There are a number of Latin dictionaries that the information professional can choose from when selecting resources for a library that serves a community that is engaged with classical education and the study of Latin. After providing a brief history of Classical lexicography and each work, this resource analyzes many of the widely available Latin lexicographical works and suggests which dictionaries are most appropriate for the various types of communities being served.
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Chapter I: Introduction

To the uninitiated the field of Classics can be a confusingly opaque discipline brimming with a host of acronyms and often-used sources dating back to the 19th century and even prior. For the newly-minted knowledge professional tasked with aiding in the education of budding classicists, whether they be studying at the secondary or higher education levels, reference questions such as “should I consult the TLL, OLD, or Lewis and Short for dictionary meanings for the verb amare for use in my research paper?” can seem impenetrable. Similarly, for those in collection development roles, the plethora of Classics reference material can be overwhelming and as will be discussed further, some of the most useful reference material was published in the 19th century or, in one case, has not even been published in a complete format as of 2011.

This paper, in an effort to shed light on one aspect of Classics reference material, seeks to provide a systematic review of Latin dictionaries in common use at the secondary and post-secondary levels of education, as the works needed for the two sets of users often contain the same texts. Through a qualitative analysis of each dictionary based on predetermined criteria, it is hoped that this paper will provide needed understanding for collection development or reference professionals who are not overly familiar with reference material pertaining to the field of Classics. It is notable that thorough search of the literature has yielded no discreet guide to Latin lexicographic material save for a bevy of dictionaries presented somewhat haphazardly in Fred Jenkins’ Classical Studies: a guide to the reference literature (1996), many of which are
inappropriate for the some of the levels of students currently under discussion. The author hopes that this analysis will provide the reader with both an in-depth content analysis of the work with examples of entries in each as well as a quick-reference tool to allow the reader to ascertain the merits and shortcomings of each of the works for his or her own circumstances.
Chapter II: Background foundation

Lexicography: Major Works & Analysis

Lexicography, the study of the creation of dictionaries, and lexicology, the study of dictionaries and their creation, are well-represented in literature. As Howard Jackson notes in the preface to his *Lexicography: an introduction* (2002), the field of lexicology has enjoyed a surge in popularity and in published research since the late 1980s and early 1990s, coinciding roughly with the release of the second edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* published in 1989. Jackson notes the publication of the *Encyclopedia of Lexicography* (Hausman et al. 1989-1991) and the *Dictionary of Lexicography* (Hartmann and James 1998) as being seminal works in mapping and delineating the field; 1988 also saw the creation of the first journal devoted entirely the field, the still-published *International Journal of Lexicography*. The field even had a moment on the *New York Times*’ Best-Seller List with Simon Winchester’s look at the rather storied history of the *Oxford English Dictionary, The Professor and the Madman*.

Of particular import to the current analysis are the works published during this surge that sought to define dictionaries and the qualities that make a *good* dictionary. Among these works is Béjoint’s *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries* (1994), which was reprinted as *Modern Lexicography: an introduction* (2000) in which the author calls for analysis of the principles of lexicography and how those principles can be put into practice in a manner capable of aiding the user in the best possible manner; Béjoint refers to this analytical account of dictionaries as
“psycholexicography”—where the creator of a dictionary best attempts to meet the needs of the user by attempting to look at the dictionary as a user would. Most recently Béjoint updated his overview of the field with the *Lexicography of English* (2010) in which he muses more openly on the direction that dictionaries are taking as a whole in the digital age and whether users or writers of dictionaries should be the ones to cope.

While Béjoint has been the leader in systematically tackling the whither and whence existential questions of lexicography, Jackson (2002) and Landau (1984; 2001) focused their notable efforts on descriptive works of the field of lexicography along with standards one could use to judge the appropriate audience and use of various dictionaries. Jackson (2002: 173) notes, “One of the crucial issues for dictionary criticism is to establish a sound and rigorous basis on which to conduct the criticism, together with a set of applicable criteria.” The criteria Jackson selects as providing a good baseline analysis are derived from the special needs of a review of a dictionary as, unlike other reviews of literature, the reviewer should not and is most likely incapable of reading the book cover to cover. Jackson (176) suggests an analysis to take into consideration internal and external criteria of the work, internal considerations being those things the author(s) of a work say about its intended purpose and external being the reader’s view of the work. As for the external concerns Jackson (177-182) suggests the following set of criteria for reviewing a lexicographical work:

*Page Layout:* The amount of white space and number of columns as well as the presence of images (a rarity in Latin dictionaries) can make a work more “accessible.”
Layout of the Entries: Do the entries use only a single paragraph? Do they use a new paragraph for each new meaning? While the latter uses more space, Jackson asserts it makes entries more readable.

Length of Entries: Does the dictionary practice nesting—the practice of placing compounded words and phrases beneath a headword, assuming the reader will realize the compound? Jackson argues that an unnested dictionary is more attractive in its page layout thanks to shorter, more numerous entries, which creates more white space.

Abbreviation: Does the dictionary abbreviate entries? Abbreviations in entries save space, but they also put the onus of understanding on the reader of the dictionary. Dictionaries containing large number of abbreviations are considered best for readers with a strong baseline knowledge of the field under consideration.

Range of Vocabulary: This particular criterion is pivotal for the field of Classics. Not only are dictionaries expected to cover a geographical and lexical range of Latin, but a chronological one as well. Latin, after all, is a long-lasting language and the when is as important as the where.

Word Formation: Are words that are often found together in pairings presented in dictionary entries? Are common suffixes and affixes presented in the entry?

Homographs: How are words that mean different things but are spelled the same way (homographs) treated? Are they given a completely new entry or given an ordinal entry showing relative frequency of usage?

Sense Division: How are different senses of a word treated? Jackson notes the trend to tone down the number of senses presented in a dictionary work. This will also be pivotal
in a study of Latin dictionaries as some works are famous or notorious for level of pedantry they exert in differentiating senses of words.

**Defining:** How does the dictionary define words? Are the entries analytical in nature? Are scientific terms defined in such a way that they could be confusing to the layperson?

**Beyond Denotation:** How does the work handle synonymy and antonymy? Are words that have collocations or words with similar definitions presented in the entry? Are entries encyclopaedic in nature? Jackson asserts these can have a large impact on the understanding of a definition.

**Pronunciation:** Jackson argues that a dictionary should have variable pronunciation guides to cover a large number of possibilities. This, however, is somewhat of a moot point with regards to Latin dictionaries as Latin pronunciation is the subject of much debate and few in the field of Classics would have warrant to use pronunciation, save for stress patterns, which are useful in the study of Latin poetry. I argue that replacing this category instead with “Stress Patterns” would be more valuable to the average user.

**Grammar:** Jackson notes that dictionaries, especially monolingual ones, typically do not go beyond denoting transitive and intransitive verbs in their definitions, save for a few newer entries that have simplified the grammatical term to “with object” and “without object.” For bilingual dictionaries, like the majority of those under consideration, grammar is of prime importance, especially given the rather complex nature of Latin noun and verb systems.

**Usage:** Does the dictionary provide notes concerning the proper usage of a word? Possible exclusions and limitations include period of time the word was commonly used in, pejorative connotations, usages relating to class, and other limitation.
Examples: Jackson asserts all dictionaries provide examples, but the quality of examples should be judged. Are examples illustrative? Are examples used primarily to show common features or to provide examples of exceptions to the rules? Are examples drawn from the corpus of the language or invented?

Etymology: While one might consider etymology more pertinent to languages with a long history of borrowing, such as English, Latin too had a history of borrowing words from Greek and to a lesser degree other languages. The presence of etymologies for Latin words could prove useful in the study of Latin poetry and prose and thus could be a valuable part of a viable lexicographical work.

Special Features: This is a wide-ranging category that includes tables and other ephemera that the editors of a particular dictionary thought would be of value to the reader (or as Jackson asserts, help sell more books).

