

# INTRODUCTION

## TO THE THESAURUS LINGUAE LATINAE

I. The institution	25
A. Historical summary	25
B. The staff	27
C. The archives and library	27
II. The lexicon	28
A. The archive material	28
B. Outline of the article	28
1. Headword entry	28
2. Preliminary section	29
3. Main section	29
a. Definition	29
b. History of the word	30
4. Supplementary sections	32
C. Signs and conventions	33

### I. The institution

#### A. Historical summary

From humanist times onwards scholars had felt the need for a Latin lexicon based on a complete collection of material from the ancient texts. This led several individuals, such as R. Stephanus, E. Forcellini, I. J. G. Scheller and R. Klotz, to venture on the compilation of a large-scale work.<sup>1)</sup> It became clear, however, that there was a task to be performed which lay beyond the powers of any one person.

Plans were made in the course of the nineteenth century for a comprehensive Thesaurus of the Latin language to be written by a group of scholars in collaboration.<sup>2)</sup> But these plans never came to fruition, and it was not until the end of the century that Eduard Wölfflin succeeded in establishing what is now the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Wölfflin founded a periodical entitled „Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik ... als Vorarbeit zu einem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae“, which began to appear in 1884<sup>3)</sup> and included, amongst other things, a number of experimental dictionary articles. He enlisted the help of numerous scholars, amongst whom he divided up the Latin texts; these had to be prepared in various ways before it was possible to make the slips from which the dictionary itself was to be compiled.

---

<sup>1)</sup> For a more detailed account see F. Heerdegen, „Lateinische Lexikographie“, in: Stolz – Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2 (4th edition), München, 1910, 693 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> On this and what follows see, in addition to Heerdegen op. cit. (n. 1), especially the preface to the first volume of the Thesaurus; A. Szantyr in: Hofmann – Szantyr, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2,2, München, 1965 (repr. 1972), p. 74 f. of the appendix; W. Ehlers, „Der Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Prinzipien und Er-

fahrungen“ in: Antike und Abendland 14, 1968, 172 f.; and G. Polara, II ‘Thesaurus Linguae Latinae’ in: A. Garzya – M. Gigante – G. Polara, Omaggio a B. G. Teubner, Napoli, 1983, 77–111.

<sup>3)</sup> The original subtitle, meaning “in preparation for a Thesaurus Linguae Latinae”, was changed, after the first fascicle of the lexicon came out, to „als Ergänzung zu dem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae“ (“as a supplement to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae”). Under this title the Archiv continued until 1908.

In 1893 the Academies of Arts and Sciences in Berlin, Göttingen, Leipzig, Munich and Vienna, much influenced by the advocacy of Theodor Mommsen, resolved to publish jointly a *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. It was agreed to base the dictionary on an exhaustive collection of slips for all surviving texts down to the mid-second century A.D. and on an extensive selection, made by specialists in each field, from the texts of the subsequent period to about 600<sup>4)</sup> and from the inscriptions. Work began in 1894 and was organised from two centres: Göttingen under the direction of F. Leo and Munich under that of E. Wölfflin. The whole of the material later came to Munich, and by 1899 such good progress had been made that work could start on the dictionary itself.<sup>5)</sup> Two years earlier a printing contract had been signed with the Leipzig publishing house of B. G. Teubner.

In the original plan 5 years were allowed for the assembling of the material and 15 for the writing of the lexicon. The first fascicle duly appeared in 1900, but by 1912 despite all efforts to increase the speed of the work only four volumes in folio were complete.<sup>6)</sup> At this point the estimated finishing date was put back to 1930: it was explained that no comparable work had ever been undertaken, hence there had been no parallels by which to judge the length of time needed.

As it turned out, not even the second target could be met. This failure resulted partly from the economic and political upheavals of the present century, which held up progress and indeed threatened the very existence of the *Thesaurus*. A further cause, however, was the changing situation in lexicography itself.

One factor here was that as time passed it became less and less possible to base the work on the slips alone, as was originally intended — it has long been regular practice to compare the text on the slips with standard critical editions and to consult secondary works as necessary for interpretation. Second, advances in classical philology and the study of antiquity meant that the dictionary had to satisfy ever greater requirements. For instance, works of the later period, especially patristic literature, were found to need supplementary excerption and closer attention in the compiling of articles. Most importantly, experience led to methods and norms of linguistic commentary and lexicographical presentation which differed from those of the earliest years in the progressively more subtle distinctions drawn. All this had to be taken into account, while the development of the linguistic and historical branches of ancient studies not only exerted influence on but was also influenced by that of the *Thesaurus*.

