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

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

courageous faith, that He, whose sunshine makes the flowers to unfold their beauties, and the corn to give back its golden increase, will not deny his blessing to the better seeds of knowledge and virtue. Is it asked what return may be expected for labors so patriotic? We answer — the consciousness of duty performed, of benefits conferred; the noblest reward that a noble nature can receive.

ARTICLE V.

HISTORY OF LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.

[The following historical statements in regard to the early history of Latin lexicography are from the pen of an eminent classical scholar in the vicinity of Boston, and, at our request, are given to the readers of this work. They will be read with interest in connection with the Lexicon of Dr. Andrews, and of others, which are appearing from time to time. — Ed.]

Whenever an important addition is made to a branch of learning, we naturally look back upon what has previously been done in that department in order to form a correct opinion and a complete and just estimate of the merits or demerits of the new production. The translation of Freund's Latin Lexicon by Dr. Andrews is such a work. It has furnished us with an occasion of arranging and digesting the materials, previously collected, of a sketch or brief history of Latin lexicography from its earliest beginning to the present time. We intend to lay before our readers, at the present time, a small portion of this sketch relating to the lexicographical labors of the Romans themselves and the earliest attempts at Latin lexicography during the middle ages previous to the labors of Robert Stephanus.

It is in the nature of the case that lexicography belongs to the last stage of the literary development of a nation. The language must have fully unfolded itself, and a literature must have grown up, the meanings of words must have multiplied, some of them must have become obsolete, obscure or less intelligible, and only retained in the older portion of the literature, before the words of the language can become the subject of reflection, examination and research. Lexicography presupposes, not only the existence of words, but that they

should have undergone changes. And not only is it necessary that the language should have fully unfolded itself and that a literature should have grown up, but the intellectual development of the nation must have far advanced before the single words of the language can become the subject of examination and research. It indicates considerable intellectual progress when a man makes himself the subject of his reflection; and still greater, when he subjects the very instrument, language, by which he carries on and communicates this mental operation, to the same process.

As the history of philology commences with the first traces of a scientific and systematic consideration of the existing monuments of language and art, so the history of lexicography, which is a branch of philology, begins with the first attempts at examining into the origin, etymology, meaning and use of single words. Such attempts we can trace as far back as the time of the Sophists, of Socrates, and Plato. Both the Sophists, as teachers of eloquence, and the philosophers were fond of occupying themselves with the contemplation of single words both as to their meaning and form. This led naturally to etymological investigations, single instances of which are found, even earlier, in poets. The etymological inquiries were not confined to tracing a word to its root, but some attempted to point out how the root itself, or rather its sound, agreed with the object designated. It requires no great penetration to see how hazardous such a proceeding is and how easily it may degenerate into idle speculations. Whatever the success with which such speculations were indulged in, they naturally led to the question concerning the origin of language itself, whether it was the product of nature, or the result of convention and usage, whether it was *φύσει* or *θέσει*, *natura* or *usu;* a question which occupied the philosophers a good deal. It is known that Aristotle entertained the latter, Plato the former opinion. As we see from Cic. Partitione 5 and Lucret. 5, 1027, this subject was discussed by the Romans as well as the Greeks.

The first lexicographical attempts, among the Greeks as well as Romans, did not embrace the whole department of lexicography but were contributions to its several branches, etymology, synonymy, and dialectology. It is a familiar fact that the Stoics were particularly fond of etymological inquiries and, as we can judge from many instances quoted, for instance, in Cicero, frequently guilty of the most ridiculous and absurd derivations. Ignorance, or imperfect knowledge, of other languages and, consequently, the absence of that invaluable assistance which comparative philology affords, formed undoubtedly

