
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. IV.

NOVEMBER, 1844.

ARTICLE I.

GREEK LEXICOGRAPHY.

Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache, von Dr. W. Pape, Professor am Berlinischen Gymnasium zum Grauen Kloster. 3 Bde., 1842—3.

A Greek-English Lexicon, based on the German work of Francis Passow, by Henry George Liddell, M. A. student of Christ Church, and Robert Scott, M. A. sometime student of Christ Church, and late fellow of Balliol College. Oxford, at the University Press. 1843.

By Prof. T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

The plan, merits and defects of Passow's Lexicon are so well known to Hellenists, that there is little need of dwelling upon them. It will be enough to say, that Passow began his work on a plan, which rendered it impossible for him to make it complete except by successive stages; that he started, as was right, from Homer, intending afterwards to go down to Herodotus, Pindar, and the Attic writers, and thus by degrees, to build up a structure of Lexicography, as time and experience should allow. His plan, even in the fourth edition, was carried out only so far as to embrace Herodotus in an imperfect manner; and hence for Attic and subsequent Greek, his Lexicon remained until his death an unsatisfactory work, although, even for those ages of the language, the best within reach. Meanwhile the ardent study of Greek literature had produced a number of contributions to Lexicography in the shape of special Lexicons, extensive indexes

and the like,—to say nothing of the more accurate knowledge of antiquities, involving the use of innumerable words, the superior revisions of texts, and the elucidation in various ways of very many obscure passages. Thus, at the death of Passow in 1833, a great mass of materials lay comparatively untouched; and it was far easier at that time to set about the same kind of work, than it was in 1819, when he began to publish as a Lexicographer.

Among the attempts made since Passow's death to supply a want occasioned by his too early removal, the two Lexicons named at the head of this article, and the new edition of Passow by Rost and Palm, take the highest place. Of the latter, which we believe is not yet complete, we shall not speak, and proceed directly to some observations on the two former.

In size, Pape's work is about a quarter larger than the fourth edition of Passow, and seems to contain more than one quarter more matter. Liddell and Scott's closely printed volume of nearly 1600 pages, in small quarto, has about as much printing in it as Passow's two, but seems to have in it considerably more matter. This is owing in part to the smaller number of letters in English words than in corresponding German ones. For instance, Passow's definition of θάνατος, 'tod sowohl natürlicher als gewaltsamer,' consists of 34 letters; Liddell and Scott's, 'death whether natural or violent,' is a mere translation and is despatched in 28. Another means by which room is gained in the Oxford Lexicon, is the omission of some of Passow's synonyms, which are often needlessly numerous. And another still is the compression of articles which are sometimes unnecessarily long. For instance, Passow on θάπτω after mentioning the general sense of paying the last dues to a corpse, and that of burning it, adds, 'denn aber auch weil die Gebeine meist in Aschenkrüge unter die Erde gebracht wurden wenn die Flamme das Fleisch verzehrt hatte, *beisetzen, beerdigen, begraben.* The same thing is expressed by the Oxford lexicographers in less than half the space thus: 'then, as the ashes were usually inurned and put under ground, *to bury, inter, entomb.*' We do not mean by these comparisons to convey the impression, that the latter work is a mere translation, or even a *rifacciamento* of Passow's; the opposite will abundantly appear by and by. All we mean is, that into a given space, its authors are able to bring much more matter than Passow's work contains, and that this is owing to superior compression.

Almost the first thing which strikes us, when we begin to use

a Lexicon, is the amount of pains we must take in hunting out the derivations and the significations of words. For an impatient person and for a young scholar, it is especially important that the typographical arrangement shall be such as to favor rapid and easy consultation. For conveniences of this kind the Germans are not particularly famous. An article in one of their dictionaries is apt to be constructed like one of the sentences in their language; you must go through to the end before getting the satisfaction which you want. Neither Passow or Pape seeks to arrest the eye by making the place where a new definition is inserted, prominent and observable. The Oxford lexicographers have attained this end very happily by the Roman numerals, and the blank space, which precede their principal definitions. We wish that they had also adopted the practice, for which Pape is much to be praised, of separating the parts of compound words by a hyphen;—a practice, which, in most cases, at once reveals the composition to the eye, and prevents the necessity of inserting one of the roots. Thus ἡμ—μετρος by this mode of printing shows its parentage, although μέτρον in brackets does not follow.

A Lexicon may be regarded as a history of each particular word in a language, and as such, will naturally begin each article with the outward shape of words,—their forms and quantity,—and with their derivation. At these points, especially at the two former, it comes into contact with grammar, and ought not to encroach upon this department. It will be enough, therefore, if, while the grammarian lays down rules, the lexicographer, taking these rules for granted, calls attention to whatever may be peculiar and remarkable in the word of which he is treating. In regard to forms, Liddell and Scott enter perhaps into more details than either Passow or Pape.[1] Both the new Lexicons mark the doubtful vowels when they are long; but Liddell and Scott, by occasionally giving the short quantity, only throw doubt into the mind of the student. If the rule, to which Pape rigidly adheres, is observed, of leaving the doubtful vowels without a mark whenever they are short, the youngest learner will find the quantity of Greek words far easier to be remembered than that of Latin