While these 16 entries, with one being modified for the specificities of Latin dictionaries, provide a solid basis upon which to analyze the viability of dictionaries, Landau (2001: 228-234) provides a notable caveat to any lexicographical analytical endeavor, which Jackson neglects. Landau notes the general trend in dictionaries following the liberalization of many aspects of society in the late 1960s to include definitions of words, often having to do with sexual or bawdy themes that would have been considered indecorous in the past. This note is of particular import as some of the dictionaries being analyzed were published in the Victorian era and definitions of bawdier Latin terms like *irrumare* and *pedicare*, as will be seen, reflect the mores of the time. It stands to question why it matters if a dictionary obfuscates the meaning of particularly irreverent words in less ribald meanings. James Adams answered that
question in his well-known *Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982) in which he argued that essential to an understanding of many types of Latin literature from satire to poetry to epigram to invective is an understanding of sexual vocabulary. While Landau (229-231) notes that public opinion has generally shifted to being more open to lexicographical works with previously taboo words, many are still uncomfortable with the idea of such works being available in the secondary school curriculum; he writes, “Teachers would be confronted on the one hand by puzzled and titillated students and on the other hand by outraged parents.” Landau’s advice is to err on the side of caution when selecting such dictionaries for a secondary school environments advising that acts of heroics are most likely not worth such a small part of the lexical corpus. Considering that stated aim of this paper includes the possibility of these lexicographical works being used in secondary school environments, one can see the competing issues arrayed against one another: on the one hand the complete understanding of Latin terminology and on the other the concerns of parents and guardians. With an eye to this problem, this paper aims to describe the manner in which each of the dictionaries under consideration handle the subject of taboo words.

A final consideration that is substantially neglected in the lexicographical literature is the subject of cost. As will be discussed, the prices of the lexicographical works under consideration range from free all the way up to thousands of dollars—a substantial burden on many smaller libraries and perhaps one that could be avoided with appropriate resource selection. While it is understandable that Landau, Jackson, *et alii* would be concerned primarily with the contents and packaging of the lexicographical product, for the librarian and information professional cost, especially in an age of budget
cuts, deserves at least some focus. As such, the cost will be discussed as part of the content analysis of the work.

Notably, two of the works under consideration are electronic dictionaries which bring a new set of considerations about. Many authors in the past decade and a half have wrangled with the issues surrounding the use of electronic dictionaries, their achievements, shortfalls, and whether they can and should exist alongside paper dictionaries or replace them entirely. Béjoint has noted that e-dictionaries, as they are commonly known, can have a freeing effect as computers are not limited by the physical constraints of a book; entries can be longer and less abbreviated, and while one of the most important qualities of an e-dictionary is its only being able to show one entry at a time, the e-dictionary affords the ability for entries to be linked via hypertext (2010: 371, 375).

Other attention has been given to the effectiveness to the e-dictionary and its effectiveness for both pedagogical and research uses. Some have argued that the skills commonly associated with dictionary use, like grammatical understanding of the language and an understanding of lexicographical terms and tropes, are not needed to such a degree in e-dictionaries (Geeraerts, 2000; Nesi, 2000). In some cases, when given a choice, studies have shown that users are more likely to use an e-dictionary over a traditional paper dictionary (Siegel, 2007). Interestingly, two studies suggest that students who used e-dictionaries were more likely to retain word information for vocabulary tests and quizzes—though these studies were conducted in a single language environment (Laufer, 2000: 851; Nesi, 2000: 845). Yet, though there are positive signs from research, some still contend that e-dictionaries are almost too good to be true. The so called
“involvement hypothesis” suggests that users who have an easy time retrieving information will just as easily forget it (Leech and Nesi 1999: 298). Béjoint also suggests that though e-dictionaries are appealing, paper dictionaries will have a place for the foreseeable future thanks to their ability to be consulted without the necessities of a computer, power, or internet; he also retreats to the romanticization of physical books that has been a common refrain (2010: 375).

Classics & Lexicology

As the field of lexicology has enjoyed a revitalization since the 1980s, so too has directing a lexicological eye towards the field of Classics and its Latin and, especially, Greek dictionaries. In the single volume Studies in Lexicography (1987) P.G.W. Glare inaugurated a renewed interest in Classical lexicological works and their study with his paper on “Liddell & Scott: its background and present state.” Glare had recently come off his success as the final editor of the Oxford Latin Dictionary (1982) project, and turned his attentions to the current state of affairs of Greek lexicography. These efforts were followed by similar analyses of the state of the field of Greek lexicography in Kitchell (1988, 1989). In 2010, Christopher Stray, whose 30 years of research have been focused on the study of Classics and its history, edited a volume titled Classical Dictionaries: Past, Present, Future. The volume is notable in being the first dedicated entirely to the field of Classical lexicology and also for bringing together a notable group of scholars to discuss a commonly forgotten aspect of the Classics bibliographical output. The volume, however, is vastly devoted to the study of Greek lexicology with only a single article
devoted to post 18th century, general Latin lexicography—a look at the publishing history of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* that was sorely needed and will be discussed further.
Chapter III: Methodology

Primary Documents

While the literature on the state of Latin lexicography and its generalized history is somewhat lacking, there is no dearth of Latin dictionaries. Even a concise history of the Latin dictionary up to the modern era would become a book-length endeavor. As such, this paper aims to only concern itself only with dictionaries that remain in common use in secondary and post-secondary educational environments. As a guide to such works, the author has taken Fred Jenkins Classics standard, *Classical Studies: a guide to the reference literature* (1996) as a baseline but incomplete guide to Latin lexicographical works. Jenkins has created broadly thorough but narrowly indeterminate work on the 667 most commonly used Classical references. Each reference is given at most 150 words in which to be discussed. From Jenkins’ “Greek and Latin Language Section” I have selected the Latin dictionaries that are current considered to have not been superseded by another work—this rules out Forcellini’s *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, which even in 1996 Jenkins acknowledged was being superseded by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* project. The author has also removed bilingual dictionaries in which the non-Classical language is not English as well as etymological dictionaries, which are considered to be more specialized works—this requirement has removed both *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* and the *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*, both of which are excellent etymological resources yet ill-suited for the current pedagogical purposes. Similarly, a few smaller Latin dictionaries, intended for individual
student use, were excluded from discussion owing to their somewhat flimsy, paperback construction and limited vocabulary. Among works of this sort are the *Oxford Pocket Latin Dictionary*, the *New College Press Latin Dictionary*, and the *Collins Gem Latin Dictionary*. While the first two works are known for being perfectly satisfactory personal student dictionaries, the Collins Gem holds a sort of legendary status among Classicists for being poorly written and in some circumstances outright wrong—one online Classics guru even notes that the book is liable to be preceded by the aspersion *horrible dictu*, “terrible to speak of” (Wills 1995).

With these restrictions imposed, one is left with a list of general-use dictionaries—the bread and butter of the Classicist’s lexicographical arsenal. These works are: the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrews’ edition of Freund’s Latin dictionary revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and Charles Short, LL.D.* (1879) (mercifully known by its editors’ names—*Lewis & Short*), and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Ongoing). While this is a good beginning to the list, the author feels that Jenkins has overlooked resources that could prove valuable in a learning environment. Notably, Jenkins passes over D.P. Simpson’s 1959 rewrite of *Cassell’s New Latin Dictionary*. While the volume is not mentioned in any notable published list of Classics reference material including Jenkins, the work has a popular following among teachers and gurus and was well-received in reviews (Bruere 1960; Rexine 1960; Richards 1960; Gill “Top 6 Latin Dictionaries”).

Two other lexicological resources that were not included in Jenkins’ 1996 work nor the 2002 update were online dictionaries—namely *Whitaker’s Words* and the online version of *Lewis and Short* published on the *Perseus Digital Library* website. While far
from being traditional paper-based Classics resources, these resources are popular with students and deserve at least some attention considering their ease of availability and their appealing lack of a price tag. Further, Perseus’ dictionary is completely based on *Lewis and Short*, lending it a certain amount reputability. Both online resources will receive a content analysis like the previous dictionary with an eye focused on their digital nature—for both positive and negative.
Chapter IV: Discussion of Resources


Stray (2010: 94) notes that competition prior to the publishing of Lewis and Short in 1879 was fierce; he further notes that the business of Latin dictionaries was a game of one-upsmanship where a particular press would create a new Latin dictionary ever-so-slightly different from previous versions released by other presses. As such, Latin dictionaries often developed a clear lineage from previous editions. Lewis and Short, though it became the standard Latin dictionary until the publishing of the OLD in 1982, was no different (Jenkins: 161). Lewis and Short’s lexicographical work is, in fact, a heavily edited reworking of a previous Latin dictionary by E.A. Andrews (1850); in turn, Andrew’s dictionary was a translation of the William Freund’s Latin-German dictionary Worterbuch der lateinischen Sprache (1834-1840). Freund, in turn, based his work on Forcellini’s Totius Latinitatis Lexicon (1771), a monumental monolingual Latin dictionary that is still occasionally used for etymological research to this day.

Though Lewis and Short was the standard Latin dictionary for over 100 years, as can be seen from its lineage, it is based on older lexicographical principles and practices and never in its history of reprinting received a major update and contains many errors (Jenkins, 162). As such, in the same breath Jenkins suggests that, though widely available, Lewis and Short should be used sparingly. In fact, though for most Classicists
it was the best they had at the time, Henderson (2010, 140) notes that *Lewis and Short* became a sort of “byword for shoddiness” that spurred on the creation of newer dictionaries like the *OLD* in the 20th century.