Supplements to the articles, longer explanations and other parerga began to appear in 1934 under the title „Beiträge aus der *Thesaurus*-Arbeit“. The series was published at first in *Philologus*, then from 1952 in *Museum Helveticum*.<sup>7)</sup>

Though set up by the five German-speaking academies, the *Thesaurus* could hardly have survived the aftermath of the first world war if it had not received help of various kinds from abroad.<sup>8)</sup> After the second world war its continued existence was secured by the creation of an International *Thesaurus* Commission, on which both German and non-German academies and other scholarly bodies were represented.<sup>9)</sup> Since 1949 this Commission has been responsible for the publication of the work.

<sup>4)</sup> For further details on the collection of slips see II A below.

<sup>5)</sup> At this stage a general editor (Generalredaktor) took charge of the practical work. The first to hold this position was F. Vollmer. His successors to date have been E. Lommatzsch 1905–12, G. Dittmann 1912–36, B. Rehm 1936–42, H. Rubenbauer in a caretaker capacity 1942–47, H. Haffter 1947–52, W. Ehlers 1952–74 and since 1974 P. Flury.

<sup>6)</sup> The volumes so far completed are listed below. Since 1901 the first side of each gathering has carried the date on which that portion was approved for printing.

vol. I	A — Amyzon	1900(–1905)	VI 2	G	1925–1934
	II an — Byzeres	1900 –1906	VI 3	H	1936–1942
	III C — comus	1907(–1912)	VII 1	I-intervulsus	1934–1964
	IV con — cyulus	1906 –1909	VII 2	intestabilis-	
	V 1 D	1909 –1934		lyxipyretos	1956–1979
	V 2 E	1931 –1953	VIII	M	1936–1966
	VI 1 F	1912 –1926	IX 2	O	1968–1981

Onomasticon vol. II C 1907–1913 vol. III D 1914–1923

On the Onomasticon see II A below. Volume IX 1 (N) has been postponed for a while: the large number of articles with very extensive collections of material would have caused long delays in publication.

<sup>7)</sup> The first 20 groups of these short articles are reprinted in: *Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit*, herausgegeben vom *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, mit einem Vorwort von Heinz Haffter, Leiden, 1979.

<sup>8)</sup> Note, for example, the list of foreign sponsors at the beginning of vol. VI.

<sup>9)</sup> Each fascicle and complete volume is prefaced by lists of *Editores* and *Adiutores*.

## B. The staff

The staff consists of about 20 people: the general editor (Generalredaktor), the editors responsible for the individual volumes (Bandredaktoren), and permanent and temporary assistants (Mitarbeiter). Germany and Austria were represented from the beginning; the participation of other countries has grown continually since the 1920s and particularly since the founding of the International Thesaurus Commission.

Necessary support comes largely from the Federal Republic of Germany and especially Bavaria. However, the other countries and organisations represented on the Commission also make direct financial contributions to the budget of the institute, or provide scholarships for their nationals to work there, generally for a period of 2 or 3 years.

Of the scholarly advisers outside the institute, an expert on Indo-European writes the etymologies and a specialist in Romance languages the section on the later history of the words. Several scholars both in Germany and elsewhere help with the proof-reading and make valuable corrections and suggestions, particularly from the viewpoint of their special areas of interest.<sup>10)</sup>

## C. The archives and library

The "treasure-house" of the Thesaurus is its archives, which today contain approximately 10 million slips encompassing the vocabulary of Latin from the earliest surviving texts down to about A.D. 600. These are arranged alphabetically according to their lemmata and, under each lemma, in chronological sequence. On many slips the context of the lemma appears in full; others, particularly where a text has been excerpted, give only a chapter or section reference or, in the case of some late authors, a reference to an index or concordance. The slips do not contain any preliminary analysis of the word in context from a semantic, syntactic or stylistic point of view; such analysis is carried out during the compilation of the article.

The Thesaurus also has an extensive library which, with its careful organisation and annotation, constitutes an invaluable tool for research into Latin language and literature. Visitors are welcome to use both the library and the archives.