[1] More exact information concerning the forms of words, will of course be sought by the advanced student from Lobeck's edition of Buttmann's largest Grammar, and from the "Greek verbs" of Carmichael, and of Sophocles. The recent work with this title, by a very acute scholar of our own country, is far superior to that of Carmichael in judgment, and may supersede every other aid in this anomalous part of the Greek language.

ones. Of course, where Epic, Attic and later usage are not uniform, where the parts of a verb differ in quantity, or where authorities to determine the quantity are wanting or doubtful, all this will be particularly noticed; but all that is necessary in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, is to put the sign of a long syllable over *α*, *ι*, and *υ*. A question where two lexicographers may reasonably differ, is, whether when the rules of quantity are without exception, there is any need of representing cases under the rule to the eye;—whether, for instance, it is best to indicate in any way the quantity of verbs in *υνω*. Pape passes these verbs by in silence, supposing that his reader is already informed upon the point. The Oxford scholars are inconsistent; they give the quantity in *εὐρύνω*, but say nothing of *εὐθύνω*, *χαλλύνω* and other similar verbs. We should think it desirable to mark all such cases; for the knowledge of quantity and of pronunciation, acquired almost insensibly in looking out some thousands of words, is a great help towards mastering the dry minutiae of the rules relating to this driest of all subjects.

The derivation of words, being a point of great importance for ascertaining and feeling their meaning, will of course find a place in every respectable Lexicon. But it is a subject on which so much new light has been thrown by the comparison of languages, and one where so much is as yet unsettled and merely conjectural, that one may well be at a loss how to treat it. This, it is well known, was Passow's weak side; he followed the Dutch school whose speculations have been swept away, as leading back to imaginary roots, and as supposing a state of the Greek which cannot be shown to have existed by proofs found within or beyond the limits of that language. But if we desert Passow's path, what other shall we take? Shall we take a course parallel to that of Döderlein[1] and seek the birth-place of Greek words on their own soil; or shall we follow the opposite method of the Sanscrit scholars—we might better say of some tyros in that language—and derive our Greek words from Sanscrit roots, which, even in their own home perhaps left no descendants. It is plain, we think, that neither plan is safe; nor is any other, which does not recognize an extended comparison of cognate languages, and of the laws deducible from such an examination, on the one hand, while it looks, on the other, to the genius of each particular sister language and explains it, as far as possible, by itself.[2] But

[1] Lateinische Synonyme und Etymologien.

[2] The Greek Etymological Lexicon of Kaltschmidt we have found exceed-

such a plan, if carried out would build up a comparative Lexicon for a class of languages, or we may suppose, by and by, for all the dialects used by man. And here for the practical lexicographer who deals with a single language, the previous question arises: Whether a great part of this matter is not for him extraneous; whether in short, it is his business at all to go beyond the limits of the language to which he gives his labors; whether, when he has hunted a word to the borders of its native land, he may not then give up the chase, and leave the further pursuit to another set of trappers and huntsmen. We incline to think that, while it would be well to have an etymological dictionary of the roots of both the Greek and the Latin together, in which could be comprised within a brief space all the results of investigation hitherto reached,[1] a manual Lexicon should confine itself to the language with which it is concerned, if the root in its earliest sense still survives there, and depart from this principle only when the parentage of derivative words must be sought somewhere else, or the original signification of roots needs to be illustrated.[2]

In looking at what is done in these two works to exhibit the derivations of words, we find Pape usually strict but narrow, while Liddell and Scott have united, with a largeness of views which is somewhat questionable, partiality and inconsistency. In looking at a great number of words in Pape's volumes, we happen to have found one, and only one, where a Sanscrit root is referred to, although no particular reason seems to exist in this case why he should depart from his ordinary practice. In many cases where the root is uncertain, or lost, or foreign, Pape takes

---

ingly unsatisfactory. To know the roots which he gives,—universal roots they may be called,—is much the same as knowing none at all.

[1] A work of that kind, confined to results merely, and written with due brevity, need not much exceed in size Schmidtheuner's dictionary of German etymology, the second edition of which occupies less than 600 octavo pages.

[2] Since writing the above, we have found some admirable remarks in Freund's preface to his Latin Lexicon, in which a similar opinion is expressed in regard to the extent to which comparative exicography should be applied. Freund makes the very just observation, that if the opposite course be taken, the same words nearly must appear in the Lexicons of all the languages belonging to a family; for instance, when each of the cognates of our *stand* in Latin, Greek, Sanscrit, etc. is treated of. It may be added that such information is vain and empty when separated from that relation of vowels and consonants, in the sister-dialects of a class, which comparative grammar discloses, and is only calculated without this foundation to turn those who imbibe it into pedantic dablers and smatterers, who know words but are ignorant of laws.