a serious impediment. Grammarians and rhetoricians, at an early period, compared the conversational language (*ἡ συνηθισμένη λέξις*) with the written (*ἡ τεχνικὴ συνήθεια*) and the different dialects, collected words peculiar to single dialects, provincialisms, peculiar forms of words and phrases, and pointed out the changes in the significations of words according as they belonged to earlier or later writers. These detached investigations and collections were made as their want was felt, and deposited in commentaries on ancient writers, especially Homer, or in separate works. Among the writers on etymology, deserves to be mentioned Apollodorus of Athens, a pupil of Aristarchus. Two of his works are known by name: *περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν* and *λέξεις Ἀττικαί*. Krates, an opponent of Aristarchus, wrote a similar work, *λέξεις Ἀττικαί*. He differed from Aristarchus on a point which divides most ancient philologists into two great parties. While Aristarchus maintained that the principle of analogy prevailed in language, Krates declared in favor of that of anomaly.

The most prolific occasion, however, for lexicographical collections were the comparisons of glossae, *γλῶτται*, that is, differences of usage as to words and phrases with reference to time, locality and writers. Such collections were not yet called *λεξικά* but *συναγωγαὶ λέξεων* or *γλωσσῶν*, or *ὀνομαστικά*. The mode of arrangement was various, the words being sometimes arranged in the order in which they occurred in a particular author, or according to subjects, or also alphabetically. The name *λεξικά* was first given to those collections in which the words were arranged in the last mentioned order. To this class belongs Philetas, who may be mentioned as one of the earliest lexicographers among the Greeks. It is doubtful whether he is the same Philetas mentioned in a fragment of the comic poet Strator or Stratis, which contains a scene in which a citizen who does not understand the antiquated words with which a cook lards his discourse, has recourse to the lexicon of Philetas to ascertain their meaning.

It is not our intention to encumber these pages with a long list of the names of Greek lexicographers extending from the foundation of the Alexandrine school to the fall of the Greek empire, and of whose works nothing is left or scanty fragments only. We shall simply name the two most important dictionaries which are still extant, the work of Suidas and the Etymologicum magnum. Both belong probably to the same age, the latter part of the tenth century.

We have thus seen that among the Greeks the sophists gave the first decided impulse to lexicographical studies, which were afterwards

taken up and continued by grammarians and philosophers. Of a somewhat more practical nature was the occasion of lexicographical investigations among the Romans. It became a matter of importance for the practice of the law to understand the antiquated terms of the ancient laws and legal formulas; these, therefore, were the first class of words which became the subject of lexicographical, and more particularly etymological, inquiry. After being once commenced the inquiry easily extended to other portions of the older literature. We have still the title of a work of Aelius Gallus who was a contemporary of Varro: *de verborum, quae ad jus civile pertinent, significationes;* and of Antistius Labeo, Gellius says, 13, 10; *in grammaticam atque dialecticam literasque antiquiores attioresque penetraverat, Latinarumque vocum origines rationemque percalluerat, eaque praecipua scientia ad erodandos juris laqueos utebatur.*

The Romans enjoyed in this pursuit an advantage not possessed by the Greeks; we mean a thorough knowledge of the Greek language and literature in addition to that of their own. Independent of the close relationship of the Greek and Latin, which of itself was an invaluable assistance to those who were acquainted with both, their familiarity with the Greek language enabled the Romans to avail themselves of the philological labors of the Greeks, especially as regards the philosophy of language, in the investigation of the phenomena of their own language. The Romans stood, as it were, on the shoulders of the Greeks and arrived much earlier and quicker at the point to reach which the Greeks had labored for ages. Hence the striking fact that Dionysius Thrax, the first Greek grammarian — if he is the author of the τέχνη γραμματική which bears his name — was a contemporary of Terentius Varro.

