

merely, but with principalities and powers, with the rulers of the darkness of this world, and with spiritual wickedness in high places. No doubt should enter our minds, that we have a great adversary, who seeks every opportunity to lead us astray, and that he has at his command innumerable spirits, ready to do his bidding and further his wicked designs upon mankind.

ARTICLE V.

LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE M. LANE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

It is now more than twenty years since the first volume of Freund's *Lexicon of the Latin Language* was published. This work supplied a want that had long been felt, and its circulation has accordingly been very great. A *Lexicon* drawn in part immediately from the ancient authors themselves, with a judicious criticism of the materials, employing in its definitions the supple adaptation of the German, in place of ponderous Latin periphrasis, full enough for the ordinary scholar, and yet compressed into four volumes of moderate size, could hardly fail to come into general use, and crowd out its predecessors. The heavy *Thesauri* of former days were too bulky and inconvenient. The four folio volumes of Gesner, laden with a learning that reminds one of the Dutch philologists, were constructed on an antiquated plan. The *Lexicon* of Forcellini — an immeasurable advance on what had preceded it — still held ground, and is at this very moment printing in an extended form at Padua. Scheller's estimable work, which Ruhnken condescended to correct and superintend in a Leyden edition, held the first place in common use, with its modifications by Lünemann and Georges.

The favorable reception which the work of Freund has met with, is due quite as much to his theoretical exposition of the wants of Latin Lexicography, as to his practical execution. The Preface, in which he lays down his principles, is a masterly production. So too the lexical scholia on special words prefixed to the lexicon, are models of patient and thorough investigation. We may trace here the influence of Greek lexical studies: the plan of a Greek lexicon begun originally by Johann Gottlob Schneider and improved by Passow has undoubtedly contributed much in an indirect way to the adoption of just views in regard to the lexical stores of the sister language.

It was soon evident, however, that Freund's theory was in advance of his practice. The minute criticism to which the ancient authors had been subjected, the great range of reading required, the necessary concentration and condensation of the vast material, made the task too great for the powers of one man. Some of the articles are very thorough and satisfactory, others are slurred over imperfectly or copied. Some authors are treated thoroughly, or were treated thoroughly for the times, others are cited, but nothing more; in the study of Lucretius, for example, not much satisfaction will be found in Freund. In place of independent researches, we find appended to every Lucretian word merely an extract from the metrical version of Johann von Knebel.

Again, many traditional errors indicate that Freund has not always gone back to his authorities, and weighed the evidences judiciously. For example: every lexicographer, from Gesner down to Klotz, Ingerslev, Freund, and his translators, cites a verb *PERITO*, "a frequentative from *pereo*." If we look to the authorities adduced in support of this strange word, we find quoted Lucret. 3, 710, and Plaut. Capt. 3, 5, 32. Lucretius does not use the word: in the place quoted, *peritare* (if there were such a word) would be out of place, and secondly the codd. Lugd. give this line *ex illa quæ tum perit partita per auras*. Plautus does not use the word; the line of the Capt. referred to reads, to be sure in the old editions, in Weise for instance, *qui per virtu-*

tem peritat, is non interit. The "peritat" here seems opposed to interit. But in reality it arises from an error in writing two words as one. Now the proof: Nonius de diff. verb. p. 422, quotes this very place under the word pereo, in order to explain the difference between pereo and intereo: "Plautus Captivis: qui per virtutem perit at non interit." PERITARE is a figment which is not found in any classical author; and strange to say, while lexicographers propagate it from age to age, they overlook the only place where it is intentionally used, viz., by the author of the Thesaurus, published by Mai, Auctt. Vaticani, VIII., p. 189, who says: "a pereo peritas, i. e., perire verb. frequent." But this writer betrays the blunder he has made by the example he quotes: "unde *Plautus in Captivis*: qui per virtutem peritat."

The same thing may be shown of not a few other words which Freund has embodied in his work. For most of these words he can hardly be considered answerable, since they passed unchallenged by the criticism of his times. Of a more serious nature, perhaps, is the omission of classical words: superfluity is more pardonable than deficiency. Here again Freund cannot be held answerable for words added to our lexical store since the publication of his work. For example, the noun efferitas, the existence of which might almost be assumed *a priori* from the adjective efferus, the verb effero, etc., has been proved by Klotz from external arguments to be not only a good, but a Ciceronian, word. But as its claims to citizenship have only recently been made known, it is of course not found in Freund's book.

We have spoken of Freund's sins of commission and omission, in which unhappily he does not stand alone. The same cleaving to tradition has propagated many errors in the definitions of words. Take for example *praecanus*. This word is used only once, and then by Horace in the description of his own person, epist. 1, 20, 24: corporis exigui, praecanum, solibus aptum. In all dictionaries, without exception, this is rendered "*prematurely gray*." Examining the authorities for this meaning of *prae* in composition,

we find it goes back in the last instance to the interpretation of the Schol. Cruq. ante tempus canus. But if we compare the usage of the language, we shall arrive at a different signification, *very gray*, as the *prae* does not refer to time, but to comparison with other men. Between prematurely gray and very gray there may not be a very great difference, but lexicography must to a hair divide.

To take another instance of traditional error. All dictionaries define *memoriter* "from memory, by heart." The opposite of this would be *de scripto*, as Nizolius gives it. This is as false as false can be. *Memoriter dicere* *never* means to *speak from memory* as opposed to speaking from notes or reading; it always refers to the memory as a mental faculty; *memoriter dicere* means to speak *with a ready and comprehensive memory*. This is so beautifully demonstrated by the citations of Madvig (Finn. p. 74) that it is strange lexicographers have not paid heed to it. And yet such is the conservatism of dictionaries, that it would be safe to predict that the erroneous interpretation will be found in lexicons published in 1879.

It was a step in the right direction for Freund to distinguish the words of different epochs and authors, by prefixing to each word the designation ante-classical, classical or post-classical, or poetical. This is particularly called for in a language which sunders by the sharpest lines poetry from prose; which confines itself in the golden age of its literature to a limited round of words, compensating by its intensity and energy for the budding fulness and the breadth of a former age. With many words the boundary-line is sharp and precise. With others it is less definite, fading away in imperceptible gradations. The danger in applying designations like those of Freund, is that of overshooting the mark, and generalizing from a limited number of examples. For the historical study of the language, Freund is unsatisfactory: he does not inform us with sufficient accuracy in what writer and what work a form first appears. Taking his authority, we should set down e. g. *glutio* as a "postaugustan" word: indeed, all the examples Klotz gives are

from Juvenal, Tertullian, Fronto and Pliny; but in Plaut. Pers. 94, stands *nimio sunt crudae, nisi quas madidas glutias*. So the noun *vernilitas*, where also Klotz is again deficient. This now stands at the beginning of the Bacchides. On the other hand, *edolo* appears as a Ciceronian word; but Cicero uses it in a gamesome way merely, in one of his epistles, as a quotation from a tragic poet. In other cases Freund is too apt to mark a word as poetical, which really makes a part of the prose of a later age; so *miseriter*, which is used by Appuleius.