no trouble to inform his readers that such is the fact. In many other instances we find a word referred to a root, but nothing added to show the connexion of thought between the root and the derivative. Thus we are not told how *ἀγών* and *ἀγείρω* are connected with *ἄγω*; under *ἄξιος* we find this root referred to, but the hint there given, is hardly enough for a student who may not have met with *ἄγω* in its rather unusual sense of *weighing*. Pape seems to think that the student of himself will associate *ἀήρ* with *ἄημι*, and will perceive without explanation how *ἀείρω*, (*αἴρω*) comes from *ἀήρ*. In the earlier part of his work, Pape often prints the radical syllable both of a primitive and of a derivative, in capitals. Thus we have *ἈΓΧόνη* and *ΆΓΧω*. In some cases, indeed, there is a real difficulty in saying which is the primitive and which the derivative. But for the purposes of instruction, it is better to fix upon some one word as the parent form, unless we adopt the method of referring *in all cases* to the radical syllable divested of terminations and uninfluenced by euphonic changes. After a time Pape forsakes this plan of indicating the radical, and gives no notice to the eye of this part of a word. Thus *ἡδύς* and *ἥδω* both appear in small letters. This is perhaps the best plan; but we would suggest that while the capitals be reserved for forms not in use, as the grammarians employ them, some mark which will easily arrest the eye be used to show the parental dignity of the word to which it is prefixed. Pott uses the surd sign of algebra, but something less clumsy would be better. Pape's marks of division, again, inserted between the parts of a compound word are sometimes used without sufficient reason, or need further explanation. Thus we have *ἀτι-τάλλω*, printed as a compound, when it is to all appearance, only an irregularly reduplicated form from *ἀτάλλω*, and *ἄγρ-υπνος* without any indication whether *ἀγρ-* is to be referred to the very rare word *ἀγρέω*=*αἱρέω*, which we judge to be Pape's opinion, or to some other root. On the whole, Pape seems to have given little study to this important branch of lexicography.

Turning now to the Oxford Lexicon, we find there much that is useful in the exhibition of derivations, but no very mature system. In a number of cases the results of comparative philology are given, and chiefly on the authority of so excellent a guide as Pott. But—to say nothing more of the empty nature of such information conveyed to a student usually ignorant of the languages drawn into comparison with the Greek, and of the laws of comparative grammar—as the information is partial and

does not extend to many of the commonest roots, the impression is left on the mind of the student that no cognates, or at least, no certain ones have been found for a large part of the more important words. It is the practice again of Liddell and Scott, to print the roots in capitals, but they seem to the writer to have made too many capital words, or else not enough. Thus they print in large letters *πεύκη*, *πίτυς* and *πίσσα*, both *πέτρα* and *πέτρος*, *κῆλον* derivative of *καίω*, *βλαστάνω*, *βλαστός* and *βλαστή*, while the equal claims to this dignity made by *κέρας*, *κηλίς*, *πίθος*, *πέλανος*, *μύρμηξ* and *στόμα* are disregarded. Yet notwithstanding these imperfections, there is a great deal of most valuable information on the subject of derivations contained in this dictionary, of information new to the English student, and fitted to awaken curiosity and reflexion. We notice one practice which deserves to be universally adopted; that of making reference to the significations of the parent word which the derivative follows, particularly when they are the less obvious and ordinary ones.

We have been led, while making these remarks, to feel how little has hitherto been settled, and how much of obscurity remains in Greek etymology. For ourselves at least, we must own that the law which produced so many coördinate roots like *κρύπτω*, *κλέπτω*, *καλύπτω*; *γράφω*, *γλύφω*, *κολάπτω*; which are, not dependent one upon another, and much of the delicate texture seen in the formation and derivation of words, lie as yet quite out of sight. It is, however, a kind of consolation amid this ignorance to hear such a man as Lobeck call the *wortbildung* of the Greek language *ein noch unberührtes Gebiet*. We earnestly hope that this very eminent scholar will live to complete the plan which he has begun in his Paralipomena, and in his recent work entitled 'Pathologiæ Sermonis Graeci prolegomena,' although in the preface to the latter, he augurs that his life will not last long enough to travel to the end of the road which he is now pursuing. With his assistance we shall probably be able to judge of Greek derivation as completely as can be done under the guidance of one who looks at it chiefly in the light of Greek analogies, and seems averse to, or suspicious of the results of comparative philology. At the same time, it is to be hoped that the adherents to this latter school, always observing the rule in examining a language, to look first and most closely at the language itself, will establish their principles, and form their system of derivation in such a way that the narrow partizans of what may be called the 'domestic system' in language shall not be able to gainsay or resist them.

We now proceed to notice the exegetical element in the lexicons before us, and it will be our aim without following a scientific method in our remarks, merely to make a few observations designed to set forth the characteristic peculiarities of the two works before us. And in the first place, the design of Pape seems to have been one of a scientific description,—to give, as far as possible within his limits, the history of the use of each word of the language, until the time of its downfall.[1] This design is modified by practical considerations, as for instance by the very important one of giving less attention to the writings of the later Greeks which are but little read, than to those of the classical period. It is also a design difficult in itself, for the point of time is hard to be determined where the lexicographer ought to set up his boundaries and say that he will travel on no farther. Practically he may well stop with Nonnus, and leave out of view all the mass of historical, legal, medical and grammatical writers, of christian theologians and pagan philosophers after that period. But should he furnish no aid for reading the fathers of the fourth and previous centuries, some of whom, as Chrysostom, surpass many of their heathen contemporaries in excellence, and even in purity of style? Should he establish the absurd law, that none but heathen can find admission into his catalogue? It is plain that the great length of time during which the Greek was a written language, besides the other burdens which it lays on the lexicographer, makes it hard for him to know how far down he ought to follow the stream of composition. The general scientific lexicon must embrace everything. The maker of a manual scarcely can tell what to embrace and what to exclude.