Though oft-maligned by scholars, the question remains as to whether the volume has a place in the body of works available in an educational setting. Prior to examining the work with Jackson’s criteria with the addition of treatment of taboo words and price, the author would like to present a sample page from the dictionary containing the word *monere*, a fairly common word that students learn early in their Classics careers (Figure 1).

For a largish work like *Lewis and Short*, the page layout is quite accessible for such an early work. Fonts, though not large, are not microscopic, though they could present difficulty for some readers. The three-column presentation does, however, create a ‘wall-of-text’ that could be intimidating to some readers. Differentiated meanings are clearly marked with the Roman numerals I, II, III, etc. and submeanings within those by the letters A, B, C, etc. Notably, however, the work does not begin new meanings on a new line, a newer innovation in lexicography that creates a more attractive, inviting layout to the page (Jackson: 178). In the newer method, polysemous meanings (those words that have variable meanings and submeanings) are given a new line in order that the reader can better differentiate definitions.
Figure 1: Lewis and Short
Length of entries in *Lewis and Short* vary considerably. For example, the reproduced page showing *monere* displays that particular word in nearly an entire column. Yet, immediately following is the word *moneris*, which is given a very short, 3-line entry. Some entries like the famously polysemous word *agere* may run as many as three entire pages. Longer entries such as these create a somewhat difficult to navigate ‘wall-of-text.’ If the student learner is searching for a particular meaning of *agere* or even *monere*, the sheer number of entries could confuse or overwhelm the user.

Notably, even with extremely long entries for some words, abbreviations are heavily used within *Lewis and Short*, though the definitions for these abbreviations are thankfully given with the front matter of the book. Both attested authors and grammatical terms are given in an abbreviated format that could prove vexing to a newer student of Latin, especially those who are unfamiliar with some antiquated grammatical terms that are not used as commonly today, e.g. “*plusquamperfectum*” for the pluperfect tense. Jackson notes that fewer abbreviations usually means more accessibility, a feature that is often ignored by academics in dictionaries (Jackson: 178).

In terms of content, the sheer range of *Lewis and Short* will only be matched upon completion of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Source material for the work covers the entirety of what many consider to be Latin literature—200BCE to 400CE (Jenkins: 162). As such, *Lewis and Short* cover most every word that all but the highest level of Classical researcher would encounter. In fact, many of the words encountered in *Lewis and Short* occur only once in the entirety of Latin literature. Words such as these are marked with an asterisk preceding the entry, though this is only outlined in the abbreviations section.
and may escape the notice of students. Similarly, some words are found only in
inscriptions or in the old grammarians; these words are marked with a ‡.

Word formation in *Lewis and Short* is fairly straightforward. While Latin is fond
of the addition of suffixes and affixes to words, these changes often cause notable
spelling shifts (e.g. *gradior* and *progredior*) that can obscure the original word to the
unfamiliar. Luckily, *Lewis and Short* breaks up entries with suffixes and affixes
completely, so that the word *loquor*, “to talk” appears in a completely different location
than *proloquor* “to speak out.” The work does, however, provide a separation of the
suffixes and affixes from the words so as to give clues as to their formation; thus,
*proloquor* is rendered “*pro-loquor.*”

Homographs, those words that are spelled the same but have different meanings
entirely, usually based on a different etymology, are differentiated in *Lewis and Short*.
For instance, the verb *cedere* has many senses: one meaning “to go” and another meaning
“to have some result.” These senses are shown in the text by the presence of the Arabic
numerals 1., 2., 3., etc prior to the entry. A notable peculiarity of Latin is that its large
number of endings can create homographs for words that are completely unrelated. Paper
dictionaries, such as this particular version of *Lewis and Short*, assume that reader is
familiar enough with Latin and lexicographical principles so that they would be able to
parse such a happening. The author, speaking from his own learning experiences in Latin,
would suggest this is one of the most frustrating aspects of looking up a word in a Latin
dictionary. For instance, *solum* can mean both “alone” or “ground.” *Lewis and Short* with
its high expectations of users, gives no guidance to hapless translator who should stumble
onto the wrong entry on account of not knowing his or her Latin endings.
*Lewis and Short*, again, assumes a relatively high-level of learning for students when it comes to sense divisions. Take as an example the definition for *monere*. While the sense divisions are plentiful, the way they are explained could prove confusing to some newer students of Latin. For example, the note with **II.A.** “Without the accessory notion of reminding or admonishing.” followed by a grouping of definitions. Other such notes in that particular definition include “only in Tacitus”, “Mostly poet. And in post-Aug. prose”, and “With an object or rel. clause” among others. While these sorts of definitions demonstrate a preciseness of defining that is difficult to match and that could be useful to the astute undergraduate or graduate student, such grammatical and literary markers could prove difficult for the new acolytes of Latin.

Definitions in *Lewis and Short* are for the most part clear. Note in the definition of *monere* that the authors choose to list the definitions and then give examples of the word being used in this way in Latin that require some amount of understanding on the part of the user. Further, *Lewis and Short* uses a system whereby similar words are often given in the definition; note the entry *monile* from Figure 1 wherein the Latin words *gemma* and *margarita* are given in their Latinate forms, though no mention is explicitly made to their synonymity, again requiring the user to have some understanding of the words in the first, or the willingness to maneuver to those words to ascertain their definitions. Jackson further suggests that definitions can go “beyond denoting,” meaning the definitions provide encyclopedic insight as to the words particular meaning to language (Jackson, 160). *Lewis and Short* does this regularly with terms that are particular to Roman culture; for instance, words like *censor* and *lictor* and many others are given a highly encyclopedic entry which explains their history within the culture.
Stress patterns are presented quite clearly in Lewis and Short, with the standard long and short vowel markers ˇ and ˉ being used above the letters of a word’s entry, making this work conducive for us by a student studying Latin poetry.

Presentation of grammar in Lewis and Short is copious with many sense divisions in the work being created based on definitions taking a differing grammatical part of speech, like the dative or the genitive. Genders of nouns are clearly designated by an m., f., or n. while grammatical subsets of nouns known as declensions are given by the lexicographically standard genitive ending immediately following the entry of the word—e.g., the word moneris in Figure 1 is shown to be a third declension noun via the “is” shown directly after.

Usage notes in Lewis and Short are somewhat restricted. Frequently accompanying entries are notes like “post-Aug.,” “post-Clas.,” or “In Tacitus Only.” These notes limit the time period of particular words or a particular sense meaning in a word. These denotations, however, require the reader to be familiar with what exactly constitutes “post-Classical” or “post-Augustan” works or who Tacitus was and when he wrote. Particularly noteworthy in this vein is that words that would commonly be associated with speech are often demarcated by being found in Plautus, Terrence, or Cicero’s Epistles, meaning that the student must be aware that these authors (and Cicero in these particular works) are associated with a more colloquial writing style than is often used in Latin literature.

As can be seen in Figure 1, examples are copious and cited precisely by author—though the citations are given by abbreviations and the examples give no translation to
aid the reader. *Lewis and Short*, in this manner, purports to be authoritative rather than pedagogical in its outlook.

Etymologies in *Lewis and Short* are given in a succinct format. As per the abbreviations section, words that are directly taken from Greek have a † in front of their definition, like *monochordos* from Figure 1. Also, note that *Lewis and Short* have provided the Greek version of the word for the reader in its non-transliterated format. Etymologies for other languages to which Latin is related, like Sanskrit, are also provided where appropriate. In the abbreviations section *Lewis and Short* notes that brackets also show possible relations to other words—for example, the authors feel *monition* is related to the verb *moneo* as it is set in brackets within the definition. While this system of etymological reference certainly saves space, it can create somewhat cluttered definitions as well as confuse readers who have not taken the time to read the sections of the dictionary that explain what the codes mean.

Special features in *Lewis and Short* are not extant, with the entirety of the front matter being devoted to a denotation of the abbreviations used in the book and the sources from which entries are taken.

Taboo words in *Lewis and Short* deserve special mention. Using the words *irrumare* and *pedicare* as tests—as they both appear in Catullus poems that are commonly assigned in early Latin courses—one finds that *irrumare* is defined quite incorrectly as “to extend the breast; to give suck.” *Pedicare* is given the definition “paedico, etc.,” forcing the reader to find another entry (when *pedicare* is the more commonly written version) which is simply defined in the obscured translation “to practice unnatural vice.” While the definitions are quite Victorian, it should be noted for
higher level students intent on doing actual Classics research, that some definitions are obscured to adhere to the sensitivities of the time.

