

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Lewis' Latin Dictionary for Schools *A Latin Dictionary for Schools*. By Chaelton T. Lewis, Ph.D., Editor of Lewis and Short's 'Latin Dictionary.' 18s.

W. T. Lendrum

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 04 / April 1889, pp 164 - 167  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194582, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00194582](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194582)

### How to cite this article:

W. T. Lendrum (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 164-167 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194582

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Hachette. The introduction is interesting and well written, the notes sensible, though they do not add much to what may be found in previous editions, except that more attention is given to the etymologies, which are usually taken from Bréal and Bailly's *Dict. Etym. Lat.* I am glad to find that M. Thiaucourt is usually in agreement with me when I have seen reason to depart from the text of Müller. In § 134, *eorum (dentium) adversi acuti morsu dividunt escas*, where I had proposed to omit *acuti* as a gloss on *adversi*, he agrees with Dr. Goethe in defending the existing reading, holding that *acuti* is an epithet to *adversi*. If we are to retain *acuti*, I should prefer to take it as an explanatory addition ('the front teeth, the incisors'), like *qui genuini vocantur* after

*molares* in the same sentence. There are one or two explanatory notes in which I should dispute the view maintained, e.g. on *undique aptus* 37, 'qui s'adapte de tous les cotés, qui est complètement approprié à ce qui l'entoure,' surely it is the idea of compactness not of adaptation which is expressed; cf. *Orator* 235, *facilius est apta dissolvere, quam dissipata conectere*. So in 64 I think *conversis casibus* must mean 'by change of inflexions,' not 'aux cas obliques.' In 149 and 150 M. Thiaucourt ingeniously explains the change from the gen. to the dat. in *plectri similem linguam, chordarum dentes, dentes cornibus*, and the hendiadys of *commissuras et artus* by Cicero's dislike for the forms *cornuum, artuum*.

J. B. M.

#### LEWIS' LATIN DICTIONARY FOR SCHOOLS.

*A Latin Dictionary for Schools.* By CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D., Editor of Lewis and Short's 'Latin Dictionary.' 18s.

THIS book is 'not an abridgment of any larger work, nor is it a Dictionary of the Latin language. It is designed to explain every word or phrase in Latin books commonly read in schools,' and the author gives a list of these, embracing some eleven or twelve of the most familiar Latin writers between Terence and Juvenal. He adds a second list, stating the authors excluded from the survey of this Dictionary, in which the names of Plautus, Lucretius, Propertius and Tacitus in his historical works are the most prominent. In somewhat curious contrast with this limited field stand the other features of the work, of which special mention is made. Among these are minute attention to niceties of orthography, the determination of quantities not merely metrical but also 'hidden,' and the classification of words under their etymological roots, these last being presented in a separate table placed at the end of the volume. So novel an experiment was not, it seems, attempted without consideration. A scheme of the Dictionary as first proposed was submitted to 'thirty of the gentlemen supposed to be most competent to improve it,' and over twenty of these, among whom appear many of the most eminent American scholars, are enumerated by name as having contri-

buted to the plan ultimately adopted by the author. Fortified by so strong a consensus of competent American opinion, Dr. Lewis is probably sure of his public in his own country; but as the work is also offered for circulation in England, it would perhaps have been not amiss if a similar attempt had been made to sound the opinion of scholars and teachers across the water. For it may be doubted whether the verdict of an English *consilium* would have entirely agreed with that of Dr. Lewis's American friends. Here the tendency of late has rather been to extend the field of school reading to the less familiar authors, and those of us who sympathise with that movement will regret that it should have been checked rather than encouraged by the appearance of the new Dictionary. There is probably not a public school in England in which Plautus, Lucretius, Propertius and the historical books of Tacitus are not at some time read, and school editions of nearly all the authors excluded by Dr. Lewis are rapidly appearing among us. Tutors will therefore hesitate before recommending their pupils to provide themselves with a book at once so elaborate and so restricted as this, which, however excellent within its prescribed limits, must by its very nature prove inadequate to their needs two or three years before they leave school. Details of orthography, quantity or etymology are hardly likely to appeal to the mere beginner, who

will probably find a much less ambitious work fully suited to his wants; while those whose eyes are set towards the universities will obviously find it more prudent to equip themselves at once with a lexicon complete enough to see them to their journey's end.