From these passing strictures on the work of Freund, the inference is not to be drawn that we are disposed to slight his valuable services to lexicography. The additions he has made and the simplicity he has introduced must be gratefully acknowledged. Our object has only been to show that he did not come up to the ideal of himself or his age.

The lexicographical labors undertaken out of Germany since the beginning of this century, have been confined chiefly to the translating and compiling from German works. Mr. Leverett's accurate compilation from Scheller and Lünemann was a welcome substitute for the Ainsworth to which the preceding generation was confined. Mr. Riddle's modest work is favorably known as a school-book; and the translation of Freund, superintended by the late Mr. Andrews in America, and Mr. Smith in England, has brought a more copious mass of materials before the reading public, though it is to be regretted that they did not take the opportunity to make improvements that were obviously needed.

If we look back now twenty years and compare the present state of Philology with its condition at that time, we find great changes. The most important advance, which lies indeed at the bottom of all philological and historical studies, has been in the way of criticism. The eclectic method of former days, which coördinated all manuscripts of all ages and values, and from the diversity of readings thus presented, selected those which the majority of manuscripts or the whim of the editor might favor, is now happily exploded; the old tradition *editio princeps codicis instar*

is now set aside. A more rational method has been introduced, and the reading of one good manuscript is deservedly put before those of fifty bad ones. The great labor expended during the past ten or fifteen years in selecting and collecting the best manuscripts, has been attended with the best results; and, aided by judicious and methodic emendation, it has furnished texts of most of the Latin authors in a state of great purity.

A second class of aids to lexicography consists in the lexicons to special authors. The unaccomplished here unfortunately preponderates over the accomplished. The ideal lexicon of the Latin language, towards which things seem to be slowly tending, can never be written till the usage of individual writers is carefully studied and thrown into a lexical form; and already something has been done towards this end. We may notice here such works as Bonnell on Quintilian, and Bötticher on Tacitus, though the latter might with profit be considerably augmented. Valuable materials for the lexicography of the Dramatists, with the exception of Plautus and Terence, and for Ennius, may be found in the editions of Ribbeck and Vahlen. For Plautus we have the programme of Kampmann, *Res Militares Plauti*, a dictionary of the military terms used by Plautus, a sort of forerunner to a more complete *Lexicon Plautinum*. But for the great majority of authors nothing satisfactory is found. Even for Cicero we have only the meagre indices of Ernesti and Schütz, or the inconvenient collections of Nizolius. A *Lexicon Ciceronianum* suited to the age is an important desideratum.

In a third class we may put works bearing more or less directly on the subject of lexicography, such as works on *Synonymes*, *Style*, on *Comparative Philology and History*, *Antiquities*, etc.

With these means and appliances a new step has been taken, and a *Lexicon* prepared which bids fair to supersede Freund. The author is REINHOLD KLOTZ, well known from his edition of Cicero's Orations, his *Devarius* on Greek Particles, his connection with Jahn's *Jahrbücher*, and many

other literary undertakings. When the lexicon was begun, Professor Klotz was Extraordinary Professor of Philology at the University of Leipsic. Before it was completed he was promoted as the successor of Gottfried Hermann at the same university. The aims of the work are perhaps best given in the words of the programme :

“ First, to embody in the work the substratum of the Latin language itself, i. e. the roots of the Latin language and the words derived from them, as fully as the narrow limits of a lexicon allow ; to point out, so far as is possible, their derivation or connection, to fix their fundamental signification, and to define this more explicitly by their usage ; furthermore, to develop the shades of meaning a word may have, from the fundamental signification, and arrange them in their natural order, with careful attention to the technical terms used by statesmen and diplomatists, jurists, rhetoricians, naturalists, physicians, agriculturalists, architects, etc., which had not hitherto been treated with uniform success.”

“ Secondly, to give the connections in which the words are found, if not with all the detail of a thesaurus, yet with greater completeness than had hitherto been done, and in a more perspicuous way than is done in the larger dictionaries ; to point out accurately the grammatical constructions in which the words occur, and to pay special regard to the prepositions and other particles.”

“ For the attainment of the first of these two ends, it was necessary, in the first place, to make a careful use of Etymology, Synonymics and Antiquities, and to give at least the final results to which they lead. As to the Etymology, the author has endeavored to give his own views with all possible caution, and to note briefly the views held by the ancients themselves on the etymology of any word, although these views may, on investigation, prove untenable, as they generally aid in showing the idea which the ancients had of a word. Synonymics, i. e., the comparison of words of similar signification, so profitable for the understanding of the exact meaning of words, the author has deemed of greater importance, and has generally endeavored to confirm the

results attained, by appending words of the opposite signification; he has also briefly touched on the synonymics of forms, showing for example the difference between *abitio* and *abitus*, *abortio* and *abortus*, *actio*, *actus*, *actum*, and *agmen*, *discessio* and *discessus*, *scriptio*, *scriptura*, *scriptus*, and *scriptum*. And finally, as to the Antiquities, the author has thought them a fit subject for consideration only when necessary for the understanding of a word, or for the explanation of certain established phrases, while he has refrained from introducing them into articles of a purely historical or mythological nature."

"For the second end, it was furthermore necessary to pay more regard than has hitherto been paid to the Grammar of the Latin Language, both in respect to Etymology and Syntax; yet here also the author has always tried to separate the mere grammatical from the lexical grammatical, and to avoid unnecessary detail; yet it was occasionally necessary to show the difference in signification between different syntactical connections, e. g. between *manere aliquem* and *alicui*, *subire aliquam rem* and *alicui rei*."

"Proper names, so far as they belong in a dictionary of the Latin language, have been incorporated in the body of the work for various reasons; many of them, particularly the genuine Latin names, were originally appellatives, and constitute an integral part of the language; moreover, the forms derived from them are often to be discussed as synonymes, e. g. *Achæus* and *Achivus*, *Hispanus*, *Hispanicus* and *Hispaniensis*. The Geographical Names particularly have received careful attention on account of their various Derivatives."

The work was begun in this spirit more than ten years ago, but — *habent sua fata libelli* — various hindrances intervened, and it lingered along slowly. After a time the coöperation of two other scholars was secured, Dr. Lübker, of Parchim, and Dr. Hudemann, of Kiel, with whose aid the work was completed.

We have then in this work of Klotz a dictionary embodying the latest results of German patience and study, and representing, better than any other dictionary does, the

present phase and condition of Latin antiquity in Germany. To show its superiority by selecting a few articles from Klotz and Freund, and exhibiting them side by side, would be an easy and not unprofitable task, if space allowed. But what is aimed at in the following is rather to point out some of the deficiencies and errors still noticed in all our dictionaries. In doing this, Klotz is taken as the basis, because it is the best lexicon; and what holds with regard to this, holds *a fortiori* of others.