---

<sup>10)</sup> Together with the supporting organisations all who have worked on a volume whether inside or outside the institute are listed by name in an introductory note or in the preface. Since the first volume the compilers

of articles have been named at the end of each entry or series of consecutive entries, since the fifth also at the foot of each page. Initials on the first side of each gathering refer to the editors of the volume.

## II. The lexicon

### A. The archive material

The material in the archives, upon which articles are based, includes a complete set of slips for all surviving texts from the beginnings of Latin literature to the Antonine period. From the following period down to about A. D. 600, in other words to the period when the Romance daughter languages were splitting off, a few authors and works are also fully covered by slips made either at the outset or subsequently<sup>1</sup>). Most, however, are represented by excerpts, that is, slips for selected occurrences of words. These excerpts have been added to over the years (in some cases made exhaustive), so that today almost all surviving works down to A. D. 600 are covered in the archives either by excerpts or, where appropriate, by references to special indexes.

The addenda, begun after the publication of the first volume in 1900, continue to grow, as earlier excerpts are revised, newly-discovered texts, particularly inscriptions, taken into account, and references added to leading classical periodicals and other secondary literature<sup>2</sup>).

The selective procedures adopted for most later texts have proved their value and good sense in the practical work of the Thesaurus. Nowadays it would be quite possible to obtain complete coverage of large bodies of text, such as the Church Fathers, by means of electronic data-processing. However, searching for lexicographically significant examples in the resulting mass of material would involve an unjustifiable outlay of time and effort<sup>3</sup>). Anyone who needs comprehensive information on the occurrences of a word can turn to author indexes and concordances, which have recently been appearing in ever greater numbers, and to the data-banks now coming into existence.

At first the dictionary was meant to include proper names. Those beginning with A and B were incorporated into the first two volumes beside the appellatives, while letters C and D appeared in a separate Onomasticon. Then, however, the continuation of the Onomasticon was post-

---

<sup>1</sup>) As well as several shorter texts, the following authors and longer works from the later period are now covered in their entirety: Fronto, Gaius, Apuleius, the Digest, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Cyprian, the Historia Augusta, Arnobius, Juvencus, the Peregrinatio Aetheriae, Avienus, Jerome's Epistulae 1-65, the Vulgate, Prudentius, Augustine's De civitate dei, Commodianus, the Codex Theodosianus, the Codex Iustinianus, Boethius' Philosophiae consolatio, the Regula magistri and Regula Benedicti. Of inscriptional sources those dating from the republican period contained in the first volume of CIL are complete in the material, as are many significant inscriptions of the empire; for all other inscriptions and for papyrus texts the material consists of excerpts only.

<sup>2</sup>) In greater detail see P. Flury, „Aus den Addenda des Thesaurusarchivs“, Museum Helveticum 41, 1984, 42 ff.

<sup>3</sup>) The scale of the problem which would ensue can be illustrated if we consider Augustine. A complete set of slips for his works would increase the present size of the archives by almost a half.

poned indefinitely—since it served not so much pure classical philology as historical and prosopographical studies—in order to permit more rapid progress with the appellatives. Where problems arise over the distinction between proper names and appellatives, each case is decided on its merits<sup>4</sup>).

As a general principle Greek words are accepted if used in a Latinised form, for example *ostracum* from *ὄστρακον*. Even where Latin uses the Greek form without alteration, for instance *ostracoderma* from *ὄστρακόδερμα*, the word is cited unless the script or context shows that it is to be regarded as a Greek insertion. In this area, however, perfect consistency is impossible. Editors of Latin texts differ greatly in the way they print Greek words and in the textual information they provide; as a result the collections in the Thesaurus archives are themselves far from uniform<sup>5</sup>).

### B. Outline of the article

It is important to realise that since every word is an entity with its own individual history there can be no universally binding rules for lexicographical presentation. In practice, however, certain general methods have been developed and have proved their worth. The most important of these will be summarised below.

As with other historical dictionaries, such as the German dictionary of the Grimm brothers, increasing lexicographical experience has brought about changes in the shape of the articles. The earliest were, by and large, relatively simple enumerations of passages; but as time went by there evolved the more differentiated structures and interpretations typical of later volumes<sup>6</sup>). The many variations in the form of articles which have arisen in this way cannot, unfortunately, be discussed here in detail.