Those lexicographical notices were not at first collected into separate works; the jurists deposited theirs in their commentaries on the laws, the historians theirs in their historical works, and the grammarians theirs in their general grammatical treatises. Works exclusively lexicographical were rare and mostly of the class of glossaries; alphabetical works do not seem to belong to the period previous to Varro. The historian L. Cincius Alimentus may be named among the lexicographers of this age provided the *liber de verbis priscis*, mentioned by Festus, was a distinct work and not rather a collection of extracts from an historical or antiquarian work of the same author. Other glossographers of this and the succeeding period are Suntra *de verborum antiquitate*, Publius Luvinius *de verbis sordidis*, Veranius Flaccus *de verbis pontificalibus* and *priscorum verborum liber*, Statilius

Maximus *de singularibus apud Ciceronem*, Verrius Flaccus *de obscuris Catonis;* C. Suetonius Tranquillus *de vestimentis et calceamentis et cetaris, quibus induimur; de vocibus mali ominis;* Modesti *libellus de vocabulis rei militaris.* With the exception of the last named, fragments only of all these writers have been preserved in the works of Varro, Gellius and Festus.

In the progress of time more attention was bestowed upon synonyms. Remmius Palaemon, Valerius Probus, Aelius Melissus labored in this department, and particularly M. Corn. Fronto, of whose work *de differentiis vocabulorum* we have still an epitome, and Nonius Marcellus, whose work *de compendiosa doctrina*, contained in nineteen chapters, is partly lexicographical, partly grammatical and antiquarian, and partly of the description of a glossary. The age of Nonius is not ascertained. As he quotes Apuleius and is himself quoted by Priscianus, he must have lived after 200 and before 520 of our era. The principal value of his work consists in the quotations from ancient authors now mostly lost, especially from dramatists and historians; but this value is again considerably impaired by the circumstance that Nonius did not quote from the originals but copied from glossaries and similar collections.

Our object being to point out the commencement and progress of lexicographical studies among the Romans, rather than to enumerate those who have labored in the subordinate parts of this field, we shall merely remark that the taste for labors of this kind continued, and sometimes displayed itself in a somewhat whimsical manner. Aelius Spartianus, one of the Historiae Augustae Scriptores, relates of the emperor Geta that he was in the habit of ordering entertainments composed alphabetically; for instance, one in which the names of all the dishes commenced with *a*, another in which they begun with *p* or *f*.

Much more important than these glossaries was the comprehensive work of M. Verrius Flaccus *de verborum significatione*. M. Verrius Flaccus was a distinguished rhetorician in the time of Augustus, and by the emperor selected as the teacher of his grandsons Caius and Lucius with the condition of not receiving any other pupils. This happened probably about 10 B. C. It is highly probable, if not certain, that he is the same person in whose honor a statue was erected in the forum of Praeneste, where he had caused to be placed an almanac, *fasti*, carefully and skilfully prepared by himself and inscribed on marble tablets. A portion of these tablets were discovered in 1770, containing the fasti of January, March, April and December. Verrius wrote, besides his dictionary, several other works, among

them *libri rerum memoria dignarum*, quoted by Gellius and Pliny. Whether he wrote a work *de rebus sacris* is doubtful, because what is quoted as from this work may as well have been passages from the work *de verborum significatione*. Our knowledge of this great work is derived from quotations in later writers and particularly from the epitome of Festus. But it is not to be overlooked that, although Verrius is frequently mentioned, A. Gellius is the only ancient writer who, in two places, quotes the lexicon by name, viz. 5, 7: *Verrius Flaccus in quarto de verborum significatione*, and 5, 18: *Verrius Flaccus refert in libro de significatione verborum quarto*. Verrius arranged his book, generally, in an alphabetical order, regarding, in doing so, not only the first but also the second and third letters. He sometimes united kindred letters, such as *e* and *i*, or *o* and *u*, and seems to have attached more importance to the consonants than vowels. In the arrangement of the several books he paid no regard to the alphabetical order. The number of books of which the whole work consisted, is uncertain. As the epitome of Festus filled twenty books, the original may have extended to forty or fifty. This may be considered a very moderate estimate, since the work which Verrius wished, perhaps, to imitate, the Greek lexicon of Pamphilus, a pupil of Aristarchus, had ninety-five books. The work contained as much information on subjects of history and antiquities as on matters of language. As an etymologist, Verrius belonged to the juste milieu and showed his sound judgment by being exclusively neither a Romanist nor Hellenist.