In regard to the number of words quoted and the range of authors included, a short inspection will show that Klotz is far more copious than his predecessors. The additions are made chiefly from later authors, who occupy the debatable ground between the genuine Latinity of the Romans and the barbarous Latinity of the Middle Ages. Strict theory may be inclined to reject these authors in a lexicon of pure Latinity. But, practically, it is no small convenience to have included those words and combinations which have sprung directly from the Latin of a purer age, even though the spirit which dictated them may not be the classical spirit of former times. Furthermore, these words may be of use in illustrating words and phrases of the classical period, as they occasionally betray a reminiscence of some classical author, or may now and then be genuine words of the classical age, which from accident or chance have not been used by writers of preceding ages, or have not come down to us in works preserved. Thus the verb *circumtero* is given by Freund as a *ἀπαξ εἰρημένον*, and is by Klotz said to be used only figuratively of the contact of one *person* with another, with the reference to Tibull. 1, 2, 72: *hunc puer hunc juvenis turba circumterit arta*; but we find it used in the primary sense, Myth. Vat. III. p. 183 of the sea, *wasting* or *rubbing* on the land. Again, Klotz asserts of the word *aspritudo* that it is used "only of a raw, inflamed or pustulous condition of body, e. g. *aspr. similis pustulis iis*; *aspr. oculorum*: *linguæ*." Yet App. Mett. 1, 2, 17, says *aspritudinem jugi quod insurgimus*. What is chiefly objectionable in Klotz's treatment of these words is a certain want of consistency.

The Latinized word *hydromantia* is given with a reference to Pliny and late writers, while *aeromantia*, *chiromantia*, *geomantia*, and *pyromantia* are not cited. The word *demorsito* is omitted (App. Mett. 2, 22, 144 ; 3, 25, 221), although the language of Appuleius belongs in the lexical treasury. The adverb *fixe* is given as occurring in one place only, and there in the comparative *fixius* ; the positive *fixe* is used by Cassiodorus (fr. ap. Mai., Auctt. Vatt. III. p. 353), which should be given in the dictionaries. *Actualiter* and *imprægnò* are found in Klotz's, and perhaps in no other lexicon. But why they are more entitled to a place than hosts of other words from the same authors, it is hard to see. Altogether, for these late writers, more independent study is necessary to give greater symmetry to the work.

The remarks in the Programme on the propriety of adopting Proper Names in the Lexicon are very just. The English edition of Andrews's *Freund* is not improved by the omission of Proper Names. In the vocabulary of an ancient language, where they are of necessity limited, they may justly claim a place, at least in the present state of lexicography, and for other reasons besides those given by Klotz. The greater vivacity and transparency of a primitive language and the intimate connection between the name and the person or thing named, make it important that the etymological and lexical element they contain should not be overlooked. Every reader of the classics knows with what avidity the ancients seized on the meaning of a name, rang changes on it, and twisted it into fantastic puns, which in colder and less susceptible languages would seem tame and bald. Cicero does not shrink from going down to the root of his antagonist Verres's name, and in one of his most elaborate orations contrasts C. Claudius *Pulcher* with C. *Verres*, or speaks of him as *ex homine tanquam aliquo Circaeo poculo factus Verres* ; or again he deduces the name from *verro* to sweep, and alludes to him under the name of *everriculum*, a drag-net.

The importance attached to the sound or the fancied etymology of a name is well shown in the changes of names

of towns *ominis causa*; for instance, *Maleventum* is changed to *Beneventum* on account of the fancied derivation from *male* and *venire*: *Dyrrachium* is preferred to *Epidamnus*, to avoid the sound of *ἐπί* and *damnum*: *Segesta* is retained rather than *Egesta*, *Ἔγεστα*, which sounds too much like *egestas*. In innumerable other instances, the ancient interpretations of names are etymologically wrong; for example, the Homeric derivation of the name of *Odysseus*, or the divinatory interpretation of the name of *Helen* in *Æschylus*, *ἐλεῖν -ναῦς*, instead of *σέλας, σελήνη*. Fanciful expositions like these are made for the need of the passing moment. It is perhaps the part of the special exegesis of a particular author to comment on *Sophocles's* derivation of *Αἴας* from *αἰαῖ*, or the exultant interpretation, *αἰετός*, the soaring, sweeping eagle. But even wrong interpretations show that the name was not regarded as a dead or abstract sign for the thing. It is a vital part of the organism of the language, always combining something of a general nature with the specific, and connected by roots and by inflections with its whole lexical and grammatical substratum. Adjective forms and compounds, which have been lost from the written language, may be retained in a name. Thus from the root *niv-* we find *niveus*, *nivalis* and *nivarius*; from the root *ninguo* the lexicons cite only *ninguidus*. But another adjective of this later root may be added, *ninguarius*, which is found as the name of one of the *Insulae Purpurariae* in *Plin.* 6, 32, (37) 104, *Ninguaria*, which the lexicons omit. Or as an instance of a compound of *vallis* we find in the same place in *Pliny* *Invallis*, improperly quoted under *Convallis*.

For Fictitious names, indeed, there is obviously no place but the lexicon. In biographical, geographical or mythological collections, they are not in their place; and fictitious names, particularly comic names, have a more palpable and significant lexical element than ordinary names. *Klotz* has wisely followed his predecessors and adopted them in his book. But in his treatment of these he has not always made use of the results of modern criticism and independent labors, and he omits many names simply because they are

not found in the works of his predecessors. Chrysopolis, the modern Scutari, is given because it is mentioned by Pliny and Ammianus Marcellinus. But why omit the fabulous Eldorado, Goldville, in Arabia, which now stands in the text of Plautus, Pers. 506 ?

Chrysopolim Persæ cepere urbem in Arabia,
Plenum bonarum rerum atque antiquom oppidum.

The punning names in the Captivi, 160 sqq., Pistorienses, Panicei, Placentini, Turdetani, Ficedulenses are very properly cited: but why omit the ominous list of boon companions in the Trinummus, 1821 ?

Chiruchus fuit, Cerconicus, Crimnus, Cricolabus, Collabus.

Surely Collabus, Grab, Grip, is not to be passed over, as it is something of a curiosity in the way of a lexical hybrid, con and λαβείν. Or further, why not cite Archidemides (Bacch. 250), a name which seems chosen for the sake of the pun (vs. 284) with demo ?

Quom mi ipsum nomen ejus Archidemidis
Clamaret dempturam esse, si quid crederem.

Gelasimus, the parasite of the Stichus, is overlooked ; and yet, vs. 174, we read :

Gelasimo nomen mi indidit parvo pater
Quia jam a pausillo puero *ridiculus* fui.

And honest Gripus, of the Rudens, has been slighted, although the name is obviously chosen with reference to his calling, and the city he proposes to found and call by his name, monumentum famæ et factis, refers to the Sicilian γριπέύς, fisherman. Further, the suggestive name of the place, Cryphiolathronia, is omitted.