But setting these merely practical considerations aside, it may be further questioned whether the limited scope of this work does not seriously impair its value as a teaching power. Even if it be granted that the authors in question are not read in schools, that appears no good reason for their exclusion from a school dictionary. Every user of a complete lexicon must have felt the advantage derived from the habit of studying as a whole the articles which he has occasion in the course of his reading to consult. But in the new Dictionary one has only to refer to such articles as those on *barbarus*, *igitur*, *potior*, to be reminded how necessarily imperfect, from the point of view of Latinity, is the information a work so framed is able to supply. The plan adopted by Dr. Lewis fixes the attention too exclusively on a single period, and gives little or no record of the growth of the language from youth to maturity. It plunges the reader at once *in medias res*, omitting entirely the first act of the drama and allowing but the merest outline of the last. But such a method will place even the students of Terence, Cicero and Virgil at a disadvantage. For however strict may have been the limitations observed by the literary circles who framed the 'sermo urbanus' of Rome, still it must not be forgotten that the language they worked upon had already passed through an eventful history, and the child is the father of the word no less than of the man. Recent editors of Cicero have been careful to point out the close approximation which exists between many parts of his writings and the language of the older Latin Comedy: Sallust was long ago noted for his 'nimia priscorum verborum affectatio,' and Virgil had not only a poet's delicate ear to catch the far-off echoes of a word, but he was often at special pains to justify by an appeal to the 'storied past' the linguistic no less than the political usage of his own time. These facts miss their needful emphasis in the new 'Dictionary for Schools.' To take an example: Dr. Lewis explains the word *audacia* by 'daring,' 'courage,' 'valor' and the like ('syn. fortitudo, animus, virtus'); and he gives similar renderings for *audeo*, 'venture, dare, be bold.' Such renderings will no doubt often suffice, but they can hardly give just that shade of meaning which

these words conveyed to a Roman ear; and so Dr. Lewis is constrained to find a special interpretation for his very last citation under 'audeo,' Virgil's 'audere in praelia.' But if Plautus had not been placed beyond the ken of this Dictionary, it would have been possible to begin with passages like 'propter *avaritiam* ipsius atque *audaciam*' (*Capt.* 287, cf. Brix *ad loc.*), or 'Ecquid *audes* de tuo istuc addere' (*Men.* 149), and a young student would surely find these living instances a more instructive illustration of Virgil's phrase—to say nothing of 'sodes'—than a mere reference to the dry bones of a 'logical abstraction' AV, which he will perhaps be more puzzled than enlightened to find is shared with 'audeo' by words so far apart as 'ovis' and 'avunculus.' Similarly, to explain 'talibus orabat Iuno' by the Plautine 'bonum aequomque oras' would be to illustrate not only the meaning but the method of Virgil, just as in the lines (*Aen.* 4, 440) 'si fata meis paterentur ducere vitam *Auspiciis* et *sponte* mea componere curas' the archaic use of *sponte* (cf. 'haruspicum *responsis*'), a mere 'variation on the theme auspiciis,' is best illustrated by such a passage as (*Tac. Ann.* xii. 42) 'gnarum cuius *sponte* (i.e. *auspiciis*) praeficeretur,' which however Dr. Lewis's unhappy restrictions forbid his quoting. The fact is, Augustan literature can no more be understood without reference to archaic usage than Attic Greek without reference to Homer and Herodotus, or modern English apart from Chaucer and Shakespeare. But the plan of Dr. Lewis's Dictionary cuts him off from the possibility of this historical or evolutionary method of interpretation, the most instructive surely of all methods, and one which renders a book like Bréal's 'Dictionnaire' so stimulating and attractive. Nor can it be said that this want is adequately supplied by the list of etymological roots, for, as Bréal well observes, 'un vocabulaire étymologique, qui se contenterait d'indiquer la racine sans autre accompagnement, serait à peu près aussi instructif qu'un dictionnaire de biographie, qui se bornerait à fournir le nom et la date des personages.'