The epitome made by Festus was undoubtedly the cause of the neglect and eventually of the loss of the original. Sextus Pompeius Festus, of whom we know nothing except that he lived after Martial, whom he quotes, and before Macrobius, by whom he is quoted, between 100, therefore, and 435 A. D., made an epitome of the work of Verrius in twenty books, of which a portion, from the letter M, has been preserved in a fragmentary condition. It is probable that Festus, in making the Epitome from Verrius's work *de verborum significatione*, made use of other works also of the same author, such as *de obscuris Catonis, de Plauti vocabulis, de jure sacro et augurali*. However much harm the epitome of Festus may have done by causing the loss of the original, it is still, even in its imperfect condition, a rich mine of information which Niebuhr, among others, used in his historical researches with great ingenuity, though, as K. O. Müller thinks, with too little critical discrimination. Müller makes the same charge, and justly, against Forcellini, Schneider (K. L., the Latin grammarian) and Dirksen. The latter, a distinguished jurist, speaks

in his excellent work *de XII Tabulis* of codices of Festus, overlooking the fact that there has never been more than one codex, the codex Farnesianus.

The same fate which Festus had prepared for Verrius, his epitome being the indirect cause of the loss of the original work, he very nearly experienced at the hands of Paulus Diaconus. Paulus Winfried, sometimes called Paulus Diaconus, sometimes Pontifex, prepared in the eighth century for Charlemagne an epitome of Festus which was soon extensively used, and occasioned the neglect of the work of Festus. Until the sixteenth century the epitome of Paulus alone was known. About that time the only remaining codex of Festus, incomplete and beginning with the letter M, came to light. It is said to have been brought from Illyria, and came into the possession of Pomponius Laetus, who gave the greater portion of it to Manilius Rallus, retaining only several leaves. Angelus Politianus copied the whole, and Victorius made excerpts from this copy. The next time we hear of the codex, it — that is to say, the portion given to Manilius Rallus, wanting, therefore, the few leaves which Laetus had retained — is left by the Cardinal Michael Silvias to the Cardinal Ranuzio Farnese. How it got from the hands of Manilius Rallus into those of Silvias, is not known. While in the possession of Cardinal Farnese, Fulvius Ursinus caused it to be copied page by page and line by line, calling it *antiquissimum exemplar bibliothecae Farnesianae*, and to be printed in 1581. When in 1736 the Farnesian library of Parma was transferred to Naples, the codex Farnesianus wandered with it to the latter place, where it is at the present time. It was not until 1833 that a German scholar made a new, and, as Müller assures us, careful collation of the manuscript with the edition of Ursinus of 1581. The edition of K. O. Müller, undoubtedly the best, is founded on this collation.

We have dwelt longer on Verrius, Festus and Paulus, because the first was unquestionably the greatest among Roman lexicographers and the other two, who were the means of preserving in some measure the results of his labors, were the last representatives of Latin lexicography immediately before, and even after the commencement of, the darkness of the middle ages. When we emerge from this gloomy period we meet some lexicographers even long before the invention of the art of printing, but at this distance of time and with our imperfect means of information it is probably impossible to ascertain whether Festus and Paulus exercised any, and if any, what influence upon these specimens of Latin lexicography.

The earliest lexicographer whom we meet during the darkest period of the middle ages is Papias who lived about 1000 of our era. This fact in inferred from the circumstance that in the word *aetas* he enumerates all the emperors and stops with Henry II. who reigned from 1002 to 1124. Papias, who was a native of Lombardy, understood Greek as well as Latin. His work is entitled *Vocabularium* or *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum*, and was undoubtedly one of the sources of the Catholicon. It was repeatedly printed after the invention of the art of printing, for the first time in Milan in 1476, more than four hundred years after the death of the author, and several times in Venice in 1485, 1487, 1491, 1496.

