

REVIEW ARTICLE

LATIN TERMS IN GREEK: A DISCUSSION*

Study of the means used to express in Greek the vocabulary of Roman institutions and, in general, study of the penetration of Latin words into the Greek language are topics which, on the basis of the abundant material now available, could yield to careful and systematic investigation results of great interest. The direction in which such study should be pursued was indicated by J. and L. Robert in *Bulletin épigraphique* (1948), no. 26, who preferred to a mechanical list of Latin words in Greek the plan of D. Magie's *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis* (Leipzig, 1905; repr. Aalen, 1973): "le plan même d'un ouvrage comme celui de Magie est d'ailleurs plus favorable à l'étude de ce qu'il importe, en définitive, d'étudier: la romanisation des pays grecs. Il ne suffit pas de dresser des listes de mots latins transcrits en grec. . . . Ainsi, on ne fait vraiment l'histoire de la pénétration de *veteranus* en grec que si, en même temps que les exemples de *οὐετρανός*, on recherche les cas où l'on a traduit, et non pas transcrit, *veteranus*, en employant un mot tel que *παλαιστρατιώτης*; l'histoire de *μακελλάριος* n'est complète qu'avec celle de *μάγειρος*; et ainsi de suite. Et ces études de vocabulaire ne peuvent se séparer de l'étude des inscriptions bilingues et des causes de la répartition, dans un même endroit, des inscriptions latines et grecques, selon la chronologie et le caractère de l'inscription."

Now there has appeared a new work on this subject: Hugh J. Mason's *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*. In his preface (p. ix) Mason states, "My interest in this study is in the Greek words themselves, and it is for this reason that the core of the work is a Greek-to-Latin lexicon." After an introduction (13 pages) consisting of rapid discussions, notably of abbreviation, geographical variation, changes in time, and individualisms, the Greek-to-Latin lexicon occupies pages 19–100. It is followed by a "Discussion of Selected Terms" on pages 103–171, which is divided into 22 sections containing examinations in greater detail, utilizing more numerous attestations than those cited in the lexicon, of such terms as *αὐτοκράτωρ*, *ἐπαρχεία*, *κολωνία*, *πρεσβευτής*, etc. The book ends with a "Latin-to-Greek Reverse Index" which rejoins the plan of Magie's monograph: here s.v. *veteranus* the reader can find a list of the various Greek equivalents, nouns (both transcription and translation) and participles, for which attestations are cited in the lexicon. (Magie's lexicon on the other hand proceeded from Latin to Greek and was arranged not alphabetically but according to categories, so that in the section *Res militares* all relevant Greek terms known to him were registered s.v. *veteranus*.)

A work thus conceived, utilizing the wealth of epigraphic and papyrological documentation that has appeared since the date of Magie's study, could serve as an excellent base for the type of investigation outlined by the Roberts. Unfortunately Mason's lexicon, which he considered "the core of the work," because of errors of

* *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*. By HUGH J. MASON. American Studies in Papyrology, vol. 13. Toronto: Hakkert, 1974. Pp. xxiii + 207.

method in its conception and negligence in its composition, is inadequate for such a purpose and is generally unreliable as a tool for research.

First of all it should be evident to any editor of a dictionary that attestations must be listed for each sense in chronological order. That this is not the case here may be demonstrated by an examination of each of the four texts quoted s.v. *κράτους imperium principis*. The first is an inscription of Gerasa for which Mason gives the reference "SEG 7.589" and the date "184 p.": the reference is false, but this is of no importance since the text has been republished by C. B. Welles in his corpus of that city (C. H. Kraeling et al., *Gerasa: City of the Decapolis* [New Haven, 1938], pp. 406-7, no. 69). In fact *SEG* dates this text "a. 190 p." (Welles prefers 191); the source of error in Mason's date is the commentary to the edition of this text which appeared in *IG Rom.* 3. 1357 (not cited by Mason) "post annum 184, ante annum 193." The second text is quoted from "*IG Rom.* 1.1509 (Gortyna, III)" but was republished in the corpus of Crete by M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1950), no. 300, where the inscription is dated between A.D. 180 and shortly after 182; no date is assigned to this document in *IG Rom.*, so that Mason, left to his own devices, chooses the wrong century. The third text is quoted from "*BGU* 362.III.25 (Sept. Sev.)," but, in the passage cited, U. Wilcken indicated precisely the date "26 Jan. 215": since Septimius Severus died in 211, the reign is that of Caracalla. No date is given by Mason for the last document quoted: upon verification one is surprised to find that this papyrus, listed in the lexicon after texts of the second and third centuries after Christ, was written in 8 B.C. Another example of this neglect of chronology is furnished by the entry s.v. *πραιπόσιτος*, where the texts are listed in the following order: "temp. Gordianorum"; "temp. Caracallae"; reign of Septimius Severus (precisely 209-211); reign of Trajan (precisely the first half of 117)!