Pape's plan seems to be this: to begin with a word where he first finds it in the extant remains of Greek literature. If it is in familiar use afterwards, citations are made chiefly from writers of the classical period in order to throw light upon its significations. If the later writers followed the law of the earlier as they usually did, there is no need of supporting a word by their testimony, un-

[1] The proper names of a language are a part of its words, and a part too, it may be, governed in regard to composition and derivation, by peculiar laws. It was this reflexion perhaps, which led Pape to append a collection of such words to his Lexicon, as the third volume, preceded by a preface in which he sets forth the laws of formation which prevail in such cases. The volume may accompany the others or not, as the purchaser chooses. It performs little else besides giving the form of the proper names and the most important passages where they are found. The inscriptions as well as the writings of the Greeks have been rummaged in preparing it.

less there is some peculiar and new shade of meaning added to it—a shade of meaning only new to us perhaps, because so much of Greek literature is lost, but borrowed in reality from some author of the best age. If the later writers made use of new words, as they did of many thousands, it is denoted either generally by Sp. i. e. *later* writers; or by adducing the name of the author; as Diosc. Gal. (Dioscorides, Galen,) or as happens in a vast multitude of cases, by citing one or more passages where it occurs. There are obvious reasons for this difference of treatment lying in the importance of the author, and the greater or less plainness with which the word, according to the laws of the language, interprets itself.

It is clearly impossible for any one postdiluvian man, to read and make excerpts from all the volumes of so copious a literature as the Greek. Men, on whose term of life modern insurance-offices will give an annuity, must be dependent to a considerable degree upon others. Thus Pape shows that he has freely used Passow's labors and mentions in his preface his obligations to the modern revisions of the Thesaurus of Stephens. And here Pape exemplifies the difference between a mere book-maker and an honest man; between the hungry literary cormorant and the conscientious scholar; the former of whom will devour other men's labors by the yard, and fill his book with the crude and dissimilar masses from every quarter with which he has gorged himself; while the latter will mingle his own careful study with every hint from another source, and give to all his materials an original and uniform texture. Pape, so far as we have observed, presides over his materials, examines everything, and brings everything into a shape that seems to him the right one.

As the Oxford lexicographers speak of their work on the title page as "based on the German work of Passow," they do not appear before the public in the light of original authors, and are freed from somewhat of that anxious responsibility which such authors usually feel. But their title page hardly does them justice; and it is their highest recommendation that the performance goes far beyond the pretension. On the basis of Passow they have built up a structure including the phraseology of all the Attic writers, of Pindar and Hippocrates before the Alexandrian epoch, as well as of Theocritus and others who flourished afterwards. These they have explored more thoroughly, while the later writers have also been examined although with less care and labor. If much of this work has been performed with the

help of those special lexicons and indexes which have appeared within a half century, and of the Thesaurus of Stephens, still every page shows that a judgment has been passed upon all important words by the authors themselves; and their numerous references to the results of modern criticism and to the best works on archaeology and history indicate that they are familiar, not merely with the names of philologists or with their works in general, but also with those parts of them where each matter is treated of professedly and at length. In the number of such references they far exceed Pape, and this will be thought to be one of the principal merits of their Lexicon.

In giving the meanings of words, besides skilful and well arranged definitions and apposite citations, a lexicographer ought to have in view certain objects, which, on account of the imperfection of earlier lexicons can be only imperfectly accomplished. A perfect lexicon, besides giving the outward form and the arranged meanings of a word, should tell how it differs from or is contrasted with other words, at what period, and especially when first it was used, in what kinds of style it is found, or any particular sense of it has been observed, and whether it is used but once, rarely, or constantly, by all writers of a class, or by one as his favorite term. For instance, it is of no small interest to know that *βλέπω* is not found in Homer or Hesiod, although *βλέφαρον* is a common word with them; that *μέλδω*, our *melt*, occurs only once, and that in Homer, until the Alexandrine poets used it in their learned style; that *ἐπαΐω* is rather a favorite word of Plato, that *καινός* and *νέος* differ, and how, that *ἐντελέχεια* is a word of Aristotle's own coining, and that *δημιουργός* had a new meaning among the Attic philosophers which afterwards became quite current. All such knowledge is essential to the full history of the words of any language, but a Greek lexicographer can go but a small distance on those paths, because they have been almost wholly untravelled. In the department of synonyms, for instance, the Greek is very far behind the Latin, as it is indeed in almost all branches of the lexical art. And perhaps the only exception to this remark is furnished by the greater difference in Greek than in Latin between the words of prose and poetry, and by the marked distinctions between the dialects. These differences have induced and enabled modern critics to make those nice remarks on the dramatic and epic styles, which have contributed much to our accurate knowledge of the language.

It will not be strange then, that a deficiency will be felt to ex-

ist in both of the Lexicons before us, as to most of these subordinate departments of lexicography, but it is a deficiency, which is found in all Greek Lexicons whatsoever, with which we are acquainted, and cannot soon be supplied. Their respective degree of merit, so far as they have entered into these departments, we will not attempt to assign; and will merely observe, that Pape has made a beginning in developing the shades of difference in synonymous words, by stating under many articles what similar words accompany, and what opposite ones are contrasted with the word in question.