Besides the etymological significance of most proper names, they are often worthy of notice as expressing a character, or as abstractions of personal attributes ; if Verres is said to

be like Q. Mucius, the latter name might not belong in the lexicon; but when he calls him a Q. Mucius, it is plainly used in a lexical sense. Clinia is a man's name, but in Pl. Bacch., 912, it denotes a phase of character.

Many important omissions of names are to be remedied in the dictionaries. On the other hand, many names that are found in the dictionaries are to be modified materially or to be entirely shut out. We find, for example, Arripides for Quodsemelarripides; Expalponides for Nummosexpalponides; Cluninstaridysarchides for Clutomestoridysarchides; the campi Gurgustidonii for Gorgonidonii. Idistavisus is given as the nominative of the German grove mentioned by Tacitus, A. 2, 16, instead of Idistaviso: cf. Nipperd. ad loc.

Under Megara, Klotz mentions the "Dat." Megaribus, but omits the nom. Megares, Plaut. Merc. 646, Proll. Trin. 152. In connection with the name Silenus, the femin. form should be mentioned, Silena, Lucret. 4, 1169.

To mention the changes to be made here in detail would be a thankless task. Some of these errors betray a carelessness of critical authority and inattention to grammatical forms. Klotz gives s. v. Dolo the form Dolum, as from Dulus, a metaplastic nom. of Dolo, with Plaut. Pseud. 1244, as his authority; but the true reading is *superavit dolum* Trojanum, the Trojan wile, fortified by Becker de comm. Rom. fabb. p. 64, with citations from Hom. Od. 8, 492, and Verg. Æn. 2, 264. All dictionaries give a word Cæligenus, Cælusborn. On what authority? Varro uses it of Victoria and Venus; Appulejus of stellæ: but this proves nothing for the nom. in *us*. Analogy points rather to a nom.-gena, as in Saturnigena, Terrigena, Janigena, Divigena, Martigena, Phœbigena, etc. And analogy is confirmed by its use in Ausonius, overlooked by the lexicons (Ecl. de Fer. Rom. 36), Falcigerum placant sanguine Cæligenam.

When proper names make an integral part of an adjective or verb, they come very clearly within the limits of the lexicon. A Greek lexicon would not omit such words as *δύσπαρις*, *αἰνόπαρις*. Nor should a Latin; Att. 561, Ribb.:

Pari dyspari. Charmides the lexicons give, and the verb *charmida*; they omit *decharmido* to uncharmize, Pl. Trin. 977, and quote the corrupt *recharmido*.

Under the head of Proper Names, we may perhaps include Greek titles of buildings, etc., or works of art, latinized; e. g. from book 34 of Pliny we may add to the lexicons *Epithyon*, Slayer, found only in the acc. fem. sing. *Epithysan*; *Buthytes*, Oxen-slayer, the name of a statue of Isidotus; *Hageter*, an epithet of Hercules.

In connection with Greek names and appellations, we may notice the further omission of many Greek words, temporarily adopted into the Latin language, and written with Latin letters. Freund lays down the rule in the preface of his lexicon, that, in the older Latin authors, Greek words are more commonly given in Greek letters; in the later Latin as Latinized words with Latin letters. This may be true of technical terms of the Ciceronian age and the writers following that age, as compared with the later commentators and grammarians. But if we set aside technical terminology and look at the literature, we shall find the canon reversed, particularly if we take the dramatists into account. When the ancient Latin writers use a Greek proper name, they are inclined to latinize it as far as possible: later writers use the Greek form. The ancient writers unhesitatingly adopt many Greek words, and make Latin words of them, which later purists drop. The thing may perhaps better be stated thus: The older Latin authors use Greek words precisely as if they were Latin. These words are not so many dead things taken from books, but are, to a greater or less degree, familiar to the ear, are caught from the spoken word, and work their way up to Rome from Magna Græcia or Sicily: and before the complete establishment of a Roman literature and laws of criticism, they formed an organic part of the written language of that unconscious age. Then follows the period of reflection, of study and of conscious criticism; Greek words are banished by strict purists from literary productions addressed to the general public, from history, and oratory. They are used in

philosophy and criticism as technical terms, taken from books, familiar to scholars rather than to the public at large. As such, they are commonly written in Greek letters. Then follows the third period, when the feeling for purity is gone, and foreign words are unhesitatingly used.

Moreover, critical changes of texts, made since the publication of Freund's lexicon, extend somewhat the domain of lexicography in this respect. This may be illustrated by the examples, *instar omnium*, given by Lachmann, ad *Lucr.* 4, 1169. The text of *Plaut. Epid.* 5, 2, 17, gives *apolactizo inimicos* instead of *ἀπολακτίζω inim.*,¹ which Klotz does not notice. So also *traulizo* = *τραυλίζω balbum esse*, *Lucret.* 4, 1164, belongs in the Latin lexicon, even though the inflection is Greek, *traulizi*: and from the same place we may add the following euphemisms for personal defects: *melichrōs*, honey-colored = *nigra*: *acosmos* = *immunda et fetida*: *dorcas* (for which the lexicons give only the primary meaning) = *nervosa et lignea*: the combination *Chariton mia* = *parvula, pumilio*: *cataplexis* = *magna atque immanis*: *ischnos* in the neut. with *eromenion*, = *cum vivere non quit præ macie*: *rhadinus* in fem. *rhadinē* = *jam mortua tussi*: *philema* = *labeosa*. Under *satyrus* 2d, should be added that the fem. occurs *Lucr.* 4, 1169.

The following two, mentioned by Lachmann, also belong here: *zetematium*, *Lucil. ap. Non.* 359, 14; and *eupatereia*, id., the Homeric epithet of Tyro.

Plaut. Most. 595, latinizes the Greek *γρῦ*=*grunt*: ne *gry* quidem, or perhaps better, *gru*, = *οὐδὲ γρῦ*. *Chilōter*, *tri*, s., name of a garment, *χειλωτήρ*, is to be added from *Nov. ap. Non.* 148, 31, *Ribb.* p. 219.

Many changes are yet to be made in this part of lexicography, and the subject requires a careful and critical revision.

We notice now some of the omissions of compound words, beginning with Verbs. In compounds, consisting of a verb and a preposition, the first part is often uncertain,

¹ Unless we prefer to write with Fleckeisen, *Ep. crit.* p. xiii, *apolactisso*, which would also change the *badizo* of the *lexx.* to *badisso*.

owing to difference of texts, particularly with *dis-* and *de-*, which are confounded in the manuscripts. For instance, *decerto* is a very familiar word: *discerto* no lexicon gives. The best authorities give it Plaut. Men. 809, *dic mi istuc quod discertatis ut sciam*. Here it is confounded with *dissero*.¹ On the other hand, *dejungo* is given as a Plautinian word: it should be *dijungo*. Of *despolio*, the lexicons say that it occurs once in a deponent form. Not so: in the supposed instance of this dep. the MSS. give us a different verb, wanting in the lexicons: *quos impune depopulatur* [et] *dispolatur* *dedecus*, a compound of *dis-* and the root *polor*, found in *interpolare*: cf. Ribbeck, p. 146.

