of words; hence the author has preferred to leave a statement in the lexicon entirely without support from writers of the ante-classical period, rather than to rely upon what was, in a critical respect, suspicious.

Happily, in our days, this important part of Latin philology is beginning to draw the attention of the learned. Lindemann's *Corpus of Latin Grammarians*, who are, it is well known, the chief source for the ante-classical fragments,¹ is actively pursuing its course, so courageously begun: valuable collections, of a special kind, as Meyer's *Fragments of the Orators*, Neukirch's *Fabula Togata*, Krauser's *Fragments of the Old Historians*, are clearing up particular difficulties; and perhaps the author may have the pleasure, in future parts of this work, by the aid of Lindemann's edition of Nonius, of quoting a number of useful passages, which he must now pass by, as wholly unintelligible.

But if the Latinity of the above mentioned period demanded the greater share of attention, still the periods succeeding it received that degree of notice which the harmonious union of the whole indispensably called for. The results of many years' reading, for the purposes of lexicography, have been put together, in order to make the picture of the classical and post classical usage, if not a striking likeness, at least a resemblance to the original.

It hardly needs to be mentioned, that in using the classics, the author has adopted for his basis the existing critical editions. But as there neither is nor can be a critical edition, the correctness of whose readings may not here and there be doubted, the author has felt that he might follow his own subjective judgment; and accordingly, though he has usually adhered to one editor as giving the best text, he has, when it seemed to him necessary, gone over to the reading of another. In such cases, that edition is mentioned by name, in which the reasons for the adopted readings are unfolded.

† 2. Besides the classics, the Latin lexicons, both general and special, have been consulted, as well as those works which enter into some separate department of lexicography. The very acceptable materials, which were here found already collected, have been critically sifted and arranged in their proper places, and contribute a very great share to the completeness of the information contained in this work. On this occasion I feel constrained to mention, with sincere gratitude, a special-lexicon which is in the press while I write, and to which it gives me real pleasure to direct the attention of the learned public. This is a *Lexicon Quin-*

¹ I take this occasion to remark, that the oldest Latin monuments, such as the *Leges Regiæ*, the fragments of the *Twelve Tables*, the *Inscriptions on the Columna Rostrata* and on the *Tombs of the Scipios*, the *Song of the Fratres Arvales*, the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, etc., will be printed, as accompanying documents, at the end of the 4th volume.

tilianum, composed by Prof. Edw. Bonnell of Berlin. The highly honored author has had the unusual complaisance of allowing all the proof-sheets of his very valuable work to be transmitted to me for my use. Although when the first sheets reached me, the printing of my book had already advanced to the middle of the letter B (about to the 35th sheet), yet the small inequality in the plan of my work, thereby occasioned, seemed to me to be as nothing when weighed against the important gain which would accrue from the use of so thorough a work; and accordingly from the article *bibo* onward, I transferred to my manuscript, from this lexicon, whatever seemed suitable for the more general nature of my own dictionary. Those who can estimate the high importance of Quintilian's diction, in settling the usages of speech during the post-Augustan period, will feel bound to unite with me in the heartiest thanks to the learned author for his noble disinterestedness.

Breslau, Jan. 8, 1834.

WILHELM FREUND.

[The preface is followed by three specimens of what Freund calls his "lexicalische scholia." The first is written on the words *alvear*, *alveare*, *alvearium*, and shows that while the former was not used at all, the second only now and then occurs in writings of the post-Augustan period, and that the third was in good and general use. Freund also maintains that the endings *-ar* and *-are* of the same word, and alike in good use, are scarcely to be found; and yet again, that the ending *-alis* is especially appropriated to objects of religion, and *-arius* to those of common life. *-ar* seems to have arisen out of *-al*, when an ending of derivatives, owing to a previous *l* in the word.

In the second he maintains, that in Cic. Orat. 47. 158, when the orator says, "una praepositio est *abs*;" etc., the reading ought to be "est *AF*;" which form was (Cicero would then say) still in use in keeping accounts, and was regarded by him as the original one.

In the third he shows that *u* of the fourth declension makes *us* in the genitive; that the manuscripts are quite in favor of this form, and that the supposed genitive in *u* is to be ascribed to the use, among physicians, of such half-compounds as *cornububuli*, *cornucervini*, like *olisatri* for *oleris atri*, *sil-Gallici* for *silis Gallici*.]