At $255.00 for the single volume hardbound edition, *Lewis and Short* is somewhat expensive and could be a burden on some reference budgets; the work, however, is now outside of copyright protection and available for free in an online environment on the Perseus Digital Library website, as will be discussed further. Upon closer analysis it does seem that Jenkins’ analysis stands in that the volume is based on antiquated principles and could prove difficult for new learner, though some of its heavily sourced definitions could be of great use to a higher-level student of the language.


Jenkins’ quote concerning the *OLD* still rings true some 28 years after the publication of the dictionary: “This is now the standard Latin-English dictionary” (161). Though thought of as the standard Latin dictionary today, the status of the work as a publishing venture was questioned from its beginnings in 1931 when the Delegates of the Press asked for a completely new Latin dictionary based upon a completely new examination of the language independent from any previous work, including the published parts of the *TLL* and *Lewis and Short* (Glare: A2). Henderson (2010) notes the complete boondoggle that the early years of the work were, noting a completely disorganized method of recording entries and definitions and a first editor who was near incompetent. The *OLD* was published in 8 fascicles beginning in the 1960s and even as the output of decades of research began to be seen by the Classical world, reviews were
mixed with some preferring *Lewis and Short*, even with its faults (Dyer 1972). Most reviewers, however, were satisfied with the results of the research and came to embrace the clean appearance and ease of use of the *OLD*, which was based upon the principles set about in the creation *Oxford English Dictionary* (Mueller 1985; Luck 1984).

Referring to the reproduced page containing the definition of *monere*, note that the page layout of the *OLD* even resembles that of the *OED*. Unlike the *OED*, however, the *OLD* is a single-volume work, roughly 30% smaller than *Lewis and Short* (Figure 2). White space on the page is copious and unlike *Lewis and Short*, which can appear like an impenetrable wall of text, the *OLD* uses varying font sizes to differentiate parts of entries. Bolded headwords and a small area of white space between entries make the page attractive and approachable, though the work uses a three-column format.

Note as well that entries are arranged in such a way as to make the definition accessible. New section of a definition are bolded and white space used to separate within the entry. Indentations are used to set apart differing sense meanings of a word and the use of tildes in the example texts allow the eye to jump between uses fairly easily. Much like *Lewis and Short*, abbreviations are given at the beginning of the book for both authors and grammatical terms that are used. The work again calls upon the user to familiarize him or herself with the terms prior to use, which could be an impediment to thoughtful use of the work by some students.

The range of vocabulary used in the *OLD* is quite large, though not as thorough as that of the *TLL*. The *OLD*’s range should be more than adequate for daily use of almost any level of Latin student, though there are some shortcomings. Notably, the *OLD*’s corpus of words that is used for the work ranged from the beginning of the language
Figure 2: Oxford Latin Dictionary
down to roughly 150CE. The cutoff is not entirely clean as some critical texts that ran
over into the early 3rd century CE are included as well, while any texts of the early church
from the same period are excluded. This exclusion means that anyone interested in late
Latin or the early church will need to look elsewhere for a dictionary, most likely *Lewis
and Short*.

Suffixes and affixes in the *OLD*, as in *Lewis and Short*, form completely different
words and are not mentioned in the entries. The dictionary does, however, note when
some words are derived from another entry, which could be of aid to some students; for
an example of this note the entry for *monita* in the reproduced page. The *OLD* denotes
that the word is derived from *moneo, monere*.

Homographs are presented in the same manner as *Lewis and Short*. The different
numbers show when a word takes on a new meaning. One also notes that sense divisions,
while as copious as those in *Lewis and Short* (and based upon more up to date
lexicographical principles), are not as copious as those in the *TLL*. Though one may well
question the necessity of myriad sense divisions for most students excluding graduates.

Definitions in the *OLD* are outstandingly clear. Note in the reproduced page the
manner in which definitions are presented in clear English with their corresponding
grammatical parts of speech. Subdivisions within each definition allow the reader to
quickly reference the sorts of grammatical construction that a word may use, and
parentheses limit definitions so that a user does not apply the definition incorrectly (note
*moneo* definition 3, “(of things, events, etc.)”).
While significantly more terse in its encyclopedic definitions, the OLD does provide a good deal of background information on geographical definitions as well as those definitions pertaining to Roman culture and practices.

Unlike Lewis and Short, the OLD does not provide the stresses for every word and only provides stress marks for those words that might give a reader pause. The OLD thus expects a certain level of competency with the Latin language on the part of the user with regards to stress patterns.

In a move that makes the OLD infinitely easier on the eyes than most other dictionaries, grammatical notes are placed in parentheses within definitions. This action on the part of the work’s editors means that though grammar is copious, it does not infringe on the reader’s ability to read a definition.

One major downfall of the OLD is its lack of usage notes throughout. Words are not typically designated by a time period nor are sense divisions within definitions. The editor’s preface to the work even notes that the order of sense divisions should not be taken as indicative of the order that meanings of words came into usage. Readers are left to analyze the citations of a particular definition in order to find when a particular definition was prominently used. This can be particularly problematic as some authors purposefully imitate an archaic style for their works and, thus, confusing the user. Examples, as in Lewis and Short, are copious and based upon a new survey of Latin literature. As previously mentioned, use of tildes to mark a particular words place within the citations allow the user to quickly and accurately find the various uses of the term in the citations.
Etymologies, as in *Lewis and Short*, are presented in brackets. Words of uncertain origin are given the term [dub.] for dubious. Greek words are given by the abbreviation Gk. Followed by the word in the Greek alphabet. The editor’s preface also notes that these etymologies are quite cursory and that if a student has a real interest in the etymology of the words he or she should consult one of the etymological dictionaries. The *OLD* has no special features so to speak, though the front matter author index with abbreviations does give a synopsis of the authors’ works as well as the times during which they wrote.

Taboo words are covered in the *OLD*, but in way that belies a certain squeamishness on the part of the authors that is somewhat odd for a 20th century work. The verb *irrumare* has a highly circular definition pattern, sending the reader first to *irrumator* and then *irrumatio* before giving up a highly clinical definition that does not capture the vulgar nature of the word in the Latin language. The same goes for *pedicare*, which is presented in such clinical terms as to make it sounds like a procedure one might have in an out-patient clinic. While the definitions show the professionalism of the editors of the work, without usage notes the spirit of the words is lost to the reader, which could prove problematic to some later students of the Latin language.

At $365, the *OLD* is no small purchase for many libraries and many librarians will have to ask themselves whether their students will make use of the dictionary on a basis that justifies the price tag. The *OLD* is a fantastic resource for settling disputes of the meanings of words or that ever-lingering question in the Latin classroom “Can you use this word that way?” Similarly, with its attractive layout and ease of reading, the work serves as an excellent foray for students into the world of Classical scholarship and
give them the opportunity to do their own research on words and how they are used. Obviously, the work is indispensable for those at a post-secondary level, but there is also much to be said for having a copy in the library of a secondary school with a Latin program.


As previously mentioned, Jenkins passes over *Cassell’s New Latin Dictionary* in his annotated bibliography of Classical Studies. It is an unfortunate oversight as Cassell’s, as the work is often known, fills a gap in the pedagogical tools of a Classical Studies program. While not containing the plethora of examples and variety of definitions and scholarship that *Lewis and Short*, the *TLL*, or the *OLD* do, Cassell’s offers a level of scholarship not commonly available in beginner’s dictionaries yet presents this information in a way easily accessible to new students.

*Cassell’s*, like most of the dictionaries under consideration, has a long history, which is iterated in the preface to the work (Simpson: v-vii). Originally published in 1854 by the father and son team of John Relly Beard and Charles Beard, the work was heavily indebted to Freund’s Latin dictionary, the same from which *Lewis and Short* grew. From the outset, the work was notable in that it contained an English to Latin section drawn up entirely by Charles Beard. As to the presence of an English to Latin section and the presence of Latin composition in the Classical curriculum Simpson notes that it is “an exercise which may be called artificial certainly, but has long been regarded in England as an integral part of the curriculum” (Simpson: vii). Similarly, many of the common
methods of learning Latin in the United States, as they are derivative of the English system of Classical learning, require some amount of English to Latin prose composition either in a structured classroom setting at the post-secondary level or in exercises as seen in such student textbooks as *Ecce Romani, Wheelock’s Latin*, and the Cambridge Latin course.

At the original time of its publishing, *Cassell’s* was roughly two-thirds the size of its present iteration. It went through many revisions over the course of the late 19th century, though the specifics of these revisions are unclear due the loss of the publisher’s records during the Blitz. What is known is that the work became codified in 1892 and remained in that state until D.P. Simpson of Eton was asked to overhaul the work completely in 1953. As for his reworking of *Cassell’s*, Simpson writes, “My aim has been to conform to the fashions of the present day, both in English idiom and Latin spelling; to introduce fresh material from various sources; and in matters of explanation and arrangement to go part of the way back to the simplicity of the first edition” (Simpson: vii). If reviews of the overhauled edition are any indication, Simpson performed his work admirably.