Other prepositional compounds, omitted by Klotz and others, are *amigro, as*, to move away, Liv. 1, 34: *adneo, es*, to sew on, Plin. 11, 2, (1), 3, *pinnas adnevit: attumulo, as*, to heap up: id. 9, 6, (5), 14, [orca] *attumulata fluctibus in tantum ut circumagi nullo modo posset: eccelebro, as*, Liv. 1, 45: *magnitudo victimæ eccelebrata fama* (cf. *ecnubo*, ibid. 4, 4 and Alschefski ad 6, 15): *injurgo, as*, id. 10, 35, *hæc injurganti increpantique*. *Supereo* may be added on account of Lucret. 3, 1031, *pedibus superire lacunas*, though it is somewhat doubtful whether it is a part of the verb. *Neparco* = non parco, is found in Plaut. Most. 124, *sibique aut materiae neparcunt*.

In verbs compounded with two prepositions, it is hard to say whether the first preposition is a constituent part of the verb, or whether it is to be taken adverbially or as a preposition with its case. The latest manuscript investigations, however, go to show that these double compounds occur oftener than we might infer from common editions and lexicons. *Circumaspicio* is a case in point; as the text of Pliny is now constituted we read, 8, 33, (51), 121, *totius oculi versatione circumaspicit*; and if we should prefer with Hand, Turs. II., p. 70, to divide it, *circum aspicit*, the place should not be quoted, as Klotz quotes it, under *circumspicio*. But besides the double compounds furnished by the lexicons, cir-

¹ In Cato ap. Paul. Diac. p. 46, is *quid ego cum illo discertem* amplius perhaps to be read?

cumaspicio is well supported by *circuminspicio*, also overlooked in the lexicon: Liv. 1, 30, Sabini circuminspicere et ipsi externa auxilia: cf. Alschefski ad 1, 21: and by *circuminsto*: id. 3, 9: si consules circuminstarent et ipsi tribunum. We may add *adinsurgo*: Liv. 22, 4, colles adinsurgunt; *superincido*: id. 2, 10, multis superincidentibus telis; *adprocurro*: Plin. 10, 33, (51), 103. And to the late examples of *suberectus* should be added, Liv. 8, 8, hasta suberecta cuspidē in terram fixa.

We may include in the list of omitted compound verbs many others where the second or verbal part of the compound has brought the verb into a wrong place. *Deungo*, to rub one's self down, anoint, is now read in Plaut. Ps. 222, vino tu te deungis, where formerly the absurd devincis stood. *Decello, ere*,=declinare Lucret. 2, 219, corpora—decelere paullum: the dictionaries do not give this, though Klotz properly corrects himself, s. v. depello. We have the colloquial *gratulari*, and the more dignified *gratari*: the compound *congratulari* is quoted, but *congratari* overlooked, Plaut. Men. 129, conferre omnes congratantes. The frequentative *accusito* occurs perhaps only once, but *incusito* occurs in the same place, Plaut. Most. 713: nihil erit quod deorum ullum accusites: Te ipse jure optimo incusites licet. Another frequentative, *clarigito*, is now established by Lachmann, Lucret. 5, 946, decursus aquai Clarigitat late sitientia secla ferarum. This place Klotz quotes s. v. cito, with the misprint *clavus citat* for *clarus*. A more suspicious compound is *insolesco*, which may be added for Plaut. Men. 461: quoi tam credideram insoluisse=insuevisse. *Emino, -are*, found in the Vulg. N. T., hardly belongs here perhaps: but *eminor*, which the lexicons give, with Plaut. Capt. 4, 2, 11 for authority, does not exist; cf. Proll. Trin. p. 178: further, the citation Plaut. Capt. 799, quae illæc est minatio, should be added s. v. minatio, and the word *eminationis* struck out. In connection with this root, we may notice the spurious Plautinian word given by the dictionaries, *minaciae* for *minae*, which certainly does not occur in the places quoted by Klotz, and future criticism must decide whether it is in place, Truc. 5, 56.

992 : 995 : 1002 : 1052 : Næv. fr. 32 : Enn. 302, Ribb. ; cf. Rhein. Mus. VII, p. 556.

Interutrāque, between both, Lucret. 2, 518 : 3, 306 : 5, 472, 476 and 839 : 6, 362 and 1062.

Not compound words alone do we look for in the lexicon in vain. The simple inceptive verb *certisco* = certum fieri, occurs Pacuv. 107, Ribb. : atque eccos unde certisent. *Vectito*, frequent. of *vecto*, is not in Freund nor Smith, the former implying, and the latter (s. v. *vectitatus*) directly asserting with Gell. 9, 6, it to be obsolete. It is, however, used by Cato in Cæcil. : quem ego denique credo vectitatum iri ludis : Paul. Diac. s. v. *citeria*. So Scaliger : furthermore, the compound *circumvectito* should be inserted from Plaut. Rud. 933 : oppida circumvectitabor, incorrectly given under *circumvecto*.

Nouns. *Cucus*, cuckoo, Plaut. Pers. 174, whence *cuculus*, is correctly given by Forcellini and Gesner, but dropped by Freund, Smith, and Klotz. *Cepolindrum*, a fictitious spice, Plaut. Pseud. 832 : *sipolindrum* is to be expunged : the cook has possibly in his mind the word *κίτρος*. *Eugium*, Lucil. and Laber. ap. Non. 107, 30 : and Laber. ap. Non. 490, 22. *Vaso* = *vasatus*, like *naso*, *capito*, *fronto*, Pomp. ap. Prisc. as emended by Ribbeck II, p. 198. The collateral form of *femur*, *feminur*, should be quoted, Plaut. Mil. 27, and Rhein. Mus. 1850, p. 312. Two verbal nouns from Lucretius : *linctus*, from *lingo*, 6, 971, *nectari*' *linctus*, and *torres*, from *torreo* = *ἀρόκανμα*, 3, 917, *arida torres*. The dimin. *mammicula*, from *mamma*, *mamilla*, is found Plaut. Pseud. 1261 : *ubi mamma mammicula opprimitur* ; *crumilla*, from *crumina*, Pers. 687 : *metuebas ne crumillam amitteres*. *Sincipitamenta*, id. Men. 211, *sincipitamenta porcina*. *Ditiae*, a collateral form of *divitiæ*, Plaut. Trin. 682. *Sacrificiolus rex*, Varr. L. L. 6, 27, p. 84, Müller. The plural of *Collicrepeida* is to be added, (like *cruricrepeida*) Trin. 1022, and the senseless *Oculicrepeida* to be struck out.