Next, it is important that a lexicon cite the earliest known occurrence of each term: this would furnish the essential basis for study of the penetration of Latin words and Roman institutions into the Greek world, and indeed for philological study in general. But here too this work is unreliable: for instance s.v. *σαλάριον* are cited an inscription at Ephesus "temp. Commodi," a passage from the *Digest*, and two Christian authors; but earlier than all of these is a decree published by O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia* (Berlin, 1900), p. 105, no. 116 (inscribed under Hadrian), and LSJ cites s.v. a papyrus containing a decree of Oxyrhynchus under Antoninus Pius.

In the third place, it is elementary that care must be exercised to insure that citations are correct. Unfortunately, this principle is very often disregarded in the lexicon: for example, the first text cited s.v. *σιγγουλάρις* mentions a *στρατιώτην πρίγκιπα*, but one is astonished to find the same document quoted s.v. *πριγκιπάλις*; upon verification one finds that the edition cited has in fact *πριγκιπᾶ[λις]*, a certain restoration after the copy of Schönborn in *CIG*. S.v. *ἐπιμελητής* the first citation is "Sherk 55," by which is meant not the work listed under "Sherk" in Mason's table of abbreviations on page xv and again in his bibliography on page xxii, that scholar's *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore, 1969), but rather the monograph *Legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian* (Diss. Johns Hopkins; Baltimore, 1952), of which Mason nowhere gives the title even in an abbreviated form, thus leaving the nonspecialist completely at sea. (The second

citation for ἐπιμελητής is a document from "Acmona Phrygiae," but the name of that city, of which I shall publish the epigraphic corpus, is Akmonia.) For the first citation Mason gives the vague indication of date "II," i.e., second century after Christ; s.v. στρατηλάτης the same inscription is quoted from E. M. Smallwood's compilation, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge, 1966), with the date "temp. Traiani." In fact this text is to be cited in the edition by Chr. Habicht, *Pergamon*, vol. 8.3: *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin, 1969), no. 21, where it is dated (pp. 50 and 53) precisely to the first half of A.D. 117 (s.v. χάραγμα Mason does attempt to cite the edition of Habicht for this inscription, but his reference is false).

Historical geography is treated with the same neglect. Thus s.v. τιμάω *donare* (*don. mil.*) the first reference is "IG Rom. 3.398 (Lycia)": although in the edition cited this text is located "non longe a Kestel" and stands between inscriptions of Cremna (no. 396) and Comama (no. 399), Mason was misled by the fact that this page of *IG Rom.* is headed "Lycia et Pamphylia"—of course these cities are in Pisidia, and the plain south of Lake Kestel belonged to the Roman colony of Comama (cf. B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* [Oxford, 1967], p. 51), a fact not without relevance to the occurrence here of this phrase. Among the references cited s.v. Ἀντωνιανός is "CIG 3953.1 (prope urbem cui Denizli nomen)": in fact the term appears in CIG 3953 l, lines 3–4, where the lemma states "in vico Karreeuke s. Karajukbasar, qui videtur in vicinia esse veteris Themisonii." The town of Karayükbasar was doubtless the site of Themisonion or of Eriza (L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure*² [Paris, 1962], pp. 112–13), whereas Denizli is the modern successor of Laodiceia on the Lycos.