The essential parts of an article are: (1) headword (lemma) entry, generally followed by (2) a preliminary section; then (3) the main section consisting of (a) a definition and (b) a history of the word; finally, where appropriate, (4) various kinds of supplement.

#### 1. Headword entry

Here spelling and prosody are mostly normalised; that is, with few exceptions, each word appears in a lexicographically standard form. Other basic forms which determine

---

<sup>4</sup>) Thus examples of *luna*, *musa*, *oceanus* and *ops* referring to deities are placed with the appellatives. Less fortunate was the decision to consign such words as *levita* and *palatium* to the Onomasticon.

<sup>5</sup>) For instance, the original material omitted Ciceronian examples of a number of Greek technical terms such as *epagoge*.

<sup>6</sup>) Compare, for example, *praecedo* in vol. X with *antecedo* in vol. II; on this subject see in greater detail P. Flury, „Der Thesaurus Linguae Latinae“, Eirene 24, 1987, 8-15.

the inflection are then added; but attention is paid to the actual occurrence of forms, and those which do not occur are not usually reconstructed.

Any word which is plainly to be regarded as an inflected form of another word—for example a substantive or adjective identical with a participle—is treated immediately after that other as a sublemma. This is done irrespective of alphabetical order, but a cross-reference is generally inserted at the appropriate point in the alphabetical sequence of headwords. On the same principle adverbs normally come after their adjectives and certain fixed expressions, such as *ius iurandum* and *lucri facio*, follow their principal component word (*ius, lucrum*).

Words which are not recognised and others of doubtful authenticity are marked accordingly with a question mark before the headword, a *crux*, or, if the word is to be deleted from the vocabulary of the ancient language, square brackets round the whole article.

The sign  $\times$  before the headword means that not all instances of the word in the Thesaurus archives are cited (see 3b $\beta$ ).

In the headword entry long vowels are regularly indicated by a long sign. However, final *-o* in the first person singular of the verb and in the nominative singular of substantives in *-io* is left unmarked, since the vowel began to be shortened at an early period. For the sake of uniformity, long vowels are shown even in words which first occur late and in which we cannot assume that speakers made any distinction of quantity. Here long signs are placed in accordance with etymology.

## 2. Preliminary section

The section immediately after the headword entry gathers together items of general information, both ancient and modern, which cannot be accommodated in the main section illustrating the word's development. Since the early volumes these items have been presented in approximately the following order:

*Etymology.* Apart from words such as *composita* which have a very obvious derivation, the etymological explanations are written by a specialist in Indo-European languages, whose contribution is placed inside square brackets. Initials at the end of the brackets stand for the contributor's name.

*Ancient accounts of the etymology (de origine).* These are reproduced without regard to modern opinion.

*Spelling (de scriptura).* Those spellings are listed which deviate from the norm as shown in the lemma. Inscriptions, papyri and manuscripts earlier than A.D. 600 receive particular attention, as do relevant comments of the ancient grammarians.

*Abbreviations of the stem (notatur).* These are recorded mainly from inscriptions, coins and papyri. The drop-

ping of inflectional endings is generally disregarded, however.

*Notae Tironianae* (Nor.Tir.). In most cases this section gives only a reference to the page and number in the standard edition.

*Gender (de genere).* Information on gender and variation of gender (including the *genus verborum*). Relevant comments are added from the ancient grammarians.

*Forms (de formis).* Remarks particularly on non-standard forms, and pertinent comments of the grammarians.

*Prosody (de prosodia).* Ancient testimonies together with observations by the compiler of the article on prosodic irregularities.

*Ancient explanations of the meaning (de notione).* These are given here, unless they can be attached to particular passages or groups of passages in the main part of the article. Glosses come at the end.

*'legitur inde a ...'* A brief chronological survey of the word's distribution. There may be differentiation between poetry and prose, the use of singular and plural and so on, depending on the characteristics of the particular word. Comparisons are sometimes made with synonyms, either descriptively or by means of a frequency table.

*Survival of the word in Romance languages.* This part is contributed by a specialist and placed inside square brackets with initials to indicate the contributor's name (for abbreviations of the names of Romance languages see p. 13 above).

*Matters relating to textual criticism.* These are discussed inside square brackets at the end of the preliminary section. They include recurrent confusions with words of similar sound, spelling and meaning; passages which cannot be placed in the main section on account of textual corruption in the transmission of the word itself or its context; and a selection of noteworthy conjectures.