Accipitrina is given by the lexicons as a substantive from App. Herb. 30. This is not quite correct. It is really the fem. of *accipitrinus*, an adj. formed regularly from *accipiter*,

like *caninus* from *canis*, *passerinus* from *passer*, *hædinus* (which Freund, Klotz, and Ingerslev by a strange error write *hædīnus*) from *hædus*, *formicinus* (also wrong in Klotz, "formicīnus") from *formica*, etc. The name of the plant *accipitrina*, sc. herba, is a translation of *ἰεράκιον* from *ἰεραξ*, just as *hirundinina* sc. herba is the Latin equivalent for *chelidonium*, *viperina* for *ἐχιδνιον*, or *siminina* for *πιδήκιον*. The lexicons should first give the only place where *accipitrinus* occurs as a real adj., Plaut. Bacch. 274, *accipitrina* pugna, which they omit, and then subjoin the substantive use of *accipitrina*.

In connection with this word, we may notice that the lexicon takes no account of the application of *accipiter* itself as the name of a fish; App. mag. 34, probably the *ἰεραξ* of Athenæus.

To the same class of adjectives in *īnus* omitted may be added *draconinus* from *draco*, Myth. Vat. Mai III, p. 227 B, and the comic word *mininus*, Plaut. Pseud. 329, where there is a pun on the two possible derivations from *mina* = *μῆνα*, and *mina* ovis, a smooth-bellied sheep, under which latter word the dictionaries omit Plaut. Bacch. 1129.

On the other hand, the lexicons give *fungīnus* as the adjective derived from *fungus*. But the text both of Ritschl and Fleckeisen in the only place cited for the word is at variance: Plaut. Trin. 851: *pol hic quidem fungīno generest, capite se totum tegit*. Which is right, the text of Plautus, or the lexicon? We are inclined to think the latter; analogy is decidedly in favor of *īnus* (for the *cucurbitīnus* and *suberīnus* of the lexicon are both spurious, and should be *īnus*.) and the line of Plautus may be remedied by a change in the order of the words: *Fungīno pol hic quidem generest, capite se totum tegit*.

Commodulus, dimin. from *commodus* (*commodum*), Plaut. Stich. 690, as restored by Ritschl and Fleckeisen: *pro opibus nostris satis commodulumst*. The lexicons give it under *commodule*, where Klotz further quotes strangely c. *esse* *alibubi*, Rud. 2, 6, (for 2, 5, 11) for c. *ludis*. *Artutus* from *artus*, like *cornutus* from *cornu*, Plaut. Asin. 565: *octo Artutos audacis viros, valentis virgatores*. *Astutos* is wholly out of

place here. *Vesculus*, dim. from *vescus*, = tiny, to be added: Plaut. Trin. 888, *vesculum vinarium*. Proll. p. 81.

Placidule, dim. from *placide*, ib. 726, *dormibo placidule in tabernaculo*: Proll. p. 81: Rud. 426, *non licet te sic placidule bellam belle tangere?* *Gravanter*, adv. from *gravor*, unwillingly, reluctantly, Liv. 21, 24, *haud gravanter ad Pœnum venerunt*. And why do the lexicons give only Ciceronian examples of *gravate*? We should add Plaut. Cas. 5, 4, 26; Rud. 408: Bacch. 532: Stich. 763. An adverb from *nugax* in the superlative has also been overlooked, Plaut. Tr. 819: *actum reddam nugacissime*.

Let us now notice some of the words which are imperfectly treated.

Under *abligurrio*, Smith quotes Cic. Cat. 2, 5, 10, *fortunas suas abligurierunt*, as an instance of the secondary use of the word, in the sense of *comedo*, waste, devour. In this sense it is colloquial, and not used by Cicero, and therefore properly rejected by Klotz. But Klotz and others overlook the passage in App. Met. 10, 14, 703, where it occurs in the primary sense, *lick, lick off, abl. dulcia*. *Fundator*: in the primary sense add a prose example, App. Dog. Plat. 2, 24, 250, *fundator urbium*: in the secondary sense, for which the dictionaries give only the authority of inscriptions, may be added App. *ibid.* 1, 1, 180: *legum Atticarum fundator*. In connection with *infusco*, Smith very properly gives its application to sounds, which Klotz omits. But both omit the cases where the adjective *fuscus* is used in a moral sense, App. Dog. Plat. 2, 14, 229: *animas fusciores*: *id. de mundo c. 25 fin.*: *quod sit curæ levioris fusciorisque*. Of *helix* only two significations are given: we may add that of orbit, from App. de deo Socr. 8, 140, *usque ad lunæ helicem*. Under *gestio*, Klotz quotes an example from Cicero only of the use of the word as applied to inanimate objects: we add Plaut. Mil. 8, *machæra . . . gestit stragem facere*. *Mustus*, young, fresh: an instance of the word applied to a person, Næv. ap. Non. 136, 7, (Ribbeck II, p. 13) *musta virgo*. *Cingulum* is applied metaphorically, App. de mundo 7, *constringitur Oceani cingulo*, unless indeed this is from *cingulus*. Of

caesim in the first sense the dictionaries give examples from husbandry only: add of architecture, App. Mett. 4, 1, 320, lapide pretioso *cæsım* diminuto. To familiar phrases like *fores crepuere*, under *crepo*, should be added the less familiar use with a personal subject: Plaut. Bacch. 833, *forem hanc pausillulum aperi: ne crepa*, don't make a creaking. Under *dictum*, in the sense of command, order (to which should be added *Hinc in manipulis castrensibus sunt dicta ducibus*, Varr. L. L. 6, 61, p. 96, *dicta* = *παραγγέλματα*, Müller), the dictionaries give the familiar *dicto audientem esse*, but omit *dicto obedientem esse* likewise with a dative, e. g. Plaut. Bacch. 439: *magistro desinebat esse dicto obediens*: Pers. 378: *Futura's dicto obediens an non patri?* Hence in the line of Att. ap. Non. 72, 2, which Ribbeck, p. 164, gives *Quam invita ancillans, dicto obediens viri*, we cannot but think there is an error, and that *viro* should be emended. *Duplus*, twice as large, twice as much: the meaning two-fold = *duplex*, should be noted: Plaut. Bacch. 641: *duplum hodie facinus feci, duplicibus spoliis sum adfectus*: App. Flor. 3, 16, 69: *duplam gratiam debeo*. If the neuter of *formidabilis* as an adverb, *formidabile ridens*, is properly quoted in the dictionaries, why omit the like use of *exitiabilis*? App. Mett. 6, 16, 411, *exitiabile renidere*. *Domus*: under the head of the idiomatic construction *domi est* or *domi habere*, in the secondary sense, we must add the ablative *domo*, used similarly, with the idea of source: Cic. p. Cluent. 8, 27: *domo sibi quærendum remedium*, i. e., from his own resources: Plaut. Amph. 637, *experior domo atque ipsa de me scio*; or with the antithesis *foris*: Bacch. 648, *ut domo sumeret neu foris quæreret*: cf. the Greek *οἰκοθεν*, as Pind. Nem. 3, 31, *οἰκοθεν μάρτυε*. *Manducus*: Munk, de Fabb. Atell., p. 39, and lexicographers overlook the definition given by Placid. Gloss. ap. Mai, III, p. 485: *lancam hominis figuram, quae solet circensibus malas movere, quasi manducandum*. So the MS. But we have here an evident corruption; an essential thing with the *Manducus* was the *noise* made with the teeth, the chattering or gnashing. This is clearly implied, Plaut. Rud. 535: *quid si aliquo ad ludos me pro Manduco locem?*

Quapropter? Quia pol *clare crepito* dentibus: so also in the definition of Festus, ire solebat magnis malis ac late dehiscens et *ingentem dentibus sonitum faciens*. Hence we may assume the true reading to be *ligneam* hominis figuram. *Consentaneus*: we may add to the dictt. App. Asclep. 1, where it is combined with a genitive: alterum alterius consentaneum esse dinoscitur.

