

2. Latin from A to P: The *TLL* in the 20th Century

GREGORY HAYS

University of Virginia

AFTER MORE THAN A CENTURY, the basic look of the *TLL*, with its two eighty-four line columns per page, remains reassuringly familiar. Yet this superficial continuity masks real changes, not least in the basic corpus of material. Obviously the Thesaurus reflects the discovery of new texts. Some of these, like the new Gallus, are familiar to almost any classicist. Others may be more familiar to specialists, especially students of late antiquity: new letters and sermons of Augustine, new passages of Rutilius Namatianus's *De reditu suo* and Tiberius Claudius Donatus's commentary on the *Aeneid*, portions of a gospel epic by one Severus, the "Appendix Maximiana."¹ And to these literary texts must be added the constant stream of newly published inscriptions, bringing with them new senses, new constructions, new spellings.

On the flip side, the *TLL*'s corpus has also grown smaller. Users of the 1990 Index are familiar with the annotations *non iam affertur* and its even more disapproving cousin, *nunc spernimus*. Most often the work has been dropped because a reattribution or redating pushes it beyond the *TLL*'s terminus of 600 c.e. But other cases are more curious (for additional instances see Krömer 2003). The 1990 Index still includes a text it refers to as "Epist. Vinisii." This is a brief text published by Nicholson in 1904, a letter from a fourth-century bishop in Roman Britain warning a parishioner against an Arian rival, a certain Biliconus. Or so it was believed. A little over ten years ago, Roger Tomlin showed, in perhaps the wittiest article ever published in *ZPE*, that this text is in fact an ordinary curse tablet, one of scores or hundreds that survive from the sacred spring in Bath. The saintly "Bishop Vinisius," his correspondent "Nigra," and the dastardly "Biliconus" existed only in the first editor's fantasy; it did not help that he was trying to read the tablet upside down.

Less obtrusive—but far more important in the aggregate—are incremental improvements in familiar texts. New commentaries and other works have

¹ See the useful appraisal by Dolbeau 1998–99.

improved the handling of specific passages and terms. New editions, built on a sounder manuscript basis, often clear up difficulties or eliminate bogus readings. Yet there is still much work to be done here, especially among later and vulgar texts. To cite one example, *TLL* VI.1.1172.59 includes a brief article for *fortiusculus*, a word attested only in Fulgentius the Mythographer. The Thesaurus slips are based on the only critical edition of Fulgentius, the 1898 Teubner edition by Rudolf Helm, who printed *fortiuscula* on the strength of two ninth-century manuscripts, R and H (only one of which he had himself collated). In the course of preparing a new edition of Fulgentius, I have recollated Helm's manuscripts as well as a number of others, and I can report that R and H, like all the others, have *fortiuncula*. *Fortiusculus* is a ghost-word, which should be removed both from the text of Fulgentius and from the *TLL*. The Thesaurus, like the rest of us, is at the mercy of the available editions, and it is chastening to realize that a Thesaurist today, armed with the latest in digital technology, would still make exactly the same error.

If the material has undergone changes, so too (and to a far greater degree) has the Thesaurus's handling of it. Many characteristic *TLL* features took time to reach their current form: the introductory "Kopf," with data on etymology, orthography, etc.; the hierarchical subdivisions; the complex systems of parentheses and brackets; the laconic break-offs *al.* and *et saepe*. Even the twin organizing principles of chronological development and "exclusive opposition" were not present from the outset. Here the differences between the opening volumes (A–B) and those that follow are perhaps the most marked. At first glance, the earliest articles are little more than vessels into which citations have been poured; finer distinctions are sometimes made, but rarely signaled explicitly. In the volumes for C and D one can observe a development toward the precision and articulation of classic articles like Eduard Fraenkel's *fides*. Succeeding volumes (e.g. G–M) represent what one might think of as the Thesaurus's classical period. The most recent volumes (O and the now nearly complete P) seem to me to show a heightened sensitivity to nuance and ambiguity that may reflect trends in literary interpretation more generally. While retaining the strict either/or categorization of earlier volumes, recent article-writers are freer with cross-references, more alert to borderline cases, quicker to confess hesitation or uncertainty.

To illustrate these changes, I shall compare three articles, one early, one fairly recent, and one somewhere in the middle. Every word presents its own problems (as the Thesaurist quickly learns), but I have tried to pick three words with a similar semantic range and of roughly comparable frequency. As an appendix I include the basic *dispositio* for each of these words (essentially the article with the citations removed).