In regard to the definitions of words, the rule of their divisions and arrangement, it may be said with truth, that no one word is a law for another. At the same time certain rules are clear; as for instance, that the literal sense, that meaning which is deduced from the meaning of the root or from the known laws of transition from physical to spiritual phenomena in the use of language, must stand first; that the passage from the specific to the general, or the opposite, be noticed, as well as that from the literal to the tropical; and that the subordinate shades given to words as they are viewed objectively or subjectively, with reference to space, time, number, purpose, good or hostile quality, etc., be carefully detailed.[1] It is plain that the excellence of a Lexicon depends to a great degree upon the faithfulness with which these nice distinctions are noticed, and the sound judgment with which they are made to follow one another.

A fault which we find with Pape is, that in many articles he does not make marked distinctions in sense sufficiently observable. Thus under the article στόμιον, we have "*little mouth, opening*, especially *of a hole,—bit.*" And here amongst other passages, one from Soph. Electra, is quoted, where the word is used tropically. Liddell has succeeded better with this word. He has, 1. A small mouth. 2. The mouth of a vessel, also of a grave, or of a cave, hence a *cave, vault;* of the lower world, Aesch. Cho. 807, [this passage, however, is to be otherwise interpreted], in general any *aperture* or *opening*. 3. A *bridle-bit*, etc. Liddell also here cites the passage from Soph., without further notice. We venture to present the definition in a reformed shape thus: στόμιον, diminutive from στόμα. 1. *A small mouth.* 2. Not diminutive in sense. Spoken only of other openings besides the

[1] See the preface to Freund's Latin Lexicon, whose admirable remarks on the whole subject of lexicography might prove of the greatest service to all who may hereafter labor in this field.

human mouth, (but not of the mouths of rivers?) as of a *cave, vessel*, hence, metonymy, *a cave* or *vault*. 3. By metonymy, (something put on or in the mouth, comp. χειρίς, *glove, sleeve* from χείρ), (*a*) *a bit*, (*b*) tropical in the phrase στόμα δέχεσθαι τινά, to submit to my authority. Soph. Electr. 1462.

The help to the eye, which is too often withheld by Pape's neglect in subdividing his articles, is too freely given by Liddell. As might be expected, in the Oxford work, Passow's minute divisions are pretty generally adopted. But there is this improvement upon Passow, that the more frequent resort to a double mode of denoting the significations, enables the author to break up his divisions into genera and species. Under ἥκω Passow had nine divisions; Liddell six, of which two are subdivided; and Pape none at all. We believe two or three main divisions only necessary. For the purpose of consultation, Pape's fault is the most inconvenient one, unless the process of subdividing should reach that wonderful extent, of which we have many specimens in Schleusner's Lexicon of the New Testament. This fault, too, leads to the greatest degree of inconsistency; for it cannot be carried out through a whole lexicon, without introducing confusion to an extreme. It must necessarily happen, therefore, that, where such a fault partially obtains, words will stand side by side, which are equally capable of having a principle of division applied to their meaning, but are treated differently without any sufficient reason. We cannot see, for instance, why Pape should unite the two senses of ἄρδην, *lifted up*, and *taken away utterly, wholly*, without even separating them by a dash, which he often uses; and yet a few lines below, should reduce those of ἄρδω, under two heads. Here, too, he is singularly careless. His first example, under the first head, is one where ἄρδω is used metaphorically, ἄρδειν δρόσῳ χαρίτων, *to water with the Graces' dew;* while his next all relate to literal watering. His second head is as follows: 2. In general, *to refresh, comfort—to increase—cherish.* The word might be treated better, somewhat after this manner, though in the hurry of writing we will not pretend to be very exact. 1. *To supply water to, to water*, spoken of a man's watering cattle, a river's watering land; in the middle voice, of an animal's getting water for itself; metaphorically said of hymns of praise being poured on a person. 2. (Generalized). To produce an effect, (*a*) similar to that of water when drunk by a thirsty animal, *to refresh*, (*b*) or to that of water on a plant, *to make to grow, cherish.* The proofs for all this are furnished by Pape's excellent

collection of examples. We do not believe that he is deficient in discrimination, but only that he has not given himself time to arrange the meanings of words in his own mind, while he has given careful attention to several of the other weighty matters of lexicography. It is owing to this circumstance, that younger scholars, especially, will consult Liddell's work with more satisfaction and profit in the daily reading of the classics.

The definitions are supported in both the lexicons before us, as has been already said, by a far greater number of citations than Passow had brought together. In this consists, as we think, the principal value of Pape's work. Within the compass of two not very large volumes, he has quoted or made references to a large part of the most important passages in the early Greek writers, almost uniformily, to the earliest author, in whose writings a word occurs, and to later writers by name, and with a specification of the place, where it seemed necessary. The passages also are often so chosen that the various constructions of a verb with cases, and the prepositions most appropriately following them will show themselves to the reader. In all this, indeed, much remains to be done, but it is a great advance on Passow to have so much information, concerning the style and usus loquendi of the post-homeric period, conveyed within so small a space. We have no doubt that Pape makes ten references to the Attic writers to every one of Passow's. The quotations too, are judiciously made, as far as we have had opportunity to examine them. In some cases, indeed, we have thought that too many, similar in kind, and from the same author, followed one another, as though Pape had some index or lexicon before him, from which he did not know how to stop extracting; but such fulness is far better and more desirable than its opposite, abstinent brevity, and unsupported assertion. It is a very great satisfaction—particularly for a somewhat mature scholar—to have it in his power to test articles in a lexicon, on their positive side at least, by weighing and, if need be, examining in their place, passages which establish a meaning beyond doubt. With this within his reach, even if he but seldom finds it necessary to perform the laborious process, he feels confidence in the results of careful lexicography, and yet independence upon its conclusions; while without the means of investigating for himself, furnished by collections of passages, he is obliged to trust, and yet suspicious of being deceived.