## 3. Main section

### a. Definition

In recent volumes the main section begins with a general definition (where necessary, the separate sections with particular definitions). This is an attempt to give a semantic equivalent to the headword, and usually takes the form *i(dem) q(uod)*. The Thesaurus does not normally give translations<sup>7)</sup>; on occasion, however, it provides a Greek equivalent (see the article *lux* used as an example below, where the Greek word accompanies a Latin paraphrase). In general Latin synonyms or, more frequently, paraphrases or definitions are employed in an attempt to describe the original, essential content of the word. This is done as far as possible in a manner which reflects the etymology. The intention is to give a first general idea of the meaning. Only the material which follows, arranged in its groups, can display the full range of usage; and this overall view is necessary in its turn if one wishes to see the particulars in a true light.

<sup>7)</sup> See W. Ehlers art. cit. (n. 2 of chapter I) 177f.

The definition is often followed by further illustrative material, which is either bracketed or prefixed to the first chapter of the main section: *synonyma*, *iuxta posita* and *opposita* (see section 4 below), or ancient definitions and *differentiae*.

### b. History of the word

#### α. Arrangement of examples

In the main section of the article the quotations are generally divided up into groups. From the headings which introduce these groups, their order and hierarchical numbering or lettering, the reader can form an impression of the essential facts of development and usage. It is assumed that he will submit the findings presented in each article to his own critical judgement.

The article *lux* (vol. VII 2 p. 1905, 56 ff.) may serve as an example. Here only the higher levels of classification are shown:

i.q. claritas lucendo effecta, φως

caput prius: proprie

#### I generatim

A -x caelestis

1 diei, solis

2 signorum nocturnorum

3 fulminis

4 arcus caelestis

5 nimbi divini

B -x non caelestis

1 strictius pertinet ad ignem

2 latius vel hyperbolice

#### II speciatim de virtute oculorum

A per se

B cum determinatione

caput alterum: in imagine et translate

#### I usu profano et communi

A praevalente respectu decoris, praeclaritatis sim.

1 metonymice de hominibus

2 de ipsa praestantia

B praevalente respectu intellegentiae salutaris, revelationis, explanationis sim.

#### II usu Iudaeorum et Christianorum proprio

A generatim

B metonymice

C peculiaria

#### Contrast between subsections

From the original practice of arranging groups in a simple series there has developed a general tendency to make use of opposition between subsections. In other words, each level of classification consists of two or more groups distinguished by mutually exclusive characteristics. Thus in looking for the expression *mea lux* applied by metonymy to a person, the reader will naturally turn not to 'caput prius: proprie' but to 'caput alterum: in imagine et translate' and, more precisely, to subsection IA1 (p. 1915, 8 ff.).

When searching for particular passages, meanings or usages it is important, therefore, to understand the different levels of classification and how they are related to each other. Chapter headings which, taken in isolation, are not immediately comprehensible become clear when one reads the headings opposed to them<sup>8</sup>). For example in 'caput prius' of the article *lux*, subsection I 'generatim' covers all concrete applications of the word apart from the special sense "eyesight" under II. The same heading 'generatim' in subsection IIA of 'caput alterum' encompasses all instances of the specialised use of the word in Jewish and Christian writings, with the exception of the metonymies under B and some individual usages under C.

Sometimes it is impossible to devise groups with sharply defined boundaries. In this case the examples may be divided up according to a predominant aspect of meaning. So in the article *lux* we find headings which begin 'praevalente respectu' under IA and B of 'caput alterum'. Instead of this, doubtful examples may be referred to in the subsection headings, as at p. 1910, 10, 1911, 52 and 1916, 13. Such cases are frequent and show that strict adherence to the method of contrast in the organisation of the article can be no more than a useful principle of arrangement. The classification is meant to display the features of the available material, not to subject it to some abstract system of division.

#### Content as a criterion for grouping examples

The criteria of content, by which the examples of a word are grouped on the separate levels of classification, depend on the nature of the material. This differs from word to word.