Multiple errors arise when another text is cited s.v.v. ἑκδικος, ἐπιμελητής, εὐθηνία, σημάφορον, σιγγουλάρις with indication of provenience "Alabanda" (or "Alabandae") and reference in each entry to Dessau, *ILS*, vol. 4; this inscription is the sole attestation cited for δωρέω where it is attributed to "Caria," and is mentioned again s.v. ιππικός, this time without indication of provenience. Here we have a typical example of Mason's lack of interest in modern research and his mechanical reliance on secondary compilations: for the inscription in question was republished by L. and J. Robert in their corpus volume *La Carie* (Paris, 1954), 2: 180–81, no. 78, where it is proved that this text (now at Warsaw) belongs not to Alabanda but to Heraclea Salbake (in fact s.v. εὐθηνία Mason, repeating the attribution to Alabanda, cites both *ILS* and *La Carie*, vol. 2: it is necessary to conclude that he simply did not read the discussion to which he refers). Curiously, s.v. στέφανος *corona* (*don. mil.*) the first attestation cited is this same inscription, again with a reference to *ILS*—but here Mason attributes the document to Argos!

The restrictions on what was to be included in this lexicon are arbitrary and the criteria for selection incoherent. In his preface Mason states that "the terms discussed are primarily political. . . . Inevitably . . . legal, military, and religious terms enter the discussion; but, as far as possible, only when they impinge on public, official, life. Matters of private, civil law, technical military language such as the specialised military 'trades,' and religious terms beyond the official cults of Rome, have in general been excluded. But to a degree, the choice of terms is idiosyncratic." What institutions were more specifically Roman than Roman law, the Roman army, and Roman religion? How can a lexicon bearing the title

Greek Terms for Roman Institutions exclude on principle the words which denote institutions in these categories? It is evident that the basic guidelines of this work are faulty.

A series of examples from the area of specialized military vocabulary, "in general" excluded from the lexicon according to Mason, will show that the choice of terms is indeed idiosyncratic: thus Mason includes *σπεκουλάτωρ* but omits *σκουτάριος*, registers *νούμερος* but excludes *σχολή*, lists *στρατόπεδον* but ignores *παρεμβολή*, receives *ἐκνᾶτος* but rejects *σταβλησιανός* (at least one attestation of each of these words in LSJ); the lexicon cites *στρατηλάτης* but not *σενάτωρ* (on this military rank see Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 [1972]: 219–20) and the Latin-to-Greek index registers s.v. *imaginifer* *σεβαστοφόρος* but neither *εἰκονοφόρος* nor *ιμαγινιφόρος* (cf. Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 [1972]: 78). Mason includes *στράτωρ* but not *κιρκίτωρ*: in addition to the reference cited by the *Supplement* to LSJ, cf. *CIL* 3. 14184⁹ (*Bull. Epigr.* [1958], p. 333, no. 492), at Tyana in Cappadocia, and *IG Bulg.* 2. 530, at the source of an affluent of the River Oescus. He cites *βενεφικιάριος* but omits both Greek versions of *tubicen*, *κῆρυξ* (H. Swoboda and J. Keil, *Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien* [Brno, 1935], p. 24, no. 34: at Vasada south of Lake Beyşehir; L. Robert, *Hellenica*, vol. 13 (Paris, 1965), p. 105: in the Cillanian Plain) and *σαλπιστής* (this text is quoted by Mason himself s.v. *ἐκνᾶτος*). Here, as in other areas, the deleterious effects of the restriction announced by Mason on page x of his preface are evident: "Purely to limit the size of the work, little material has been included after Diocletian." (Surely the reason alleged for this choice is disingenuous: after all, the lexicon itself occupies exactly 81 pages!)