Many reviews painted the new *Cassell’s* in glowing terms, only noting minor lapses in specific entries. One reviewer in the *Modern Language Journal* wrote of the work that it, “will be good news to classical teachers and students everywhere who know how difficult it has been to find and use a really handy desk dictionary of the Latin language for ordinary, everyday use in the classroom and home study” (Rexine 1960). In the same vein, another reviewer wrote, “It is clear that this is a very useful dictionary both for schools and for colleges, but all graduate students and most of the senior
undergraduates in colleges ought also to use Lewis and Short, so that they can check the references when in doubt” (Richards 1960). Richards hits upon what makes Cassell’s so valuable in a learning environment: it provides a quick, easily accessible reference tool without the difficulty of consulting the sometimes labyrinthine entries of the TLL, Lewis and Short, or the OLD, though this ease of access is made by sacrificing many of the scholarly trappings of the three larger dictionaries.

The first notable characteristic of Cassell’s is that the book itself and thus the pages are smaller than the OLD, Lewis and Short, and much smaller than the TLL. Though small in size, Cassell’s has a double-columned format with ample white space. As seen in Figure 3 different entries are accentuated by a hanging margin as well as bold type. Within the entry itself sections are delineated by an indentation. Within definitions, sense differences are delineated by the presence of a boldface I in parentheses. Abbreviations, as in the previously critiqued dictionaries, are used and available in the front matter of the book—though the number of abbreviations is less than in some of the other works like the TLL. Finally, in terms of page layout, the entries themselves are somewhat truncated as compared to those found in the three larger dictionaries. Note that monere, which in other dictionaries warranted a rather large entry, takes up only a third of a column. Overall, the page layout is attractive and the eye is guided with relative ease to the important divisions within entries, making this dictionary particularly accessible to users.

The range of vocabulary in Cassell’s is from 200BCE to 100CE and contains articles on “most of the words used” (Simpson: viii). The reader will note that this period
is slightly truncated as compared to the spans of time covered in some of the other
dictionaries under consideration, yet for most of the authors encountered in a pre-
molliculus -a,-um (dim. of mollis, soft), tender, dwell: Pl. TRANSPL., effeminate: Cat.
mollis -itic (mollis), to make pliable, soft, tender.

Lit., lanam trahendo, to spin, Ov.; artoe oleo, Liv.; ceram pollice, Ov.; abum vapore, Liv.; fragor, G.; designed humor, et idem mollissimam tepetactus, Cic.; globas, to loosen, sofien, Ov.

TRANSPL. (1) of a gradient, to ease: clivium anfractuosus medica, Cae.; Liv. (2) of growing thing: fructus feros colendo, Verg. (3) of character and feeling, to soften, make gentle; in a bad sense, to make effeminate: poetae mollissimam animus movit, Cic.; Lineae mollissimas animas movit, Cassius; Liv.; amittit, Cae.; Hannibalem exsultantem patienti
tur mollibus, Cic. (4) of circumstances, to make milder, relive, brutal: poenam, Ov.
mollissima -a, -um (mollis), soft-footed, i.e., having a trailing walk (Gr. tuklcon): Cic. poet.
mollis -a -um, adj. (with compar. and superl.), soft. Lit., physically soft, tender, pliant, supple, flexible, yielding: aqua natura, Luec.; iunxum, acatthem, Verg.; crura, colla, Verg.; cervix, manus, Ov.; humus, Ov.; arx, untrunc, Ov.; vina, to the taste, Verg.

TRANSPL. (1) of weather, mild: searctis, Verg.; Zephyr, Ov. (2) of gradients, etc.: fastigium, Cae.; clivus, Verg.; Liv., Tac. (3) of character, etc.: a, gentilis; seni, senissum ad accipisciendam et ad deponendam offendicionem, Cic.; homo mollissimo animo, Cic.; 2, effeminem, unum, accidit, Tac.; segampli, Liv.; c, easy, mild, pleasant: mollis ac succedaneo efficere senectutem, Cic.; oratio, Cic.; nasc., Verg.

Luec. (4) of nature, tender, moving: verba mollissimae illacium, Hor.; ilid mollissimam carmen, Cic.

Q Adv. (with compar. and superl.) mollissimam, softly, easily, gently: Lit., physically, quas membra movere mollis peastis; Hor.; excutient spirantia mollissima aura, Verg. TRANSPL. (1) mildly, gently, easily: quod ferendum est mollissima sepiem, Cic.; minus mollit, Carthaginensibus pati, Sall. (2) weakly, effeminate: delicat et mollis vivere, Cic.; Liv.

mollilitas -ae, f. and mollilitates -ae, f. (mollis), softness, stiffness, flexibility, pliancy: cervicium, Cic. TRANSPL. of character, etc.: tenderness, mildness, sensibility; in a bad sense, weakness, effeminacy: animi, Cic.; naturae, Cic.; civitatum moras lapsa ad mollilitatem, Cic.
mollitudo -onis, f. (mollis), softness, Lit., physical softness, pliancy: additis spargit mollitudine, Cic. TRANSPL. tenderness, softness, sensibility: humanitatem, Cic.
molli -ere di -itur (mool -i), to grind in a mill: ebera molia, molas, Cae.
molli -era -eris, -erum, m. (pl. 

molli -ere -i, m. (pl. 
mollius -ius, a -um, Molossian: pet, a metrical foot, consisting of three long syllables, Quint. canis, Hor.; m. as subst.: Mollosia, m. Molossian bound, in great request as a racing dog: Verg.; Hor.; subst.: Mollosia -eis, f. the country of the Mollosi.
molli -ius, a -um, Molossian: pet, a metrical foot, consisting of three long syllables, Quint. canis, Hor.; m. as subst.: Mollosia, m. Molossian bound, in great request as a racing dog: Verg.; Hor.; subst.: Mollosia -eis, f. the country of the Mollosi.

moly -os, -a, -um (molybdenum): has a counter-charm against the enchantments of Circe: Ov.
molybden -um, n. (molybdenum, from molybdenum), movement, motion: Lucr.; hence (1) a moving mass: e salus consurgere mere negavit, Liv.; (2) momentum, impulse: Lucr. (3) momentum, impulse: Lucr.
motion -um, n. (—movement, from moveo), movement, motion. Lit., astra formâ ipsâ figurâque sub momenta sustentân, Cic.; Hor. Ov. TRANSPL. a, change, alteration: momentum facere amunicior, Liv.; Cic.; b, of time, a turning-point, minute, moment: parvo momento, Cae.; momento tempori, Liv.; momento horse, in the short space of an hour, Liv.; Cic.

(a) a cause of motion, an impulse. Lit., ut (secutus) levi momento impulsi occidenter, Liv. TRANSPL. a, mental impulse, influence: parva momenta in asem metumque animam impellere, Liv.; Cae.; Cic.; hence, weight, importance: esse maximum momenta et pondera, Cic.; argumentorum momenta, decusque praest, Cic.; uraegen exregius maximum momentum recursum causas civitatis, a mens constitut, Liv.

Môna -ae, f. (the) Isle of Man: Cae.; (2) the Isle of Anglesey: Tac.

Mônesios -ae, m. (Monesolus), a Parthian king: Hor.
mônê -i, -ae, f. a dish, jachus; Cic.; Ov.
mônê -cre (connected with mensa), to remind, admonish, warn.

In gen., with acc. of person: Terentium de testamento, Cic.; aliquem de retinenda securitate, Cic.; with internal n. acce id ipsum quod me movere, Cae.; with acc. and infinit., to warn that...; magis idoneum tempus esse utium unquam reperturum, Cic.; with inf. quest.; monet quod statu sit res, Liv.; with et and the subj., to advise to...; ut magnam insaniae fugiat, Cic.; so with subj. alone: eae hoc movet desinitur, Cic.; with ne and the subj.: ne id faceret, Cic.; with infin. Sall., Verg., Tac.

Esp. (1) to instruct, prompt, give with authority: tu vatem, tu, divi, mere, Verg.; Liv. (2) to admonish by punishment: Tac.