Casso (caso) -are, frequentative from cado. Klotz quotes only Plaut. Mil. 852 and 856, and Freund says these are perhaps the only places where the verb occurs. Perhaps they are. But the verbal adjective *cassabundus*, assigned by Klotz rather inaccurately to cado, occurs, besides the three places quoted by Klotz, in the Gloss. Vat. C. ap. Mai, VI. p. 514, *casabundæ, saepius cadendæ: casabundus, instabilis, vacillans: ib. VIII, p. 141, cadabundus (for casabundus), crebro cadens*. Now as the verbal *cassabundus* differs but little from *cassans*, or "crebro cadens," the participle *cassans* has, with propriety, been restored in places which have been referred and are still referred by Klotz to an intransitive signification of quassare: e. g. Plaut. Bacch. 305: *capitibus cassantibus*, (cf. Ritschl ad loc. :) Asin. 403. This will justify us in assuming that, in the imitative Appulejus, *casanti* or *cassanti*, and not *quassanti*, is to be read in the same phrase, e. g. 3, 26, 223: 4, 29, 303: 8, 19, 550, and perhaps 2, 24, 10. One manuscript in these places has preserved the true form.

To this somewhat indiscriminate list of words we add a few more verbs, the construction or signification of which is imperfectly treated in the dictionaries. We look in vain for an example of the accusative with *protendor*, as in Plin. 6, 30, (35), 194: *quæ supra syrtis majores oceanum meridianum protenditur*: and similarly *continuo* with an accusative: App. Mett. 1, 24, 74: *me continuo*: so ibid. 5, 31, 378: 6, 18, 415. Of *deformo* we miss the pregnant signification *transform*, with *in* and the accusative: App. Mett. 1, 9, 39, *cauponem deformavit in ranam*: ib.: *alium in arietem deformavit*: Mythog. Vat. III, p. 237, B: *d. in animal latrabile*. *Existimo*: the lexicons overlook the meaning of value =

aestimo or puto with the genitive : Plaut. Most. 76 : satin abiit neque quod dixi flocci existumat? See Ritschl ad loc. : Capt. 3, 5, 24 : parvi existumo : Fest. p. 143 : flocci existumo : Nepos, 24, 1 : quod non minoris existimamus. With *circumspicio* Klotz makes a special division for *se circumspicere* : the same should be done with *circumspecto*, as in the first example which he gives incorrectly as an instance of the absolute use of the word : Plaut. Bacch. 279 : dum circumspecto me : Trin. 863 : circumspectat sese. *Detondeo* : the secondary comic meaning, fleece or deprive of, with the abl., is not given : Plaut. Bacch. 242, *detondebo auro usque ad vivam cutem* : (improperly referred to *tondeo*.) The construction with the infinitive should be added with the verbs *extorqueo* and *commoveo* : App. Mett. 1, 24, 76, *piscatori extorsimus accipere* : Herm. Tri. 6 : *commoveor dicere*. With *admitto* the formula *culpam in se admittere* occurs in Plautus, but with it also a. c. *ad se*, Stich. 84.

The comic word *biclinium* is explained by Klotz, incautiously following Quintilian, as a hybrid word, from *duo*, *bis*, and *κλίμη*, instead of the Latin root *clino*, for which again he incorrectly refers us to Lucretius. *Biclinium* is no more a hybrid than *bisellium*. Many words thought to belong to this class are now corrected in the dictionaries; but Smith still holds to *inaniologus*, a spurious compound with *λέγω*, for the true form *inanilocus* from *loquor*, like *falsilocus*, *confidentilocus*, *mendacilocus*. For *adlaudibilis* Plaut. Pers. only is quoted, where now *adjutabilis* stands : but *adlaudabilis* is found Lucret. 5, 158, which is not quoted. The dictionaries still continue to quote Plaut. Trin. 239, as an instance of *elegans*, in the sense of particular, fastidious. Plautus nowhere uses the word, and in the place referred to it is a gloss for *cuppes*. *Dormitator* Plautus alone uses, and in one place only, Trin. 862 : Klotz translates a *dreamer*, Smith a *dreamer*, *sluggard* : the context (*dormitator aut sector sonarius*) shows this cannot be the meaning. Lambinus illustrates it well by the Hesiodic *ἡμερόκοιτος*, i. e. a thief who sleeps in the daytime, and prowls in the night. On *ne* or *ne*, Klotz is far more satisfactory than any other lexicon. The English lexicons

still propagate the traditional errors about this word: Smith has rejected many of Freund's spurious examples, but retains two, one from Plautus, one from Seneca. The latter is instructive, as showing the way lexicons are manufactured. The passage is from De Ben. 1, 14. Freund, in quoting it, writes 1, 4 for 14: Andrews copies Freund, error and all: Smith copies Andrews, error and all: while the place has absolutely nothing to do with the word for which it is cited.

Under the adverb *false*, (where should be a reference to Charis. II. p. 179 P.) Klotz cites Plaut. Capt. 609: this example does not belong here, as the text reads ego te Philocrates *false* faciam ut *verus* hodie reperiare Tyndarus, where the vocative of the adjective is contrasted with *verus*. Again, s. v. *falso*, the Amphitr. 812 is given by Klotz and Smith, where the voc. sing. fem. of the adjective now stands: ne me appella, falsa, falso nomine. The first citation under this word, neque me habebis falso suspectum, does not belong Bacch. 3, 3, 70, but 3, 6, 41. And why should the superlative of the adverb be put under the rare form *false* rather than under *falso*?

The first two meanings given by the dictionaries of the word *numen*, viz., "a nodding with the head, a nod," and, secondly, "the inclination of a thing toward a place," are to be struck out, and the two citations to be put under *momen*.

Deprehendo is not connected with the ablative as the dictionaries make it, Plaut. Bacch. 950, but with the genitive, after the general analogy of verbs of accusing, etc., doli ego deprehensus sum.