The earliest of these is Alfred Klotz's *artifex*, published in 1906. Regular TLL users will note that some of the basic divisions are already present, in particular the distinction between words used *proprie* and those used *translate*. The distinction between substantival and adjectival uses is an obviously sensible one, deployed again with *faber*, and also, in a more nuanced form, in *opifex*. But, beyond that, the criteria of organization start to get a little fuzzy. IA1 begins with some generic references, closing with a group of inscriptions. There follow a few citations in which the *artifex* is contrasted with the *indoctus*. This section closes with an inscription singled out as a *notabile elogium*: why it is *notabile* is not explained. The next column and a half (roughly a quarter of the article) is devoted to a listing of various practitioners who may be described as an *artifex*, each group comprising up to a dozen citations. These groups are ordered not logically or chronologically, but alphabetically (from *aerarii* to *vitrarii*). In some cases the author marks off groupings with an italicized heading (*de agricola*, *de agrimensore*, etc.). Other groups are articulated only by a space before and after, and only the spacing-out of the relevant word in the citation makes clear why these citations have been lumped together.

Now this is not in principle a silly way to organize this material. It has the merit of straightforwardness, and it answers fairly clearly one question a reader might have: for what occupations the word *artifex* is attested. But it also has some obvious disadvantages. One has to read through the whole section to make sure that a given occupation is not lurking under a closely related heading (and in fact some relevant citations appear elsewhere in the article). It also ignores some real distinctions that emerge even from a cursory reading: the *artifex* who makes something (like a ropemaker) vs. the *artifex* who exercises a skill (like a charioteer or surveyor); the *artifex* whose *ars* involves material things (a potter, say) vs. the *artifex* who works with words (like a poet or orator). The penultimate item in the list seems to me especially problematic. The Stoic sage, according to Seneca, ought to be an *artifex vitae* (or, as they say in Munich, a *Lebenskünstler*). But is life really an "art" in the same sense that glassblowing is? Seneca would no doubt say yes, but I am not sure the lexicographer is obligated to follow him.

Finally, a few of Klotz's comments show a certain unwillingness to be troubled by minutiae. A note following B4 tells us that some of the citations above might also fit under II, but does not indicate which, or give an example. Under IIB we're told that the adjective "here and there" means something like "artificial." But, again: no details.

My second example, Günther Jachmann's *faber*, appeared only a few years later, in 1913. The word has a more restricted range than *artifex*, and the article is correspondingly shorter. But this only underlines the increasing degree of

subordination in the *dispositio*. Formally Jachmann operates with only two levels of distinction (Roman numeral and capital letter), but below his A and B he is clearly operating with at least two and perhaps three more levels, even if they are not officially marked as such. One might quibble with the threefold division, *generatim*, *speciatim* and *translate*. I think a more recent author would be inclined to put I and II together as *proprie* in contrast to III, *translate*, and then distinguish between *generatim* and *speciatim* within that larger category; but this is more a gain in logic than in clarity.

A second feature worth noting is the diminished role that syntactic features play in the *dispositio*; contrast *artifex* IB or IIA. This probably reflects not so much a different lexicographical philosophy as simply a difference in the usage of the two words. My own impression is that syntax continues to play a significant role in the structure of articles well into what I have called the “classical” phase. Perhaps more noteworthy in *faber* are headings that suggest a greater interpretative nuance, with comments like *in imagine* (twice) or *subeunte notione*.

My third example, published in 1976, is *opifex*, by Hugo Beikircher, the current Editor-in-Chief of the Thesaurus. The semantic range of the word (from the humble craftsman to the cosmic creator) puts it closer to *artifex* than to *faber*, and the contrast with the *dispositio* of *artifex* is obvious. Beikircher’s article, though less than half the length of *artifex*, has a *dispositio* almost twice as long and considerably more complex: five levels, all the way down to α and β . The division between substantive and adjective that we observed with *artifex* and *faber* is still present, but it is not phrased in quite that way. On the one hand (Section I) we have *opifex* alone or as an appositive with “purely explicative force”; on the other hand (Section II) we have *opifex* in conjunction with another substantive “so that it tends more or less toward adjectival force.” This may be less forthright than the simple *substantivum/adiectivum* distinction we saw with *artifex* and *faber*, but it is probably truer to the actual phenomenon.