Q Hence n. pl. of partic. as subst.: mûnta -ae, -um (muntum), a series of mountains: Cic. (2) prophetic: deorum, Cic.; Verg.
mônêria -ae, f. (mûnênum), a vessel having only one bank of oars: Liv.
Mônê -a, f. (mone), the mother of the Muses (mûnênumm): (1) the mother of the Muses (mûnênumm): (2) a surname of Juno; the Roman money was coined in the temple of Juno Moneta; hence moneta as: m., the mint, the place where money was coined: Cic. L.; b, coined metal, money: Ov.; c, the die or stamp with which money was coined: Mart. TRANSPL., communi fere carnem triviale monetae, Liv.
Mônê -a, f. (mone), relating to the mint; in jest, as subst., one who asks for money: Cic. L.
môndia -a, a,um, Molossian: pet, Molossian foot: Cic. TRANSPL. tenderness, softness, sensibility: humanitatem, Cic.
môns -itum, n. (mons), a remaining, warning: Cic.; pet.
mônitor -oris, m. (mone), one who reminds. In gen. officii, Sall. Esp. (1) a prompter:
graduate curriculum, the selection should suffice with very limited auxiliary considerations of other works.

As entries are relatively uncluttered for a Latin dictionary, suffixes and affixes are not included in the entry. Interestingly, however, possibly due to its target audience of students and teachers of Latin, Cassell’s does nest common words derived from a grammatical form of the entry in the definition. Note, for instance, the insertion of monita in bold type at the end of the entry for monere. Note, as well, that Simpson has chosen to express these derivative words via a paragraph mark affixed in the indentation, a useful means of drawing the eye. Homographs are handled through the use of numbers within the entry itself. Sense divisions are handled in a clear manner in Cassell’s, as they are delineated by the presence of the numerals 1, 2, etc. within the entry, but also labeled as figurative or literal. Note, for instance, the entry momentum, which contains “LIT.” for an entry based upon a literal reading of the word as well as “TRANSF.” which stands for transferred—a meaning derived from the literal meanings often used in a metaphorical sense. In other parts of the work, Simpson also uses “FIG.” to show figurative or poetic uses of words. These clear delineations of differing usage allow the user to clearly garner the sense of how words are used in sentences and are a valuable asset to new student of Latin.

Definitions in Cassells are exceedingly clear thanks to Simpson’s update. Note that the definitions of words are clearly demarcated in italics in clear English. Though, a feature that might prove misleading for American students is the use of “Esp.” in many of the definitions. While this abbreviation is given as especially in the front matter, the English meaning of the word denoting a peculiar usage is not made clear. Though it is
nice to have such peculiar usages shown to the student, the lack of clear transcontinental English could be cause of some translation errors. Occasionally, as is the case for some proper names and for Roman offices or items relating to Roman culture, there are encyclopedic definitions given, though they are limited in length as compared to those of Lewis and Short. Examples of such words are: consul, censor, and fascis.

Accentuation of words has been marked with the typical symbols where appropriate. Simpson notes in the front matter that the presence of stress marks is “wherever they would be most helpful” (Simpson: viii). On a similar note, grammar is presented in the entries in a manner that is more explained than in the larger dictionaries designed for scholars. For instance, note in monere, the presence of “with acc. of person.” Rather than simply saying “acc.” as would be more common in the larger dictionaries; Simpson has chosen to elaborate the grammatical principles allowed with certain words for the sake of clarity for learners. Overall, these features make Cassell’s the dictionary under consideration with the clearest indications of usage. Figurative and literal senses are given along with clear grammatical notes even though entries are somewhat shorter than other dictionaries considered.

Examples are plentiful for rather short entries and authors are given by their abbreviated names. One drawback of Cassell’s, however, is that the examples given, while cited by author’s name, do not have a numerical reference to a text or the name of the text cited, making it impossible for the user to gauge the context of a particular sentence. Users who are interested in finding the instance of a word within a larger text would be better served by consulting Lewis and Short or the OLD.
Etymology is sparse in *Cassell’s* as compared to the larger dictionaries. Only words with links to Greek are given etymological consideration. If a word is borrowed from Greek, the Greek word is given in the Greek alphabet following the entry in parentheses. The lack of etymologies allows for more space in entries and helps declutter the page somewhat. Simpson, also, suggests that students more interested in etymology ought to consult one of the etymological dictionaries he suggests (Simpson: vii).

Special features in *Cassell’s* are more plentiful than in the other dictionaries surveyed. The first, most obvious special feature is the book’s indented tabs. The tabs allow the user to quickly flip to the letter in the dictionary that he or she wants to use—this feature is peculiar to *Cassell’s* and is mentioned in many of the reviews as a notable feature.

Additionally, the front matter of the work includes a number of useful features. Among them are an “Advice to the User” section (a feature lacking in the other works); this section delineates the manner in which the dictionary is arranged as well as how one can use the work most effectively. Besides the seemingly standard list of Latin authors and grammatical terms, there is a list of common abbreviations in Latin, a subject that can be difficult for a new student of the Language. Additionally, there is a guide to and a chart for the somewhat unintuitive Roman calendar. Finally, Simpson has provided an “Additional Bibliography” section that attempts to point the student to other sources of information in Classical studies, including atlases, more in-depth dictionaries, and Language guides—though the list is somewhat dated at this point, having been published half a century ago.

*Cassell’s* is notable in the survey for completely eschewing taboo words. *Irrumare* and *pedicare* are not present in the dictionary, nor are a good many words that
would be considered taboo. On the one hand, this ensures that one can feel certain as an information professional that there is little ground on which to challenge such a work; on the other hand, one can almost be certain that certain authors like Martial, Plautus, and Statius will send the students looking for another dictionary.

At $24.95, Cassell’s is one of the most economically priced Latin dictionaries of substance. The work is perfect for quick consultation and the sort of everyday use that one is sure to see in a Latin program at a secondary or post-secondary level. Yet, one should keep in mind that such a work can and should not serve as the sole Latin dictionary for all but the most basic Classics programs found in secondary schools. Upper level undergraduates and, at particularly strong secondary schools, high schoolers may find the need to consult one of the three larger works for more obscure words or for words that Cassell’s chooses not to cover. On the whole, however, Cassell’s is a useful work that should find use on almost any Classical library shelf.

**Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.** $13,935 (Online). ~$12,000 (Print, Nine Volumes plus Index).

According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* the *TLL*, as this work is commonly known, is “probably the most scholarly dictionary in the world” (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* 2011). This assertion is based on the dictionary’s goals of creating a complete record of the Latin language from its beginning to roughly 150CE with further consideration given to texts handpicked by specialists down to 600CE (*Introduction to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*: 25). Work began on the dictionary in 1894 and it is still published in fascicles at varying intervals. The introduction to the work notes the original
end date of the work was intended to be 1912, subsequently 1930, and currently an estimated completion of 2030, making this work one of if not the greatest lexicographical undertaking in history. The dictionary is based upon a complete analysis of Latin texts and the introduction further notes that the library of “slips,” the pieces of paper researchers use to keep track of the words to be put in the dictionary now reaches 10 million—though much of the corpus research now takes place in a digital environment (27).

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the TLL is its status as a monolingual Latin dictionary. The entries are written in Latin and require a good deal of Latin knowledge to understand. One notes that the only portion of the TLL published in English (and several other languages) is the Introduction book, though it too has its first language as Latin. The TLL has been the focus of much lexicographical interest over its lifetime, due in part to the fact that the publication is an ongoing project. Corbeill (2007) analyzed the dictionary’s shift in defining style from one of simply listing instances to a more thorough analysis of sense division. Baraz (2007) noted the high level of scholarship that takes place in the TLL, noting the use of specialists, and discussed the great intricacy required in creating just one entry. Hay (2007) writes of how TLL has attempted to keep abreast of changes to the field of lexicography through a shift of practices in defining and notes the improving quality of each new volume. Hillen (2007) addressed the question of the TLL moving forward in the digital age and how the process of using electronic methods has made the process of writing the TLL more efficient.

The TLL is now published in three formats: a set of CD-ROMS, an online database version, and the traditional bound version. The longest lived version, obviously, is the
bound version, which is produced in a folio sized volume. Thus, the volumes take up a large amount of shelf space. The page layout, however, as can be seen from the page containing the first column of the entry for *monere*, is rather attractive with a simple two column per page design, ample margins, and the benefit of a set of numbers to mark the lines where one is reading (Figure 4). Note as well that some more common entries, like *monere*, are broken up by the use of charts denoting authors who used the word and the manner in which they used them.

Entries are laid out in a manner similar to Lewis and Short with new information not typically being given a new line. Note the manner in which information is somewhat packed into each paragraph.

Entries in the *TLL* are enormously long as compared to *Lewis and Short*. Note that the entry for *monere* runs for over seven columns. The length of the entry, however, is not based on nesting of compounded words as is common in many dictionaries, but rather based in the thoroughness of the dictionary, which has recorded every use of the word in Latin literature. The sheer length of such an entry, however, could prove daunting to all but the most skilled Latin researcher.