If the objections I have ventured, not without diffidence, to advance against the plan adopted by so high an authority are sound, the fact is the more to be regretted, because a really good elementary Dictionary, at once scholarly and cheap, is urgently needed, and there is probably no one living so well fitted to produce such a work as Dr. Lewis. This is clearly proved, quite apart from his previous distinguished service

in the field of Latin Lexicography, by the admirable work contained in his new Dictionary within its special lines. I have had the work in constant use for several weeks and have been again and again struck by the full, clear, and accurate treatment of most of the authors it embraces. Where so much is good, it is perhaps needless to exemplify: but I may give myself the pleasure of referring to the articles on *adeo*, *adhuc*, *nam*, *tamen*, *careo*, *invideo*, as a few of numberless instances to prove how far in advance this Dictionary is of any similar work in our language. Perhaps its most valuable feature is the careful discrimination drawn between the usage of Caesar and Cicero on the one hand, and that of Livy and the poets on the other; it thus presents a convenient *conspectus* of the best classical Latinity, which cannot fail to raise the standard of scholarship wherever it is employed. A severe scrutiny might perhaps detect a few traces of the 'somnus' which unavoidably steals over a long work: e.g. *ludus talaris*, 'a gaming-house' (*Att.* i. 16, 3), or Horace's '*dorso gravior*, "heavier than he can carry"' (s.v. *onus*—the construction is rightly explained under 'subire'). There are also occasional omissions, such as the Livian uses of *diserte*, like the '*disertis verbis*' of late Latin, of *an* in a single indirect question (31, 48, 6, Weis.), of *subire* c. dat. as a military technical term: *capesso*, too, is denied its perf. (but cf. *L.* x. 5, 4). Horace's form *Bellerophon* is not noted: '*intellegi*' is quoted from Sallust, but not *neglegi*, and readers of Cicero might perhaps expect special uses of words like *vinco*, *modestus*, *abstinentia*, *innocens*, *voluntas*, to be marked with a firmer hand. It is more serious to find *quamquam* 'with subj.' quoted without remark from Cicero side by side of Livian passages which are on a quite different footing. And it is sometimes a little surprising to find Dr. Lewis setting aside authorities one is accustomed to respect: thus he admits without comment constructions like '*in potestatem esse*' as Ciceronian, though they were noted as solecistic long ago by Gellius, and have been vehemently attacked in our own day by Madvig (*Liv. Em.* p. 9 ff.); *memoriter* is rendered 'from memory,' in spite of a well-known note in the *De Fin.*: *tantum abest ab* is explained as 'impersonal,' which confounds the distinction that has been established between the personal and impersonal uses of '*abesse*': and it is surely rash to admit to Cicero the common silver-Latin phrase *in causa esse* on the strength of a single passage (*Fam.* i. 1, 1), which has

been differently explained. In his Preface Dr. Lewis refers to the *Archiv* among the authorities he has used: yet it does not appear that the conclusions arrived at even in the earlier volumes of that invaluable series are very generally adopted. Thus the article on *instar* must certainly be re-written on the light of Wölflin's searching treatment of that word. Other papers, such as that of Thielmann on *trans* or that of Zimmermann on *secus*, *setius* might be consulted with advantage. This neglect sometimes brings in his revenges. Wölflin has shown that *nequiquam*, which alternates in Plautus almost *pari passu* with '*frustra*' and reappears with such frequency in Livy, was so studiously boycotted by the correct writers, that Terence and Cicero have each only one genuine instance of it, and that the same semi-proverbial '*nequiquam et sero*.' These two passages are quoted by Dr. Lewis without remark, and yet he tells us in his Preface that 'every word or phrase, which is cited without comment from the prose of the best period, may be accepted by the student as a model for use or imitation.' Other recent authorities are set aside s.vv. *alapa*, which is still explained as the blow in the ceremony of emancipation; *Dossenmus*, 'a clown in a lost play of Plautus'; and *disertus*, which is still referred to *dissero*, 'for dissertus.'

In distinguishing synonyms, Dr. Lewis often gives very useful information, e.g. *propter* )( *causa*: *impetro* )( *adipiscor* and others: but some of the distinctions drawn are not, I think, supported by the facts: e.g. that *recipio* implies 'a duty' )( *suscipio*, voluntary action (cf. 1 *Verr.* 34, *Or.* 1), or that *contingo* denotes favourable, *accidere* unfavourable occurrences (2 *Phil.* 17), while the contrast drawn between *patrius* and *paternus* is contradicted by the examples cited. In other cases as *potentia* )( *potestas*, *gaudeo* )( *lactor*, the distinction is not stated at all. On this head, perhaps a greater use might have been made of some of numerous 'Synomiker' at present available.