This sensitivity to blurry areas reappears in other formulations: *sublucente vi strictiore*; *praevalente notione*, etc. A related phenomenon is the punctilious accuracy about exceptions and borderline cases. In IB1b, *de rebus*, the *res* in question are incorporeal—with the exception of a citation from Apuleius, who rather preciously describes the sun as the *artifex* of the day. The section *de deo* includes two figures (Prometheus and the devil) who are not, strictly speaking, gods, but clearly belong here. In discussing *artifex* I had complained that different sorts of *artes* were lumped together indiscriminately; here we have a distinction between the rude mechanical trades (*artibus sordidioribus et vulgaribus*) and the fine (or at least finer) arts (*de pictoribus, sculptoribus*,

architectis, sim.). Note also the reference to *opifex* as a rendering of Greek δημιουργός *nisi aliud notatur*: while one finds references to Greek sources in early volumes, careful tracking of these correspondences is especially prominent in the most recent volumes.

Once more, and to an even greater degree than with *faber*, the *dispositio* is built around semantic distinctions. Syntax has not fallen by the wayside, but it does not govern large portions of the *dispositio*, as it did with *artifex*; here, if it features in the hierarchy at all, it is at the very lowest level (as in IIA1α); more often it is dealt with parenthetically, as in IB or IA1αβ. Noteworthy also is the greater number of cross-references. That recent articles have more of these than early ones is only natural, since more of the *TLL* is available for cross-referencing. But we also see an increase in cross-references *within* a given article. Here, for example, a brief section IA2 is devoted to the hornet (*crabro*) as *opifex*; a parenthetical note refers us to citations further down that apply the term to bees.

In looking at a sequence of articles like this, it is difficult to avoid speaking in teleological terms, of presenting the last century as a story of progressive improvement in lexicographical technique, from the crudeness of *agrestis* to the perfection of *perfectio*. But it is important to realize that the approach that underlies *opifex* is only one approach, and, like all approaches, it involves trade-offs on several levels. If I am looking for parallels for a particular shade of meaning, the O and P volumes are very helpful. When I am trying to establish whether a particular word ever governs the dative, I often find that earlier volumes get me where I am going more quickly. There are also practical questions that can be asked: the formal scrupulousness of the last several volumes is not the only, or the main, cause of the *TLL*'s slow progress; even so, some might be prepared to trade an imperfect *opifex* for a pretty good *sapientia* or *sollicitudo* in our lifetimes.

WORKS CITED

- Dolbeau, F. 1998–99. “Découvertes récentes d’oeuvres latines inconnues (fin IIIe-début VIIIe s.)” *Sacris Erudiri* 38: 101–42.
- Krömer, D. 2003. “Don’t Trust the Label: Zur Datierung lateinischer Texte.” In H. Solin, M. Leiwo and H. Halla-aho. Eds. *Latin vulgare—latin tardif 6. Actes du VIe colloque international sur le latin vulgare et tardif, Helsinki, 29 août-2 septembre 2000*. Hildesheim: Olms. 183–89.
- Nicholson, E. W. B. 1904. ‘*Vinisius to Nigra*’: *A 4th Cent. Christian Letter Written in South Britain and Discovered at Bath*. London: Henry Frowde.
- Tomlin, R. S. O. 1994. “*Vinisius to Nigra*: Evidence from Oxford of Christianity in Roman Britain.” *ZPE* 100: 93–108.

APPENDIX

artifex (A. Klotz, *TLL* II.696.42–702.82 = 544 lines)

I. Substantivum

A. proprie

1. generaliter qui quamlibet artem exercet

opponitur artifex indocto

notabile elogium

[aerarius] de agricola de agrimensore [antiquarius]
 [aquariae rei] de architecto [armorum] de aucupe de
 auriga [auri] [carpentarius] [claustrarius] [faber] [ferri]
 [gladiatorum] de grammaticae auctore [horologii] [lanaria]
 [lignorum] de magis de medicis [metallici] [Minervae]
 [militiae] [monetae] [organa] de oratore, sim. [palaestritae]
 de poeta artis auctore [quadratarii] de scaenicis artificibus
 [sellularii] de tonsore de topiario de eo qui tormenta vel
 fabricat vel curat [vitae] [vitri]

2. qui summis artibus operam dant

3. de deo sive natura mundum fabricantibus

B. translate: qui alicuius rei praecipue gnarus est vel aliqua re callet vel qui aliquid commisit

1. absolute

2. cum gen.