Other very Roman institutions, hardly mentioned by Mason, are more systematically excluded: such is the fate of the rich vocabulary of gladiators and their contests, equally neglected by the editors of the recent (1968) *Supplement* to LSJ, although the documents are readily available in the corpus by L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris, 1940) with subsequent additions in *Hellenica*. A rapid sample, *exempli gratia*, of words in this category omitted by Mason includes: *ἀρχικυνηγός* "chief of *venatores*," *θηρήτωρ* and *κυνηγός* "*venator*," *θηριομάχος* "*bestiarius*," *θρᾶξ* and *μυρμίδων* two types of gladiators, *κανσάριος* "*causarius*," *λουσάριον* "amphitheater," *πραϊκων* "herald," *πύκτης* "gladiator," *σεκουνδαρούδης* and *σουμμαρούδης* "*secunda rudis*" and "*summa rudis*," *σεκούτωρ* and *ἀκόλουθος* "*secutor*," *στάς* "*stans missus*."

A domain essential for the study of the influence exerted by Roman institutions upon Greek-speaking populations is the vocabulary designating occupations and professions; but this area is likewise subject in the lexicon to errors of omission and commission. I list some typical examples. *βουργάριος*: here Mason's reference to *SIG* is false and the text is quoted, without brackets even at the critical point, in the form it had before Rostovtzeff's decisive correction in 1918, as is made clear in the corpus edition *IG Bulg.*, vol. 3.2 (Sofia, 1964), no. 1690, not utilized in this lexicon (elsewhere the same text is cited by Mason from *IG Rom.*). *δηλάτωρ* is attested at the Roman colony of Philippi (*Bull. Epigr.* [1948], p. 165, no. 102) but omitted from this lexicon. The titles *δομestικός* and *ιλλούστριος* are likewise omitted (cf. Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 [1972]: 67–68 and 199 respectively). *είματιστής* "*vestiarius*" is also lacking: Mason's Latin-to-Greek index lists s.v. only the transcription *βεστιάριος*, but see L. and J. Robert, *La Carie*, 2:112–13. *ἐπίτροπος*

Σεβαστοῦ ἄρκης Λιουιανῆς at Thyateira is listed on page 143 among the “good examples” of “specialised procurators”: had Mason known the discussion of this office by H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1960), pp. 576–79, he would have placed it correctly in a different category, that of the “procurators of imperial estates.” ἐπουλῶν is mentioned in the Latin-to-Greek index s.v. “epulonum, VIIvir,” although the Greek lexicon registers no attestations of this form: it occurs on two inscriptions of Gortyn (*Inscriptiones Creticae* 4. 296 and 297). For κοίρανος, used in verse to designate the emperor, Mason does not know the discussion by L. Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l’Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* (Paris, 1963), pp. 391–396, citing notably epigrams of Rome and Constantinople. μάγιστερ, for which Mason cites a single, doubtful, example in a false reference (read *Bull. Epigr.* [1959], no. 453), is certainly attested in the *Supplement* to LSJ, which also registers μαγιστριανός, omitted by Mason (the latter word occurs also on an inscription of Dorylaeum, *MAMA* 5. 4). μουλίων is omitted by Mason (cf. Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 [1972]: 210). περίοδος *regio* is missing from the lexicon, although this term is cited on page 135 s.v. ἐπαρχία: cf. *Bull. Epigr.* (1971), no. 490. προμέτρης *ensor* (L. Robert, *Hellenica*, vols. 11–12 [Paris, 1960], pp. 236–37), ρεγωνάριος (*Supplement* to LSJ), and ρεφερενδάριος (*Sardis*, vol. 7.1, no. 19) are all omitted. There is confusion in the entry s.v. σεβαστοφόρος and in that s.v. στατιωνάριος, where Mason confuses the two senses, “member of a civilian association” and “military guard”; the same error is repeated s.v. στατίων (cf. Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 [1972]: 93). σκρίνια *scrinia* is omitted, cf. *TAM*, vol. 3.1, no. 657 ἐν τοῖς σκρινείοις ἀνθυπατικοῦ. ταβουλάριος *tabularius* “keeper of archives, registrar” is confused in the Latin-to-Greek index with *tabellarius* “letter-carrier, courier”; in his Greek lexicon Mason again has only a single entry, s.v. ταβελλάριος: for ταβουλάριος cf. L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. 4 (Amsterdam, 1974), p. 202, and Drew-Bear, *Glotta* 50 (1972): 94.