Diu: (the dictionaries should notice the form *dius*, given in the codd. of Plaut. Merc. 862, . . . neque quiescam usquam noctu neque *dius*, a form like *interdius*.) The usage *nec diu*, "not long ago," cannot be attested from Plaut. Rud. 210, because *nec dum* stands there. Further, the assumed connection with *quod* falls away, Amph. 302, where now stands jam diust *quom* ventri victum non datis, like Most. 470, septem menses sunt quom in hasce aedis pedem nemo intro tetulit. A real example of *diu* — *quod* is found in App. Mett. 1, 24, 74: sat pol diu est, quod intervisimus te. *Ædes*

or *ædis*. The authority of Plaut. Most. 474, given for the singular in the sense of house, is altogether spurious. The only *ancient* example is perhaps Asin. 220, and here probably it is questionable.

Many words have been referred to in the preceding, which have an existence only in dictionaries or in bad texts. A few more we add here, which should be expunged. *Appetisso*: given by Non. as used by Attius, is now emended to *appeto*: cf. Ribb. p. 132. *Barathrus* is a spurious word for *balatro*, Lucret. 3, 954: to the authorities quoted by Lachmann may be added Gloss. ap. Mai, Auctt. Class. VIII, p. 76, and id. p. 65. *Batiola* should be *batiaca*: Ritschl ad Stich. 694. *Coaccedo*, for which Pl. Curc. is quoted, should be struck out, as the true reading is *accedo*. *Columis* is given in the sense of *sanus*, or *salvus*, for which *incolumis* (Proll. Trin. p. 68) should stand. *Confirmitas* should be designated as a spurious word. *Curius*, said to be a derivative of *cura*, owes its place in the lexicon to a broken letter: Plaut. Pseud. 1143, *CURI* o infortunio, for *CURVO*. The example belongs under *curvus*. *Ebito*, Pl. Stich. 4, 2, 28, (not as in Freund, Andrews, and Klotz, 2, 4, 28!) should in all probability be the simple *bito*. In connection with the simple verb we may notice that the dictionaries give only the two forms *beto* and *bito*, overlooking a third form given by good MSS., *bæto*, on which cf. Ribb. I. p. 91. *Falsificus* and *falsijurius* should be struck out, and under *falsiloquus* the reference to Mil. Glor. Of the participle *fletus* Klotz gives first the proper passive use. To this he adds two other significations, a), "dripping;" sanguine; b), "weeping." Both the latter rubrics are to be struck out. *Illutibilis* should be changed to *illutilis*. *Immunificus*, *jureus*, *largitor* (-ari), *lascivibundus*, *nixo*, *revento* do not exist. Neither does *plagiger*, since the example cited belongs under *plagigerulus*; and similarly *parcipromus* is not found in Pl. Pseud.; whether in Truc., as stated by the dictionaries, remains to be seen. *Eleutheria*, *æ*, as a feminine noun = liberty, is now corrected, Pl. Stich. 422, to the neuter plural *eleutheria -orum*.

With respect to Orthography, a lexicon of moderate size

is hardly the place for discussions. But if it cannot discuss the relative merits of particular forms, it can at least present us with results, refer us to the literature on the subjects, or give a hint or two which may start a useful train of thought or study. And this is particularly desirable in the present condition of the Latin texts, which, under new and repeated castigations, exhibit an increasing richness and multiplicity of forms of words. In its attention to this branch of Lexicography the lexicon of Klotz is much superior to former works. But much must be added to make it complete; and, indeed, the investigations made since the publication of the first part of the lexicon, are alone enough to require many changes. We can only glance at one or two words where some principle is involved.

Cur, the interrogative from the root *quis*, is naturally subject to the same euphonic laws which are observed in that interrogative. We find accordingly not *quur*, the form given in old books, (any more than we find *quui* for *quoi* or *cui*,) but either *quor* or *cur*, just as we have the two forms *quom* or *cum*; but besides this is a collateral form, *cor*, attested by good MSS. of Lucret. 3, 476, (v. Lachmann,) and Mart. 11, 46, 8; also *qur*, Plaut. Merc. 471 bis, 503, 772.

Hau, the collateral form of *haud*, like *ov* and *ovκ*, found most frequently in the dramatists, is noticed by Klotz (not by Smith). Even the latest editor of Tacitus, Haase, has not observed the frequent recurrence of this form in the first six books of the Annals, although Gronovius, VI, 43, remarks that it is often found in MSS., but did not understand it: 2, 36, *hau dubium*: 2, 88, *hau dubie*: 3, 36, *hau dissimilia*: 3, 73, *hau dissimili*: 6, 20, *hau multum*: 6, 23, *hau dubium*: 6, 30, *hau sponte*: 6, 32, *hau sum*: 6, 38, *hau perpeusus*: 6, 45, *hau dedicavit*; in 6, 43, the MS. gives *HACI concelebraverant*, an error for *hau conc*. Singularly enough at first sight, these are the only places in Tacitus where *hau* is found (unless it be Ann. 16, 27, where the *HAD VENIRI* of the manuscripts points to *hau veniri* rather than to the emendation of Acidalius and Döderlein, *haud adveniri*). This, however, is explained by the fact that the excel-

lent Codex Mediceus extends only to the end of the sixth book. From other authors may be added Liv. 1, 34, *hau salubrem*; App. Flor. 3, 16, 71, *audum* for *haudum*.

Smith gives (s. v. *nosco*) a citation from Plaut. Trin. 445, *hau nosco tuum*, in which he takes *hau* for the interjection *hau*!

As with *hau*, so with the form *exim*, for *exin* or *exinde*. Klotz gives references to this form, but does not notice how often it is used by Tacitus. The editors, however, have been more observant of this word than of *hau*. It is found both before a vowel (Ann. 14, 18), and before all classes of consonants; instances from the Annals are 2, 61: 3, 13: 3, 28: 3, 36: 3, 62: 6, 5: 6, 38: 11, 30: 12, 22: 13, 1: 13, 18: 14, 61: 15, 12: 15, 64: 15, 70: 16, 14.

Ōculto, restored by Ritschl, Proll. p. 124, is well authenticated by the inscription he quotes. The same orthography is further given by the Cod. P. of Liv. 1, 34.

For a complete history of Inflected Words, new and supplementary investigations are necessary. The comparison of adjectives is not yet worked out, nor have we authentic information in regard to the occurrence of many participles. Much is also to be added and emended on the forms of verbs; of many, we find no mention whatever made of irregularities in conjugation or of the older form of the perfect, e. g. like *perfodivi*, Pl. Mil. 142: *potivi*, Most. 791: *constitivi*, Ps. 549, and *institivi*, Most. 86: *composivi*, Tac. Ann. 4, 32, etc. This can only be done by dividing the work of lexicography among a large number of laborers, and assigning to each his special department.

The somewhat desultory remarks here made on Latin Lexicography have been confined chiefly to the external part of lexicography. We have endeavored to indicate, by concrete examples—to which thousands more might be added—rather than by general statements, how much remains to be done, and to dispel the common idea that Latin Lexicography is a settled and finished thing. Much remains to be said on the general scope of lexical works, the etymologies, the derivations from the primary signification, the arrangement of the definitions. But this is too extensive a subject to be treated here.