3. cum praep.

4 cum infinitivo.

nota: possunt quaedam ex iis quae sub 2.3.4. dedimus etiam ad adiectivam vim vocis pertinere.

II. Adiectivum

A. active i.q. peritus, sollers

1. absolute

2. cum gen.

3. cum 'ad'

B. quasi passive: quod ad artificem redit, artificis manum prae se fert, hic illic fere i.q. arte factus, artificiosus

faber (G. Jachmann, *TLL* VI.1.7.54–12.5 = 371 lines)

substantivum:

I. generatim: quilibet artifex qui materiam duram (velut metalla ligna lapides ebur) tractat

A. solum ponitur

notabilia quaedam ad rem spectantia

fabri servi, pars familiae
collegia, corpora, sim. fabrum
iunguntur vel opponuntur fabri aliis artificibus
in copiosa artificum enumeratione nominantur
fabri
nominantur fabri inter homines pauperes,
ignobiles, infimos
in proverbio
in imagine
adde subeunte notione sollertis, vafri

B. accedit genitivus:

rei quam faber comparat
in imagine

materiae in qua faber operam collocat

C. genus fabrorum epithetis distinguitur

II. speciatim: in exercitu

III. translate:

nomen piscis

fort. nomen herbae chelidonium?

adiectivum:

1. de rebus

a. i.q. ad fabrum pertinens

b. i.q. scite perfectus, excogitatus

2. de homine, acced. 'in'

adv. fabre

1. i.q. scite, sollerter, facete

2. i.q. dextre, eleganter, apte, convenienter
cum adiectivo
accedit 'ad'

opifex (H. Beikircher, TLL IX.2.703.37–705.79 = 211 lines)

i. qui opus facit, conficit:

I. ponitur solum vel in appos. mere explicativa (imprimis iuxta nom. propr. e.g. p. 704.35)

A. strictius significat animantes, qui victus quaerendi causa artem quandam exercent

1. homines (comparationes cum deo, natura v. p. 704.64)

a. de iis qui in artibus sordidioribus et vulgaribus versantur (saepius cum colore contemptus)

α. in universum

β. indicatur ars vel condicio -is (per gen., adi. necnon subst. appos.)

- b. de pictoribus, sculptoribus, architectis sim.
 - 2. crabrones (cf. II B 1)
 - B. laxius significat auctorem cuiuslibet operis (huc spectare videtur NON. p. 457.24 . . . ; accedit gen. passim, inf. PERS.)
 - 1. in universum
 - a. de hominibus (anima PRVD.)
 - b. de rebus (sc. incorporalibus praeter APVL.; per prosopopoeiam PRVD.)
 - c. in sententiis generalibus (neglegitur, quis sit -x)
 - quasi proverbialiter
 - 2. de deo, natura sim. (de Prometheo CLAVD., de diabolo p. 705. 22; ceterum cum -e comparatur natura [exx.], deus [exx.]
 - a. respicitur creatio mundi et hominis sim. (tam apud paganos quam apud Christianos, deest apud TERT. [v. Braun, *Deus Christianorum* 380 sq.] et in VVLG. [in Itala semel invenimus]; gr. resp. δημιουργός nisi aliud notatur)
 - sim. de conditore civitatis caelestis
 - b. transfertur ad auctorem variarum rerum et actionum
 - sublucente vi strictiore
- II. determinat alia subst. unde vergit plus minusve in vim adi. (iuxta alia adi.: HOR., PLIN., MACR. infra sub B, CHALC. l. 37, CLAVD. MAM.; circumscribitur compar. VARRO l. 66; appos. explic. v. sub I)
 - A. attributive
 - 1. praevalente notione auctoris
 - a. spectat ad deum vel naturam
 - α. deus -x:
 - accedit gen.
 - sine gen.
 - β. aliae iuncturae
 - b. de rebus variis
 - 2. praevalente notione operarii
 - a. de apibus (cf. B 1)
 - b. de hominibus (aliter p. 703.81)
 - c. de instrumento
 - B. praedictive
 - 1. de apibus fere i.q. operosus, laboriosus (cf. A 2 a et I A 2)
 - 2. de homine
 - 3. de rebus