Much like *Lewis and Short*, the *TLL* relies heavily on a set of abbreviations in its definitions. Notably, the abbreviations are given in the front matter, but only Latin, making interpreting entries somewhat difficult. Authors are abbreviated as well as some Latin phrases, like *i.q.* or *id quod* “that is.”

The range of vocabulary in the *TLL* is second to none. The express goal of the dictionary is to provide instances and definition to every word in the Latin language through roughly 150CE and almost every word through 600CE. The dictionary performs
admirably at this, though everything beyond the letter P, as well Q and N (due to their rather notable number of words in Latin) are still missing in this dictionary, which will send the user looking for help from the OLD or Lewis and Short.

As in Lewis and Short, prefixed and suffixed words are not given mention in the definitions section as in Latin prefixes and suffixes often change the meaning of a word in a drastic way. Also as in Lewis and Short, homographs are treated by being given a different section under the headword with a corresponding Roman numeral. Under the Roman numerals for the homographs, sense divisions are made via a letter system (A, B, C, etc.) and variances under that with an Arabic number, so that a typical entry has a hierarchy of Roman numeral to letter to Arabic numeral. As Jenkins (165) notes, sense divisions are exhaustive and the researchers at the TLL have attempted to record every meaning of a word as well an example of it being used in such a manner.

Definitions in the TLL are second to none. While they are given in Latin, negating the use of this work by all but the most astute undergraduates, some graduates, and professors, they are exhaustive and have attempted to encompass all meanings of every word in the Latin language. As noted previously in the journal articles, the editors of the TLL have striven to keep abreast of lexicographical changes and later volumes, like the one containing the words beginning with M, show a distinctly analytical style of defining where senses are subdivided and analyzed quite closely. Another notable feature is the presence of signatures on each page denoting which editor wrote and researched the entries. On the presented page the reader will note [Buchwald] printed on the lower right hand corner denoting the editor. The presence of an editor’s mark attests to the quality of
the publication and will allow the reader to investigate the credentials of whoever wrote the entry.

Interestingly, as compared to *Lewis and Short*, the *TLL* avoids encyclopedic entries. The dictionary seemingly assumes that those using it have a basic grasp of Roman history, culture, and offices, offering only cursory explanation and instead focusing on instances when the words itself was used.

Stress patterns in the *TLL* also assume a good deal of knowledge of the language as individual stresses are not written unless they show a particular oddity. Thus, *monere* is not written with any stress marks, but one will note that in the world *monela* the “e” shows a long stress sign as this is somewhat abnormal in typical stress pattern.

Again, the *TLL* assumes a good knowledge of Latin grammar with terms and abbreviations being given in Latin. Definitions are grammar intensive with many sense divisions using differing grammatical constructions.

Following the pattern of assuming a good knowledge of both Latin and Roman culture and history, usage notes have been coopted into the definition by the use of author citations. A reader is expected to know the author or source abbreviations and glean the appropriate time period from that citation. Citations and their accompanying examples are unrivaled in the world of Latin lexicography in that the examples are exhaustive of the entirety of Latin literature.

As is noted in the Introduction to the *TLL*, etymologies are given by an expert in the field. Much like *Lewis and Short*, related words are bracketed at the beginning of the entry. Note in *monere* the rather lengthy bracketed etymology section with the signature...
of the expert, “J.B.H.” Words that are borrowed directly from Greek have their Greek equivalent written out in the Greek alphabet, as in _monazontes_, from the reproduced page. The notable special feature that the _TLL_ contains might be said to be less a special feature and more a necessity for the vast array of sources that the work uses. The number of citation abbreviations is vast and some extent confusing, even to someone familiar with the language. The dictionary has a separate index volume that includes an alphabetized and cross-referenced table that tells the dates each author is associated with as well as those works that are attributed to him or her.

Taboo words deserve special note for the _TLL_. Though it is highly unlikely a student for whom the obscenity of such words would be an issue would have the skills to use such an advanced dictionary, the words tend to use the denotation _vox obscaena_ or “obscene word” at the beginning of the entry. Definitions, though in Latin, are quite literal and to the point, much clearer than those provided by _Lewis and Short_.

Yet, for all its positive qualities and superlatives that are lavished upon, perhaps the greatest issue with the attainment of the _TLL_ is the price. With a price tag of over $10,000 for the portion that has thus been completed, the scholarly weight of the _TLL_ with quite a price tag—a price tag perhaps too great for all but the largest research libraries. While new fascicles or updates to the computerized version do not come regularly, they do represent a commitment to the upkeep of the work in the future. For any librarian analyzing the benefits of this work, it is important to ask who would be using it. Ostensibly, only researchers and graduate students would have need of such a specialized work and it is quite imaginable that unless one has a sizable Classics department at one’s institution, the work would most likely gather dust as its multivolume
nature and Latinate definitions make the work ill-suited for everyday use except at the highest levels of scholarship.

*Words* by William Whitaker. Available via the Notre Dame Archives website at [http://lysy2.archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/words.exe](http://lysy2.archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/words.exe)

*Words* is perhaps the most unlikely Latin dictionary under critique—unlikely in that it is the work of one man: William Whittaker. Whittaker, who passed away in 2010, was not even a professional Classicist, but rather an amateur enthusiast who had excellent skills in computer programming honed while working at DARPA as an Air Force Colonel (*Midland-Reporter Telegram*, 2010).

Whittaker’s dictionary was an ongoing project from 1993 until his death; Notre Dame now hosts an online version of the freeware program he created. The program is still available in a downloadable format from Whittaker’s website—a format that allows it to run without internet access in a format the same as that available online. Beginning with a 5,000 word list based off an elementary Latin course word list, Whittaker grew his corpus to over 39,000 words—the *OLD* only has around 35,000. Yet, Whittaker was somewhat mysterious about the source of his words, never clarifying if definitions were borrowed from other works or whence his research came. Although, he does claim to have checked the entries against the *OLD* and found the definitions to be serviceable.

The most striking characteristic one notes when navigating to Notre Dame’s version of *Words* is the simplicity of the site. Users are simply asked to “Input Latin and press Enter.” Unlike paper dictionaries, which require the user to ascertain the dictionary form of the word he or she wishes to know, often with much grammatical wrangling and some
trial and error, *Words* allows the user to enter any word in any grammatical form.

Entering the word *monere* retrieves the result seen in Figure 5. Note that entry shows both a definition as well as three lines at the beginning of the entry that show the possible grammatical forms of the word under consideration. The second notable feature of the page layout is the simplicity and fact this particular online dictionary shows the word on its own page without any navigation to skip to the next or previous entry. This makes for a very clean user experience where the user is able to see exactly what he or she wanted, but it also removes the ability of the user to see nearby words in the dictionary.

Additionally, it removes the requirement of the student to parse the word grammatically, allowing the student to be unfamiliar with grammar and overly reliant on the word study tool.

```
monere  V  2 1 PRES ACTIVE INF 0 X
monere  V  2 1 PRES PASSIVE IND 2 S
monere  V  2 1 PRES PASSIVE IMP 2 S
monoe, monere, monai, monitus V [XXXAX]
remind, advise, warn; teach; admonish; foretell, preage:
```

*Figure 5: Search results in Whittaker’s Words*

Some characteristics do, however, limit the accessibility of even simple entries like those in *Words*. Note that while the display is quite simple, that abbreviations are employed quite heavily, though they are given in the user notes on Notre Dame’s and Whittaker’s website both. While many students will be able to discern the meanings of the various numbers and abbreviations, many new students could have difficulty reading an abbreviated entry. Note too, the shortness of the entry. Whittaker has opted to make
entries as short as possible with only the most basic grammatical information presented and the definitions given pride of place.

Whittaker intended for the range of vocabulary in *Words* to encompass a greater date range than the *OLD* as shown by his references to searching Medieval Latin in the program. Whittaker is also proud of some of the achievements of the range of vocabulary in *Words*. He notes that the dictionary achieved a 99% success rate in Caesar, i.e. if one were to input any word from all of Caesar’s writings in the dictionary, one could expect a positive return from the dictionary on that word 99% of the time. While on other authors, Whittaker noted that returns fell to 94% to 97%. A number Whittaker felt was far too low as users tend to search obscure words, rather than common words. Yet, for the purpose of a learner, the ability to search even common words is a valuable asset (Statistical Information Retrieved from *Words* user information document).