The primary classification often reflects semantic distinctions. Thus the article *lux* has as its main division 'caput prius: proprie' – 'caput alterum: in imagine et translate'; then 'caput prius' is divided into I 'generatim' – II 'speciatim', subsection IB into 1 'strictius' – 2 'latius', and so on. Here factual distinctions have a subordinate position: IA 'caelestis' – B 'non caelestis', IA1 'diei' – 2 'signorum nocturnorum' etc. So have those of a morphological kind, such as p. 1906, 5 and 42 'locat. -i' – 'abl. temp. -e', p. 1911, 26 and 51 'plur.' – 'sing.' Stylistic matters are dealt with under *lux* in a short appendix at the end of the article, p. 1917, 59 ff.

Syntax is subordinated here (for example 'caput prius' IIA 'per se' – B 'cum determinatione') but elsewhere often has priority, as in many verbs which undergo a change in construction (for instance *obliviscor*, *oppleo*). Where syntactical matters cannot be fully integrated into the arrangement of the main section, there is often an appendix of structures at the end of the article (e.g. *ordino*), which may be numbered within the overall arrangement (e.g. *praeiu-*

<sup>8</sup>) The grammatical and stylistic concepts and the terms used for them are based on a philological tradition which is summarised, for example, in the *Lateinische Grammatik* of Leumann, Hofmann and Szantyr (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*).

*dico*) or else follow one of the major subsections (e.g. *orior* p. 999,19ff.). Alternatively the structures may be summarised immediately before the main section, as on p. 796,65ff. of the article *opprobrium*.

While recognising the multiplicity of these and other types of linguistic criteria, we must not lose sight of their relationships with one another. The interweaving of syntactic and semantic aspects is often especially clear in verbs, for instance those which may take fixed or mobile objects (*infundo alicui aliquid* and *infundo aliquid aliqua re*), affected and effected objects (*ligo zonam* and *ligo nodum*), and those with both transitive and intransitive uses (*ludo*, *moveo*, *obsequor*).

Criteria based on different fields of application often play an important part in the division of an article. An example from the article *lux* is the contrast in 'caput alterum' between I 'usu profano et communi' and II 'usu Iudaeorum et Christianorum proprio'. This applies also, for example, to words used in particular areas of life or in technical subjects such as law, medicine and architecture, or which occur predominantly in certain literary genres such as epic and elegy, oratory and epistolography.

Names of things generally require a division based on factual criteria, for example manufacture, applications, occurrence in nature or in everyday life (e.g. *oleum*, *ovum*, *panis*; names of manufactures such as *hasta*, *liber*, and of plants with their uses in cookery and medicine). The reader should not, of course, expect to find a word treated in encyclopaedic fashion, even though he may sometimes gather factual information from articles of this kind (for example *panis* p. 223,3ff. and 225,44ff.). Linguistic considerations take priority here as elsewhere; moreover there are many cases like the pairs *olea* and *oliva*, *oleum* and *olivum*, where a thing has more than one name, so that it would in any case be impossible in a dictionary of the language to give a comprehensive treatment under any single headword.

#### *Chronological sequence of examples*

At one time the order of groups on the same level within the classification was often determined systematically. Thus 'proprie' came before 'translate', 'corporaliter' before 'incorporaliter' and so on, as a matter of principle. More recently, with few exceptions, the arrangement has been chronological. The presentation of linguistic phenomena according to date of first recorded appearance often gives an accurate picture of their genetic relationships; and when this is not so, that fact can be significant in itself.

The first subdivision in the lay-out of an article is, therefore, that which contains the earliest attested usage. In the case of *lux*, the earliest examples are from the Twelve Tables and other ancient legal texts; they exemplify the literal sense "light of day" and occur in the locative form *luci* "by day". Consequently the article begins with this form within the broader group 'locutiones adverbiales' (p. 1906,5).

The sequence of examples within each subsection is also basically determined by chronology. It may, however, be interrupted by brackets used for grouping: so in the article *lux* at p. 1906,73 SALL. ... (TAC. hist. 5,22,3). VERG. ..., also at p. 1906, 44-7 where a bracket stands between two quotations from Cicero. Furthermore, a few passages with some special characteristic may be gathered at the end of a subsection, as at p. 1916,51. Within the brackets the chronological principle is observed; in appendices and lists placed at the beginning of a section the order may be alphabetical.

#### β. Selection of examples

Only in the case of rare words can an article cite all the examples contained in the archives. It has therefore been the aim from the beginning to present the material in an appropriate selection. Since volume III the sign \* has preceded all headwords for which the material is not cited in full. Slips for the omitted passages are stored with the rest in their original chronological order and remain available for inspection.