A very good plan which Pape occasionally adopts, is to support

a meaning by a passage from some ancient glossarist or scholiast. There are many words occurring but a few times, in regard to the meaning of which such authorities are an important aid.

The quotations made by Liddell and Scott, if less in number than those of Pape, are much more numerous than those of Passow. They are gathered chiefly from the writers of the best period, and in part evidently by means of their own reading. Thus the collection of comic fragments made by Meineke has been ransacked as the numerous references prove. We have already noticed the familiarity indicated by these authors with the works of the best modern critics; this is made known by the name of the critics prefixed to a passage where the word occurs and where he has remarked upon it. Constructions are verified by appropriate examples; meanings are supported by authorities, not very copious indeed, but numerous enough for a manual. In fine, this department of the lexicon wears the look of business-like despatch united with the desire to be thorough and critical.

We proceed to test the comparative merits of the two works before us by some miscellaneous examples selected chiefly from among words which we had occasion to examine while reading portions of Plutarch and Aristophanes.

οὖν. Pape starts with the use of *οὖν* in denoting a necessary consequence; Liddell with the looser one in denoting the mere sequence. Neither of them explains why *οὖν* in hypothetical clauses, and in repetitions should mean *surely, of a truth, verily.* Both assert that in disjunctive coördinate sentences, *οὖν* denotes, *as is to be expected, as it surely will,* or the like. But this view of *οὖν*, in which they follow Passow, is false. It is overthrown by such passages as *εἴτ' οὖν ἀληθὲς εἴτ' οὖν ψεῦδος*, (Plat. Apol. 34, E), where *οὖν* accompanies both clauses, and by such as *εἴτ' οὖν δικαίως, εἴτε μή* sc. *ἔκτεινας*, (Soph. Electr. 560,) where immediately follows: *λέξω δέ σοι, ὡς οὐ δίκῃ γ' ἔκτεινας.* To support the theory the poet should have said, *εἴτε δικαίως εἴτ' οὖν μή.* There is no little difficulty in connecting together the various uses of this particle. Perhaps the difficulty may be removed from the minds of those who can comprehend the murky oracles of Hartung, but we unfortunately are not of that number.

πω. Liddell and others assert that *πω* is never found but in negative clauses in Homer and Hesiod. Pape says this is *usually* the case. We do not know why he speaks in such qualified terms. Liddell says that *πω* was "later, sine negat.," but should have added as a general remark, what is clear in the example he

gives, that this occurs only in interrogative clauses which may be resolved into negative ones.

κρίβανος. Liddell defines it to be "*a pot or pan wider at top than at bottom.*" This is probably a mere mistake in writing for "at bottom than at top."

τύχη. Liddell defines this as being, 1. *That which seems to govern human affairs, chance, luck.* 2. *That which befalls mankind, a chance, hap, lot;* and under the first head we find several subdivisions. The distinctions are unfounded and unnecessary; and as a consequence the article is long and the divisions run into one another. τύχη means, *that which comes in the way of, befalls* men, *chance, luck, fortune*, whether good or evil, whether viewed without looking at its cause, or as caused; (e. g. as in τύχη θεοῦ) and the same personified. Pape's article τύχη is better than Liddell's, though only about half as long.

ἐξέδω. Liddell, *to eat out of;* better, *to eat out.* And the article itself should be merged in ἐξεσθίω.

παρώνυμος. Liddell does not notice the sense of *cognomen, soubriquet*, occurring, Plut. de Ser. Num. Vind. § 17, either under παρώνυμος, or under παρονόμιον, to which Pape assigns it.

διαγελάω. The use of this word with ἡμέρα to describe a time of day, as εἰς διαγελῶσαν ἡμέραν, *at day-break*, or *when day brightens up*, is perhaps confined to later writers, but it is too peculiar and beautiful to be omitted, as both Pape and Liddell have done.

ἀκροχορδών. This word sets Pape's peculiar excellencies in an advantageous light. By an apposite citation from the medical writer, Paul of Aegina, he illustrates the connexion between its meaning, *a wart with a thin neck*, and its derivation. Under χορδή, the primitive, Pape omits to notice the sense, *sausage*, to which Liddell calls attention, and for which Mr. Felton's note on Aristoph. Clouds 455 may be consulted.

τάν or τᾶν. Liddell's article is excellent, but deficient in the important point of not mentioning that ὦ τᾶν is used in plural addresses.

κέλυφος. Under this word we find in Pape the meaning, "*a small boat*," and in Liddell, "*an old skiff boat.*" It does not appear from the passage where the word is used of a boat, that the notion of a *small* or an *old* boat is necessarily conveyed. The word denoting properly a *shell*, or *pod*, is used by Antiphilus in an epigram of an old man's boat, because when he died he was covered up in it, as an oyster, or a pea, in its receptacle. See

Valckenaer on Ammonius, Animadv., Cap. xi. Both lexicons have omitted to notice that the word is used, by Crinagoras another epigrammatist, of the *skull*.