About two hundred years after Papias, about 1196, lived Hugatio or Ugatio of Pisa, bishop of Ferrara. He copied Papias and he and Papias were again copied by de Janua. While coädjutor, or rather guardian, of a spendthrift abbot, he found in the library of the monastery a copy of Papias of which he availed himself in the composition of his Glossarium. This seems to have existed and circulated in manuscript alone. Nearly an hundred years later, about 1286, lived Joannes Balbus de Ginoa or Joannes de Janua or Januensis, being a native of Janua, a maritime town in Upper Italy. Availing himself of the labors of Papias and Hugatio he constructed the famous Catholicon, printed by Faust himself in 1460. It is not only the first printed dictionary, but one of the first printed books. It contains some grammatical remarks and *dictiones, quae saepe inveniuntur in bibliis et in diariis Sanctorum et etiam poetarum secundum ordinem alphabeti ordinate subjunctas.* The Catholicon was frequently republished; the second, third and fourth editions appeared in Venice in 1483, 1487 and 1495; two in Lyons in 1506 and 1514; one in Paris in 1520. However popular the Catholicon was, chiefly from the want of a better work, its defects were too glaring to escape severe criticisms. Erasmus calls it *naeniae* and *opus indoctissimum.*

Joannes de Garlandia belongs to this period, but is otherwise not connected with this first group of lexicographers, Papias, Hugatio and de Janua. He lived about 1040, was an Englishman, and wrote a work *Synonyma et Aequivoca*, which was first printed in Cologne 1490, afterwards in Paris 1496. The dictionary of Nestor Dionysius was published in different places, especially Paris and Venice in 1488, 1496, 1502, 1507.

With the works of Tortellius, Maius and Reuchlin, we approach a better time. They form, in this department, the transition to the period of the revival of literature. Joannes Tortellius, a native of

Arezzo, lived about 1439, and was a friend of the distinguished Laurentius Valla. His *Dictionarium vocum Latinarum*, in which he paid special attention to orthography, was repeatedly printed in Venice and other places in 1477, 1480, 1493, 1495, 1504, 1508. Junianus Maius, a native of Naples, lived about 1480 and his dictionary appeared in Naples and other places in 1475, 1477, 1480, 1496. Joannes Reuchlin, or Caprio, as he translated his German name, was the most remarkable of these three men, more, however, for his great literary attainments than his labors as a lexicographer. He was born 1454 at Pforzheim in South Germany, but passed a considerable portion of his life as Professor in Tübingen. It was in the earlier part of his life that he prepared and published, in Basil 1480, the *Breviloquium sive Dictionarium Latinum ordine alphabetico singulas voces breviter explicans.* This circumstance will account for its imperfections and for the fact that it soon fell into disuse. He was well acquainted with Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and was a statesman as well as a scholar. Being sent, by the prince of the Palatinate, as an ambassador to Rome, he sought there the instruction of the distinguished Greek Argyropylus. To show the extent of his knowledge of Greek to his new teacher, he translated a passage of Thucydides into Latin, upon which the learned Greek exclaimed: *Graecia nostra exilio transvolavit Alpes.*

We come now to one of the most important men in the department of lexicography, who is, indeed, to some extent the founder of modern lexicography, although one of his successors and borrowers has gained a more extended reputation. Nicolaus Perotti was born 1430 in Sassoferrata, was professor in Bologna, became 1458 archbishop of Liponto, and died in 1480. He showed, in his Cornucopia, the way how to collect the materials for a trustworthy lexicon and made himself a very successful beginning. The first literary work by which he made himself known was a Latin translation of Polybius, which was esteemed so good that it gave rise to a charge that he had surreptitiously appropriated to himself an ancient translation discovered by him somewhere. Upon a closer examination it was found, however, that, excellent as the style was, the translation was so free and inaccurate that it does not deserve the name of a translation. The work which renders him distinguished in Latin lexicography was entitled Cornucopia, a commentary of Martial so complete that it may justly be called a dictionary. On account of the indecency of many parts of the author, Perotti was unwilling to have his work published, but he communicated it freely to his friends. As many availed them-

selves of his kindness without any acknowledgment whence they derived their information, his nephew, to guard against any doubts with regard to the authorship, copied the work secretly, and sent it to Fred. Ubaldini, duke of Urbino, for safe keeping. It was published soon after Perotti's death in 1482, and after that frequently reprinted in Venice, Paris, Basel and other places in 1492, 1499, 1500, 1513 (by Aldus Manutius), 1526, 1532, etc.