The question which criteria should determine the selection has to be answered afresh in each article. First and foremost is chronology. In every group corresponding to a particular usage the earliest examples will be cited. Thereafter the commonest usages are illustrated as a rule by only a few further examples, particularly if the article is a long one. Much more significant for the history of a word are the changes it underwent in the 800 years or so with which the Thesaurus is concerned; and these, together with peculiarities of any kind in usage, are the focus of attention. There need be no proportional relationship whatever between the number of examples quoted and the total amount of material for each use of the word.

When the sign \* before the headword was first introduced, it was often thought sufficient to give only this general indication that material had been left out. Later the additional practice arose of showing exactly where passages are omitted by a system of annotations within the article: for instance 'exempla selecta' at the beginning of a subsection and 'al.', 'saepe' and 'passim' either within or at the end of the chronological series (on the exact function of 'al.' see C 2 below).

It should be borne in mind that, whether or not an article cites all archive material, the material itself contains only excerpts for the post-Antonine period, extensive as these may be. Even the comprehensive collections from the earlier period are very far from providing a comprehensive view of the language of those days. The texts which have come down to us themselves represent a selection from the contemporary linguistic reality. No matter what degree of accuracy is attained in an article, the picture it gives of a word remains fragmentary, provisional and imperfect. Thus the article cannot and is not intended to be definitive, but seeks rather to prompt further discussion by setting out the material and showing where the problems lie.

#### 4. Supplementary sections

Syntactic and other matters for which no place can be found in the main section of the article may be illustrated in an appendix, as for example the ‘appendicula stilistica’ which concludes the article *lux*.

In earlier volumes *synonyma*, *iuxta posita* and *opposita* were often merely listed at the end of the article. Nowadays they are given in a more detailed form and accompanied by

references to allow easier checking. They are often added to the general definition (in a bracket or as a separate section, e.g. *lucrum*, *opus*) or presented in an appendix (for example *locuples*).

Any sublemmata come next in sequence (see II B 1). The last items in the article are lists of derivatives and compounds of the headword (*deriv.*, *compos.*). The note *cf. Onom.* indicates that the word occurs also as a proper name (see II A above).