ἀνίημι. This article is long and labored in both Lexicons, but the phrase ἀνίημι πῦρ, occurring in Strabo and Plutarch, is not noticed.

δοθιήν. This unusual word wants in Liddell the support of Aristoph., Wasps 1172,—the only passage perhaps in classical Greek where it occurs out of Hippocrates. The sense "*blutgeschwür*" given to it by Schneider and Pape seems better than that of *abscess, boil*, which Liddell assigns to it.

σπαραγμός. Plutarch uses this word and its primitive verb, of *pulling* the rein, or to use the words of Wyttenbach, it denotes *crebra et vehemens fraeni retractatio*. This is unnoticed in either Lexicon. Liddell's arrangement of meanings is objectionable. He puts, 1. A tearing, rending, mangling. 2. A convulsion, spasm. It should be, 1. A pulling, twitching, e. g. of the rein, of the body in convulsions, a spasm. 2. A pulling to pieces, (the result of pulling and dragging).

δίαιτα. Under this word, Liddell quotes Soph. Electr. 1073, for the sense *arbitration*. We know not who has understood it so. The Schol. and Ellendt, properly, as we conceive, explain it as meaning *way of life;* and the latter observes that it is in this passage equivalent to ὁμιλία.

κολοφών. The connexion κολοφὼν εἰρήσθω, (*let it be said as the top-most thing, the most important* or *decisive*,) and κολοφῶνα προσβιβάζειν, both occurring in Plato, should have been noticed by Liddell. The latter expression Pape also takes no notice of.

χρίμπτω. We see no reason for making this verb intransitive, as Pape has done in Soph. Electr. 721. ἔχρυμπτ' ἀεὶ σύριγγα —a passage, moreover, which needs translation more than most which he quotes. Ellendt says: χρίμπτω, *appropinquo*, activé dictum, and Hermann seems to treat it as an active verb. If Pape meant that like βαίνω, ἄϊσσω, etc. (see Kühner, § 279. Rem. 5), it is properly intransitive, but takes the thing put in motion as an accusative, he should have said so. In his citation from Aesch. Prom., ὑπό appears for πόδα, which destroys the force and sense of the passage, and we have noticed a number of typographical errors.

ἐπιφέρω. The use of ἐπιφ. αἰτίαν, in a good sense, is not noticed by either Pape or Liddell. It occurs, we believe, in Plut. de Ser. N. Vind.; but we cannot now find the passage.

μεταμέλει. There is a want of condensation and neatness in this article in Liddell, as it regards the construction. We give, as a specimen, all the essential parts of the article, omitting examples. "Construction. 1. Cum. dat. pers. et. gen. rei; more freq. 2. The thing one repents of is in the part. agreeing with the Dat. 3. *μ. μοι ὅτι.* 4. Oft. absol. *μ. μοι, it repents me*, where however, a Gen. or Part. may always be supplied. 5. Also c. nom. rei. So too in Inf." Here No. 4. is useless, unless it be desirable to specify every verb that is used without an object expressed. The rest should stand thus. Construction. 1. The person repenting is in the Dat. 2. The thing repented of is, (*a*) a nominative, or a substantive clause beginning with *ὅτι*, or (*b*) a genitive, or (*c*) lies in a participle agreeing with the person.

διίημι. Liddell translates *διέμενος ὄξει*, Arist. Plut. 720, *being melted in vinegar*. This is wrong, as is evident from the context. The active sense is given by the Schol. by Eustathius, Küster, Passow and Pape.

σύκινος. Liddell's explanation of *σύζυγον—καὶ σύκινον* in Arist. Plut. 946, by *a false treacherous comrade*, must we think be wrong, as the sycophant himself is speaking. Pape after the Schol. renders it, *weak, useless*, and this appears to be the sense, as is shown by the contrasted words *ἰσχυρὸν ὑσόν*, which immediately follow. The sycophant says, 'if I find any comrade,—even as weak and useless as fig-tree wood, [with an allusion in the word to his profession,] I will make this strong god here pay the costs.'

ἱκάνω. The sense of this verb corresponding to that of *ἥκω*, *I have come*, is noticed in neither Lexicon. See for examples of this sense, Soph. Electr. 8, and Antig. 224.

ἐπίδηλος. To the examples of this word occurring in Aristoph. Plut. 369, Liddell, after a Schol. and Fischer, gives the sense, *like, resembling*. As this meaning has been supported by no other passage, and cannot easily be derived from the primary sense of the word; some doubt ought to be expressed whether it can be the true one. Fischer defends it by observing, in the first place, that a great many significations are known only from one passage; and then adds, that, as the *resemblance* between two things makes something *manifest*, *δῆλος* and *ἐπίδηλος* came not only to be equivalent to *ὅμοιος* in sense, but also in construction:—a strange mode of reasoning surely, which would prove a great deal too much in philology. Pape seeks to avoid this objectionable explanation of the word, but after all, his translation is open to the same reprehension. The passage is probably corrupt.

μόθων. Pape is inconsistent in his treatment of this word. In the beginning of his article, he pronounces μόθων to be a son of an inhabitant of one of the Laconian country towns, (one of the Perioeci,) admitted to civil rights at Sparta, and brought up with the citizens. At the close, a μόθων becomes a *homeborn slave*, and owing to the character of such slaves, an *impudent person*. Liddell avoids this inconsistency, which arises from uniting two accounts of the meaning of the word.