More fortunate, at least as regards a wide spread and long preserved name, was Ambrosius Calepinus, called so from Calepium, a town between Bergamo and Brescia, who lived at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, and died 1510, at Bergamo, at a very advanced age. His dictionary, Lexicon Calepinum, was long famous, although he was more a diligent compiler from the works of Nestor, Tortellius, and chiefly Perotti, than an original collector and investigator. The defects of the work were numerous; many good words were omitted, many barbarous ones received, many mistakes committed in marking the quantity of syllables, and although numerous improvements were introduced into succeeding editions, many of the original defects remained so that it was said with some justice: *Bonus ille Calepinus toties coctus et recoctus parum sapit.* Besides benefitting by the labors of his predecessors, especially Perotti, which he copied, as we have already stated, he had the good fortune that succeeding good scholars retained his work as the basis of their own improvements and thus helped to perpetuate a name which, otherwise, would have been soon forgotten. The first edition appeared in 1502. In the preface Calepinus makes a characteristic remark which shows how little he was fitted for the task he had undertaken; he acknowledges that he places, in his labors, more confidence in the fathers Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine than scholars like Laurentius Valla, Priscianus and others. The second edition, of 1509, appeared like the first in Venice prepared by the author himself. For about two hundred years after this a great many editions were published in different places, Paris, Venice, Leyden, Antwerp, Genoa, and prepared by different scholars, in 1510, 1516, 1534, 1535, 1539, 1544 (by Conr. Gesner), 1545, 1548, 1560, 1570, 1572, 1581, 1592, 1620, 1647, 1663, 1681; so that the name of Calepinus was for several generations one of the most familiar, and Manutius says very justly: *Bonum fatum Calepinus sortitus est, cui fere omnes homines de suo largiantur. Certe enim illius dictionarium non tam auctoris industria quam aliorum labore studioque in tantam altitudinem excrevit.* Many distinguished scholars were employed in revising

and improving different editions; the names of others were sometimes used by booksellers without authority. It is more than probable, from the statement of Casp. Schopp (Scioppius), that the name of Jul. Passeratius was thus improperly used.

The path which Perotti had entered upon, making a single author, Martial, the basis of his lexicographical labors, was pursued by Mario Nizzoli (Nizolius). He was born, in 1498, in Bersello on the Po, lived for some years in the house of Count Gambara, a patron of literary men, was made professor at Parma in 1547, director of a new academy in Sabionetta, and died in his native place in 1566. His great work is the *Thesaurus Ciceronianus sive Observationes in Ciceronem ordine literarum digestae, quibus omnis vere Latine loquendi ratio et quot quibusque modis unaquaeque vox distingui variarique possit, per exempla Ciceronis plane demonstratur.* This thesaurus was frequently republished in Basil, Venice, Lyons and other places in 1530, 1535, 1541, 1548, 1551, 1568, 1608, 1612, until, chiefly through the labors of Ludovicus Lucius, it grew into a dictionary, published in Basil 1613. The thesaurus of Rob. Stephanus, who was a contemporary of Nizzoli and who had himself prepared one of the editions of Nizzoli's thesaurus (that published in Venice in 1551), principally furnished the materials which Lucius introduced into the enlarged Thesaurus Ciceronianus. We ought not, perhaps, to omit making mention, in this place, of Basilius Zanchius, a native of Bergamo, who lived in the time of Leo X. and died in 1560, who furnished additions to Nizolius and Calepinus.

We have thus arrived at a new and important era in Latin lexicography, which is at the same time the limit of our present task, we mean the era of Robert Stephanus.