Clearly it would be fastidious to continue enumerating errors of this sort. To avoid them an editor must rely upon wide reading and critical judgment, and surely it is impossible to attain completeness. But whatever the level of experience and erudition at an editor’s disposal, his primary obligation to the readers who will use his lexicon is to provide them with reliable texts drawn from competent, critical editions. It is no exaggeration to state that in the present work egregious violations of this fundamental principle occur on nearly every page. Throughout his book Mason cites wherever possible the notoriously unreliable secondhand compilation *IG Rom.* in preference to standard corpora such as *TAM* (e.g., s.vv. ἀκκήσσοις, ἀλιμῆντα, δικαιοδότῃς) or *IG Bulg.* (e.g., s.vv. Ἀντωνινιανός, δέσεις, πραιτωριανός) or *IG Urbis Romae* (e.g., s.vv. διάγνωσις, εἰθηνία, στάτωρ). Likewise he cites *ILS* instead of *TAM* (e.g., s.vv. κυνδεκέμουρι, σημεία, στέφανος) and *AE* (s.v. πακτίκια) or E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (Cambridge, 1967) (s.v. θριαμβικός) instead of Habicht, *Pergamon*, vol. 8.3, etc. The results of such blind reliance upon secondary compilations demonstrate the primordial necessity, for any editor of a lexicon, of using the original sources.

An example is furnished by Mason’s dependence upon the *Sammelbuch* and *Année épigraphique* in the entry s.v. κολλήγιος, which reads in full: “collega, ὑπὲρ διασείσμου [Mason’s source has, correctly, διασεισμοῦ] . . . βο’ Ἐρμῆ κ ρ *SB* 9207 (II)” (upon verification the enigmatic *rho* is revealed to be the numeral 100)

and in the following entry, s.v. κολλητιών: "colletio (cf. p. 4 [but here this word is accentuated κολλητιών]), καὶ τῶν κ[. . . ἀ]πληστῶν *AE* 1960.231 (Lydia, 247-8 p.)." The second reference is false, since this inscription was published in 1962 (cf. *Bull. Epigr.* [1963], no. 223); more important, in *RPh* 17 (1943): 111 ff. (= *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. 1 [Amsterdam, 1969], chap. 26), L. Robert collected and explained the attestations of this word in inscriptions and papyri and discussed its etymology: had Mason consulted the article from which the text was extracted in *AE*, he would have been referred to this discussion by the commentary of P. Herrmann ad loc. Not only would this have greatly improved the entry s.v. κολλητιών, but it also would have permitted Mason to delete entirely the preceding item. For the passage cited in this papyrus was read by M. Hombert and Cl. Préaux Έρμία κολληγιώ(νι), but Robert commented "il y a une légère erreur de lecture: un *tau* pris pour un *gamma*. Le papyrus devait porter κολλητιώ(νι)." In fact the editors of *Sammelbuch* 9207 cite in the lemma for this text the article by Robert quoted here, but nevertheless they did not read it; nor did Mason consult this reference given by the work which he cited. Robert's correction was duly registered by M. Hombert's "Bulletin papyrologique" in *REG* 61 (1948): 260, but this publication was apparently not utilized by Mason. Robert points out that N. Lewis, in *CE* 29 (1954): 292, discovered another attestation of this word in a papyrus of Soknopaiou Nesos where it had been regarded by the editor as a proper name; in accordance with his normal practice Mason gives no definition for this term, but it might have interested his readers to know that Lewis concluded, "The association of κολλητιών and δεκάδραχος in *BGU* I 23 lends additional support to the prevalent view that [κολλητιώνες] were military personnel charged with police duties."

Another example of the results produced by mechanical reliance upon *IG Rom.* may be found in Mason's entry s.v. ραβδοῦχος, in which he cites the following attestation: "Σαράπιδι [Κε]ρίαλις ρ. . . *IG Rom.* 1.104 (Roma)." But in his corpus of the inscriptions of Rome, *IG Urbis Romae*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1968), no. 187, L. Moretti read an additional letter (confirmed on the photograph *ibid.*) which enabled him to restore [δεκο]υριᾶλις ραβδοῦχ[ος] *decurialis lictor*: the word δεκοιριᾶλις is absent from Mason's lexicon.