On points of orthography the Dictionary seems to call for little but praise. It is needless to say that Dr. Lewis is here abreast of the most recent criticism, and his pages are not disfigured by the monstrosities that die so hard in school books. Regard for established texts has however, led him into small inconsistencies: thus, while common though incorrect spellings are usually appended in brackets to the true form, the process is sometimes reversed, and we find in one place *eculeus* (*equu-*), but in another *antiquus* (*-icus*)

or, worse still, the uncouth looking *aquila* is allowed to stand without apology. Surely it would be better to adhere to a strict rule throughout.

The quantities too seem most carefully marked, and slips like 'praestigiae' are very rare. In his Preface, Dr. Lewis claims to have paid special attention to final syllables 'whose quantity in many Dictionaries is left to be inferred from general rules.' It is therefore curious that, although his Dictionary professes to include Juvenal, he does not notice the common shortening of final *o* in later Latin poetry. *Ergo* is indeed given as 'late and rare,' but no notice is taken of forms like *transeö*, *farragö*, *Nerö*, still less of *cüi*. Indeed it may be remarked that Juvenal has not received the same careful attention as the other authors embraced by the Dictionary: it may be a small matter that 'Praeneste' is marked neuter in spite of 'gelida Praeneste,' but it is strange to find no notice taken of well-known Juvenalian uses of *sed*, *tanquam*, *quamquam*; the special force of *imputo* could not be gathered from the renderings offered, and the following words, which occur in the poet, must be added to the Dictionary: *alpha*, *aelurus*,

*Asiani*, *aropta*, *atlegiae*, *phaecasiatorum*, *russatus*, *sectivus*, *summula*.

If space permitted, one might dwell at greater length on individual points, where difference of opinion is possible or greater fulness of detail seems desirable. It is hardly safe, for instance, to recommend *iubeo ut* as Ciceronian without defining the special force attached by Cicero to that construction (cf. *Antibarbarus*): the phrase *tanti est*, too, receives but scanty justice from the Dictionary, which notices only the regular form *est tanti ut*, but not the elliptical 'Nihil mihi tanti est' (*Fam.* xiii. 42) or the absolute 'est tanti' (*Verr.* iv. 28 and 43 etc.), of which the force is quite different. But this small fault-finding is calculated to convey a false impression of the book, of which the execution as a whole will confirm and extend its author's high reputation, and only the principle can be held to be defective. Within the limits he has chosen to assign himself, Dr. Lewis has produced a work without a rival among school dictionaries, while the results of his researches into questions of etymology and quantity may well recommend it to advanced students.

W. T. LENDRUM.

#### ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

*Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges.* Founded on Comparative Grammar. Revised and enlarged by JAMES BRADSTREET GREENOUGH, assisted by GEORGE L. KITTRIDGE. Boston and London: Ginn and Co. \$1.20.

A REVIEWER of a new edition of Allen and Greenough's Grammar, unless he be very young, cannot approach his task except under a sense of the important place which the book holds in the history of Latin scholarship in America. The state of that scholarship when the first edition appeared may be seen in any edition of Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar, up to the recent revision, or rather metamorphosis. Prof. Greenough's book, as was recognized by the reviewers at the time, marked an epoch. Two things were characteristic of it. First, though the point of view was nowhere formally stated, syntactical mechanisms were regarded not as results, intellectually perfect, of a national mind, working with entire logic, but as results of the workings of multitudes of minds,

proceeding in part logically, in part under the influence of associations of various kinds. 'Analogy' is a sufficiently familiar word to-day, but though the principle was already in those days employed in sporadic cases, it had nowhere had full play before in any treatise on Latin syntax. Second, Prof. Greenough, though writing a school-book, had no aim lower than that of scientific accuracy. The result of this latter fact has been excellent so far as concerns the influence which the author has had upon other workers; though it may be questioned whether a larger sale would not have attended a poorer book. The same thing may be said of the partial disadvantage under which another Latin grammar of a high order—that of Professor Gildersleeve—has laboured. Yet we are far from saying that even from the lowest point of view either grammar has lacked success.

So much for the spirit under which the reviewer must approach his task. At the same time he will be in the mood to demand