These are some, out of a number of instances, in which we have tested the two Lexicons in regard to their treatment of particular words. In others, where we have compared them, the two differ little or not at all, except in number of quotations, where the advantage usually lies on the side of Pape. We derive the impression from a good many words which we have examined, that Aristophanes, in reading whom, a good Lexicon is felt to be particularly desirable, has not been quite as carefully studied and examined, as the other dramatic writers, by Liddell and Scott during the progress of their work.

The merits of this work and the long-felt want of a good Greek Lexicon, will no doubt cause a new edition to be soon called for. If these gentlemen will be severe towards themselves, and revise what they have written, with the due degree of labor, we have no doubt that this Lexicon will drive every other Greek dictionary out of circulation, wherever the English language is spoken, and will continue to be used for years, and perhaps for generations to come. Its value, and the language in which it is written, render it even now, a work, to which those who have long used German aids, will turn with confidence and pleasure. For ourselves, we have relied chiefly on Passow, for more than fifteen years, and ought therefore to know something about the meanings of German words; but to tell the truth, it is a very great relief to have an English dictionary to which we can resort, and often have we been much embarrassed for the moment in recalling the exact English term corresponding to the German one in Passow. A Lexicon is a book which we are apt to use in a hurry, and rather than stop to go through the double process of getting the German word for the Greek, and the English for the German, we shall often content ourselves with guesses, which do not quite hit the mark. It is wonderful how great the satisfaction is, when we feel that we have the exact impression in our own language, of a word coined in another; when, for instance, we are reading a writer whose perceptions of character are nice,

and can find the same shade of thought in an English word, which lies in the foreign one, without being obliged to resort to circumlocution on the one hand, or to feel on the other, that a hazy vagueness surrounds the word, which destroys clearness of conception. We believe, too, that words so learned through another language, are sooner forgotten, on account of the less distinct notions which they convey. At the best, the words of a foreign language are but fleeting things. They are properly called winged, not only because they fly out of the mouth with wondrous ease,—organized creations embodying thought,—but also for a reason, which, Homer, if he remembered five and and twenty thousand verses, never dreamed of;—that they are so apt to scud away from the memory, and to leave not a trace behind. We therefore fully agree with the opinion expressed in the preface to the Oxford Lexicon, that whatever may be said of having commentaries on the Greek writers in Latin, a dictionary of Greek ought to be in English, at least when it is of that convenient form and size, that it can be used from day to day, and not consulted merely on extraordinary occasions.

Since beginning to write these remarks, we have seen the following announcement from the Harpers of New York. "A new Greek and English Lexicon, including Liddell and Scott's enlarged translation of Passow's Greek and German Lexicon, with additions and improvements from the Greek and English Lexicons of Donnegan and Dunbar, etc., by Henry Drissler, A. M., under the supervision of Professor Anthon."

If this is undertaken with the consent of Messrs. Liddell and Scott, it is all very well. But we presume from the small regard hitherto paid to the rights of authorship in similar cases, both here and in Great Britain, that no such consent has been asked or obtained. Most publishers are like the sellers of old clothes—they care not whose the property is, or by right ought to be, if they can make a good bargain out of it, without coming within the clutches of the law. But there is another reason for thinking that the consent of the authors has not been procured for this republication, and that is found in the extraordinary announcement that the Lexicon is to be interpolated here and there from Donnegan. That any decent lexicographer should consent to such an intertexture is incredible; and it is almost equally so that any book-maker should imagine that the announcement of such "improvements" is a favorable augury for his work. *Ἀρχομένου ἔργου πρόσωπον χρὴ θέμεν τελαγές.* Improvements from Donnegan!

they are like improvements to a standard commentary on the Scriptures from the stores of Millerite criticism. It is as if a house-painter should set about improving the landscape of a professed artist, by touches borrowed from a journeyman's daub. The man who would really improve such a Lexicon, as the one in question, must trust not to his scissors and his paste, but to long and patient reading of the classics, to years of hard work. If the American editor and the learned gentleman who is to bear the part of supervisor, mean to go to work in this way, whether they have had the comity of obtaining the authors' agreement to the proposed improvements or not, we shall rejoice at least in this, that a better help in studying Greek is furnished to our scholars than they before possessed.

ARTICLE II.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF MONASTICISM;—FROM THE ORIGINAL SOURCES.

Continued from No. 3, p. 595. By Prof. Emerson.

Life of St. Martin of Tours. From the Latin of Sulpitius Severus.

Preliminary Remarks.

[In the last two numbers of this work, an account has been given of the rise of monasticism in Egypt. The object of the present article is to exhibit its early development in the West, by giving the Life of its first distinguished example and patron.

Doubtless a strong tendency to the monastic life had existed in Europe, for a considerable period, before the time of Martin; but to what extent it had been pursued, we have not the means of determining. Only obscure traces remain in history, of a few who practised at least a partial retirement from social life.

The achievements of Martin were early a theme for the poet as well as the historian. Paulinus Petricordius, a Gallic poet, about the year 460, wrote six books of Latin hexameters, descriptive of the life and miracles of this saint, whose aid he frequently invokes in the progress of his poem. It is, however, little more