## II. C. Signs and conventions

1. Signs indicating groups of examples (cf. p. 30f.)
- I A 1 a a  
① ② ... Figures and letters marking the various levels of classification are used in the following order: I-II A-B 1-2 a-b α-β ①-② etc. In long articles higher levels of classification may be set over these:
- caput, pars* *caput prius—caput alterum* and, above that, *pars prior—pars altera*. Short articles may begin at the level 1-2.
- ( ) ( ) Brackets within a series of quotations serve to group passages together.
- The common feature linking the passages may be the repeated association of another word with the headword, for example an attributive associated with a substantive or a particular object with a verb. In this case the accompanying word is usually printed in widely spaced letters where it occurs before the bracket, and inside the bracket is either abbreviated to its initial letter or else omitted altogether (e.g. under *lux* p.1906,44.69).
- Passages which are comparable in content or other respects may also be bracketed together; the common feature is then usually explained in italics at the beginning of the bracket (e.g. *lux* p.1906,51.55).
- (... [...] ...) Brackets with the above functions which occur inside other brackets usually take the square form. When this happens, the outer brackets enclosing them are generally printed in bold type (e.g. *lux* p.1906,52).
2. Signs indicating the omission of examples (see p. 31)
- ⊖lux The sign ⊖ placed in front of the headword means that not all examples contained in the archives are cited in the article.
- al., et saepe, et passim* The abbreviation *al.* and such annotations as *et saepe* or *et passim* show where material has been omitted. Their precise function varies according to their position within a group of examples:
- a. In the middle of a sequence of quotations from several authors they indicate the omission of example(s) from the last author named: e.g. (*lux* p.1908,58) SALL. Iug. 99,1 ... VERG. Aen. 4,586 ... 9,338 ... *al.* CIRIS 349 etc.
- b. At the end of a subsection or bracket:
- If the last author cited is of the period down to Apuleius, they indicate the omission of all later authors and possibly of example(s) from the last author cited: e.g. (*lux* p.1908,65) CIRIS 349 ... PROP. 4,3,32 ... Ov. met. 3,149 ... 15,664 ... *al.*
- If the last author cited is later than Apuleius, they show that the passages cited are only a selection of those contained in the archives for the period from the mid-second century on, in other words the period for which the Thesaurus material consists of excerpts (see II A). An illustration from *lux* (p.1908,84): TERT. anim. 53,6 ... OPT. PORF. carm. 24,3 ... PRVD. ham. 965 ... GENNAD. dogm. 62 ... *al.*
3. Presentation and explanation of examples
- The use of various fonts:
- Crc. Upright capitals used for the author's name show that the passage contains the headword.
- Verr. Roman type is used for the abbreviated title, book and section reference of a passage containing the headword; and also for all quotations from Latin texts.
- II 2,156
- Cic. Verr. Italics are used for all material added by the compiler (headings, explanations etc.) and for references to passages which either do not contain the headword or are taken from Greek sources or Latin sources after A.D. 600; also for alterations made for convenience of citation in a Latin text.
- II 2,156
- Three dots within a quotation mean that one or more words in the context have been omitted at this point.
- Brackets within a quotation (on brackets used for grouping within a series of citations see section 1 above):
- < > Pointed brackets enclose a supplement to the text, e.g. *lux* p.1906,10.
- ( ) Round brackets in the text of an inscription enclose letters omitted through abbreviation, e.g. *ludus* p.1784,15.
- [ ] Square brackets enclose letters or words which are to be deleted from the text, e.g. *lux* p.1906,18.
- ⌊ ⌋ Small half-brackets enclose words which are referred to in a following bracket, e.g. *lux* p.1906,37.
- Signs in the headword entry (cf. II B 1; on the sign ⊖ see section 2 above).
- ? oceanicus A question mark before the headword means that it is doubtful whether the word should be accepted in the lexicon;
- † optu a crux indicates corrupt transmission of the word;
- [ōcitās] square brackets show that the word is to be eliminated from the lexicon;
- (octagōnos) round brackets enclose a basic form restored by analogy.
4. Abbreviations
- of the headword:
- x The headword is represented by the shortest possible unambiguous abbreviation of its ending, e.g. *lux*: sing. -x, -is, -i, -em, -e, plur. -es, -um, -bus.
- es
- of titles of secondary literature:
- Commentaries on the texts quoted and a number of standard works are usually cited by author's name alone, e.g. v. *Housman ad l.* after the quotation of MANIL. 1,187 at p.1912,37 in the article *lux*, and at p.1905,33 *Hofmann-Szantyr* meaning J. B. Hofmann's *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* as revised by A. Szantyr, München, 1965 (corrected edition 1972). Other standard works may have a brief title added. In general, titles of secondary literature are given in the shortest readily comprehensible form, usually with year of publication to facilitate reference to *L'Année Philologique*, e.g. at p.1906,5.
- Housman ad l.*
- Hofmann-Szantyr*
- Leumann, Gramm. 1977* stands for the sixth edition of M. Leumann's *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München, 1977.
- in headings and explanations (a small selection of those most commonly used):

<i>ad l.</i>	ad locum
<i>al.</i>	(et)alia (see p. 31)
<i>a. 35</i>	anno 35 post Christum natum
<i>a. 35 a. Chr.</i>	anno 35 ante Christum natum
<i>apud ICTos</i>	apud iurisconsultos
<i>cf.</i>	confer, conferas, conferatur sim.
<i>coll.</i>	collato, -a, -is
<i>coni.</i>	coniecit, coniectura
<i>e.g. (ex. gr.)</i>	exempli gratia
<i>eqs.</i>	et quae sequuntur
<i>gr.</i>	graece
<i>i.</i>	id est
<i>i. q.</i>	idem (est) quod (see B 3 a)

<i>in univ.</i>	in universum
<i>om.</i>	omisit, omittitur, omisso sim.
<i>q. e., q. s.</i>	qui quae quod est; qui quae sunt
<i>sim.</i>	(et) similia, similiter
<i>var. l.</i>	varia lectio
<i>vol. VII 2, 1904,83</i>	sc. Thesauri vol. VII pars altera p. 1904 l. 83
<i>in schedis nostris</i>	sc. archivi Thesauri
<i>in exemplari nostro</i>	sc. bibliothecae Thesauri

For abbreviations of the names of Romance and Indo-European languages see p. 13.