From the same city another ghost-word is registered by Mason in the following entry: "ἐπιτήδεια copiae, ταχθεῖς τῶν περὶ τὴν Φλαμινίαν ἐ. . . *IG Rom.* 1.135." It is apparent that the syntax of this locution is aberrant; upon verification one discovers that Mason suppressed the fact that the two key words depend upon modern restorations, transformed the accusative of the original document into a nominative, deleted the copulative καὶ which is inscribed upon the stone, and added *de suo* the article τῶν! In fact the edition referred to has the following text: ταχ[θέντα] καὶ περὶ τὴν Φλαμινίαν ἐπιτη[δείων]. It is strange to see ταχ[θέντα] thus construed with the genitive; but this text is again cited by Mason s.v. τάσσω to attest the sense "τάσσομαι: a (copiis) esse" (once again the restoration is not indicated as such), and on page 141 among the periphrases avoiding use of ἐπὶ to translate *ab* is listed "τάσσομαι (ἐπιτηδείων)" (this is the only example cited by Mason for this verb in such a usage). However, in a work which would have been useful to Mason also on other occasions, H.-G. Pflaum (*Carrières procuratoriennes*, 1: 475) rejected the restoration ἐπιτη[δείων] on grounds of syntax, vocabulary, and

administrative organization and replaced it with the supplement ἐπὶ τῇ[ς εἰθενίας]. This correction was naturally accepted by Moretti, *IG Urbis Romae*, vol. 1, no. 59: had Mason used this corpus in place of *IG Rom.*, all of his entries mentioned here could have been deleted (the same error appears also, without any indication that it is based upon a restoration, in Mason's entry s.v. ὀχήματα).

Another inscription from Rome is cited by this lexicon s.v. λοῦδοι with a reference to *AE* (1941), where the erroneous commentary of the first edition is reproduced: curiously, the lexicon knows this word only in the plural, but this very text attests an [ἐπὶ]τροπον λούδου ματουτείνου. This error could have been corrected had Mason known L. Robert's discussion of this document in *Hellenica*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1946), p. 122, to which reference is naturally made in the corpus edition by Moretti, *IG Urbis Romae*, vol. 2.2, no. 1060.

To these errors of conception are added errors of execution: thus Mason's practice of quoting the key word in each attestation only by its initial letter followed by three dots completely conceals orthographic variations (e.g., s.v. κοιαίστωρ and σεπτέμουρ), although such phenomena are often interesting precisely for the study of the influence exerted by Latin upon Greek. In fact Mason shows no interest in this matter: for example the lexicon quotes only the form σιγγουλάρης (better accented σιγγουλάρης, to show that this is a contraction of σιγγουλάρης), although at least four other orthographic variants are attested for this word (cf. Magie, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis* . . . , p. 137 and *IG*, vol. 10, fasc. 2.1, no. 384). Likewise the lexicon registers οὐιάτωρ but not βιάτωρ (attested at Laodiceia Combusta: *MAMA* 1. 243) and includes οὐξιλλατίων but not βιξιλατίων (cf. the *Supplement* to LSJ). Here too citation of further examples would be superfluous.

In conclusion it must be stated that this lexicon with its defects does not render entirely obsolete the work of Magie. Discussing the Greek terms for *quaestor* on page ix of his preface, Mason declares that "the critical fact is that ταμίης is the regular, 'standard' term in both inscriptions and literature, that κοιαίστωρ occurs in a few scattered inscriptions, and that ζητητής does not occur except as a gloss in a lexicon. Such information is not easy to find in Magie." In fact, on page 95 Magie lists conveniently s.v. *quaestor* numerous attestations, both epigraphic and literary, for ταμίης, three inscriptions for κοιαίστωρ, and two references (not merely "a gloss," but also John the Lydian) for ζητητής: such information is impossible to find in Mason, for the latter word is omitted from his lexicon.

THOMAS DREW-BEAR
Institut F. Courby