Word formation in *Words* is bare-bones. As one can see from the results presented in the Figure, one is presented with only the word for which one searched. Similarly, definitions and sense-divisions are bare-bones as well. Note the very simple definition given for *monere* as compared to some of the previous definitions, which ran much longer. Note as well that sense divisions are made through the use of semicolons, though no effort is made to show the relation, if any, between these divisions. The use of a simplified system such as this poses many risk, among them giving the illusory image that the definitions are all equally valid in all situations—note the definition for *monere* “foretell, presage” which is given a note for being peculiar in *Cassell’s*. Gone, as well, are the encyclopedic definitions of some of the other dictionaries. Searches for *lictor* and *censor*, both magisterial positions, returned short definitions. Only a search for *consul*
turned up a slightly encyclopedic definition, “(highest elected Roman official – 2/year).” While the first part of the definition is true, the brevity of the section portion leads to a certain amount of confusion—are there two per year? Were they elected twice per year? Did they serve consecutively?

Though there are considerable shortfalls in the area of defining, homographs are handled in a very useful manner. Take for instance the Latin word *beta* which can mean both beet or the Greek letter β. A search for the word returns the result seen in Figure 6; note that the search retrieved both homographs for the word *beta* and displayed though there is no separation between the definitions, which could lead to confusion over the definitions being from the same entry. This feature of *Words* is very valuable in that if a student were to find a word that confuses him or her, the student could then ascertain all possible definitions and use context skills to choose the best fit.

Figure 6: Search results for “*beta*” in *Words*

Pronunciation is not covered at all in *Words*, making this particular dictionary a very poor choice for any student wishing to study poetry or scan lines in Latin.
The presentation of grammar in Words is interesting as was previously noted a student finds the exact grammatical characteristics of any form of a Latin word by entering it into the search engine—though the student would have to be familiar with the abbreviations presented to understand the grammatical parts. At the same time, Words expects a baseline understanding of Latin grammar from its users as only peculiar grammatical characteristics of words are noted. Take for instance the case of the verb *imperare*. The word, unlike ‘normal’ Latin verbs can take a grammatical case known as the dative, whereas most Latin verbs take the case known as accusative. Whittaker notes this in the definition by adding (W/DAT) at the end of the sense. Again, due to the brevity of the definitions, the note could be misunderstood or even go completely unnoticed by the user.

Interestingly, Whittaker sporadically uses usage notes for words. Among those that show up with regular frequency are “Early,” “Late,” “Medieval,” “Rude,” and “Uncommon.” Though sometimes these notes were unused, as is the case with *pedicare*, which lacks a note for rude. While the notes are helpful, they should be taken with a certain amount of trepidation as to their accuracy.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of Words is its lack of any examples. Unlike every Latin dictionary under appraisal, Words lack even a single example illustrating the use of the word. While there are a great many reasons for this, considering it is the work of but one man, it is nevertheless a major fault and cripples the dictionary for all but the most basic uses in Latin pedagogy. So much of Latin textual criticism, even for well-adapted secondary students, is an understanding of how words were used by authors and how the
author under consideration is using the same word in the same, or a slightly different manner.

A surprising feature of *Words*, is that words with a Greek origin are shown with the note “(Greek).” Though, unlike the other dictionaries considered, *Words* does not show the word from which the Latinate form derives its origin.

Though already mentioned, the special features of *Words* are the morphological grammar analyzer previously mentioned and an English to Latin feature that could prove useful on some exercises that secondary students and early post-secondary students.

As previously noted, taboo words are presented in Whittaker’s *Words* and given the most blunt and straight-forward treatment of any dictionary under consideration. These words are sometimes noted as rude, as is the case with *irrumare* but not the case with *pedicare*. This brings about an interesting set of characteristics where *Words* is wildly inappropriate for use by upper level post-secondary students and graduate students, but has the clearest definitions of any dictionary they might encounter. Similarly, the younger students and early undergraduates likely to use this work will have free access to these terms.

Being free, suggesting *Words* as a useful resource for Classicists seems highly appealing. Some have suggested that such electronic glossing and dictionary tools may actually help with word acquisition (Ring, 2009). Yet, one should be quite careful when considering suggesting this dictionary to students; while it provides a tool for analyzing texts, one can question the amount of the work that the computer does for the student. The ability to parse the grammar of Latin is an important skill for any Classicist wishing to read the language rather than simply input it in a computer. While students should be
encouraged to parse very difficult sentences, a word of caution should be given that students not become reliant on a system that does the grammar for them. Another major concern with Words is the lack of scholarly emphasis that the work has. While the dictionary is fantastic for grabbing a quick definition, it lacks a survey of who used the word and in what manner he or she used it. Serious students would be wise to use Words in conjunction with another of the dictionaries under consideration.

Perseus Digital Library’s Online Version of A Latin Dictionary by Charlton Lewis and Charles Short. Available at


Perseus, as this particular interface is often known by Classicists, is notable as it is a website-based platform for accessing the exact same Lewis and Short that was analyzed previously. Thus, in terms of content, most of what was said still stands as does Jenkins’ assertion that the work is best used with a modicum of caution.

Perhaps Perseus’ most notable feature, other than it being digital, is its lack of a price tag. Perseus is entirely free and easy to access from a Google search or through the URL above. Gone are the somewhat packed pages of Lewis and Short, replaced with rich text displays complete with hyperlinks.

The user’s experience with Perseus begins with a search interface that looks like that shown in Figure 7. While not as clear in its purpose as Words, Perseus simply has a search box with a drop-down menu from which the user can “Get info for” a search
phrase. Note that Perseus encompasses a large number of materials and the drop-down menu allows for the searching of other languages like Arabic, Greek, and Old Norse.

Much like Words, Perseus allows the user to enter a Latin word and it will retrieve all grammatical possibilities for that word along with a dictionary definition. Perseus, however, is more robust than Words in that it gives you the option of looking at a dictionary entry from Lewis and Short in addition to a simplified definition on the search screen.

![Figure 7: Search Interface, Perseus Latin Dictionary](image)

When one searches the verb *monere* one is given the results shown in Figure 8. The page layout is a good deal more pleasant than that the search results from Words. Note as well that different entries are delineated by a box around them. Perseus also has at its heart the entire corpus of Lewis and Short, making it somewhat more robust in its number of definitions than Words. Note that the search for *monere* retrieved *moneris* as well as the *monere* could be both words in some grammatical contexts. Definitions at the
outset are truncated, like those in *Words*. Yet the user can select a hyperlink to show the entry in *Lewis and Short*.

![Figure 8: Perseus Search Results, “monere”](image)

Selecting this option presents the user with the complete text of the *Lewis and Short* entry of the word as shown in Figure 9. Note that the entry contains a plethora of hyperlinks; these hyperlinks allow the user to jump to the definition of a word he or she is not familiar with within the examples, or, in the case of citations, to go the library’s version of the text in the exact spot the word is used. Thus, examples are greatly improved upon as the user can find the context in which the word was used in the text itself.
Users also have the option of opening the entry in a new window, which brings up the interface shown in Figure 10. Though this version of the entry contains the same interface as the previous page, the user now has the ability to see a list of examples on the right hand side with easily accessible hyperlinks as well as the ability to select words from the dictionary around the word chosen, as shown in Figure 10.
Perseus is notable in that it brings together the scholarly acumen inherent in *Lewis and Short*, and combines it with the features of *Words* that make it attractive to learners.

While students are given a morphological analysis tool like that of Whittaker’s *Words* they are then given the option of seeing citations for the definition as well as a list of authors who used the work. While the same words of caution concerning students’ reliance on grammar tools still stand, the ability to analyze citations and so easily access works that use the word under consideration make Perseus a valuable tool. At the same time, an information professional should note that that Perseus provides the entirety of *Lewis and Short* in a digital format free of charge.
Chapter V: Conclusion

As can be seen from the above works, there are many choices to be made by the information professional who is contemplating works to use in the reference interview or to add to a growing collection. The online resources explored are appealing on the basis of being free, but come with a nagging caveat that they could hinder the pedagogical merit of having students be abundantly familiar with grammar. Nevertheless, it seems appropriate to be able to suggest these resources for students or even, perhaps, having *Words* installed locally on computers in the information institution.

It is clear, however, that in terms of authority one should have on hand at least one of the paper dictionaries discussed no matter the level of Latin being taught. Secondary school professionals will want to consider having *Cassell’s* on hand and most likely a copy of the *OLD* should the budget allow it as at the very least the instructor could consult the work for questions he or she may have concerning texts being taught. Post-secondary teachers will certainly want to have at the very least a copy of the *OLD* on hand for consultation by undergraduates, graduates, and faculty as the work has wide-ranging appeal. At the same time, considering *Cassell’s* for lower level undergraduates as well as a paper copy of *Lewis and Short* for the purposes of backup is advisable as well. Yet, the omnipresent specter of budget constraint lingers and the information professional will have to weigh the options presented carefully. Of course, for those for whom money is no object, the *TLL* is sure to be a gift to the Classics Department at your college or university.
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