The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Stow Asser's *Dunkle Wöeter Dunkle Wörter*. Lexicalisches, von I. M. Stowasser. Vienna: Tempsky, 1890. (32 pages.). I Mk.

H. Nettleship

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 06 / June 1891, pp 263 - 264
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167290, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167290

How to cite this article:

H. Nettleship (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 263-264 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167290

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

called Hiberno-Saxon MS. which he gives to represent the beautiful calligraphy of our forefathers. Lastly, why should the contracted words in the dictionary of abbreviations be in facsimile of MS. writing, very poorly executed? This is one of the chief objections to Chassant's useful little book on abbreviations. The student requires to see the form of abbreviation or contraction in

clear type showing the principles followed, and he can then apply what he learns to a MS. of any age. It is causing needless trouble to make him unravel a contraction in poor facsimile of the fifteenth century in order to read it in the MS. before him which may be of any other date.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

STOWASSER'S *DUNKLE WÖRTER*.

Dunkle Wörter. Lexicalisches, von I. M. STOWASSER. Vienna: Tempsky, 1890. (32 pages.) 1 Mk.

THE difficulties of Latin etymology are so great, that any serious contribution to the subject ought to be cordially welcomed. Dr. Stowasser's little book is such a contribution. In the course of thirty-two pages he discusses, with real learning and originality, some ninety Latin words; and though in some cases he pushes his theories to the verge of paradox, in many others his views are highly plausible, if not certainly right. I will first mention some instances in which I am unable to agree with him. *Novicius* he derives not from *novus*, but from *novus* and *vicius* (*novi-vicius*, 'new to the house'). No doubt the quantity of the ante-penultimate causes a difficulty. According to analogy, as Wölflin has pointed out, the second syllable should be short, the denominative adjectives in *-icius* having as a rule a short *i*, the verbals a long one. There is however a difficulty which must be removed before Stowasser's explanation can be accepted. *Novi-vicius* should mean not 'new to the house,' but 'belonging to a new house.' *Amoenus* (pp. 4, 5) is derived from *ad*, *moenia*, *amoenus locus* being explained as = a suburban place. The word, however, is so constantly associated in usage and meaning with *amor* that it is difficult to detach it from this connexion. A base *āmū-* is required, which may perhaps, as I have elsewhere suggested, be found in the proper name *Amūlius*. When Dr. Stowasser rejects the commonly accepted derivation of *nutrix* from *nu-* to flow, and proposes to refer it to *novus* and *trī-*, comparing *παιδο-τριβεῖν*, he omits to deal with the fact that Catullus uses *nutrices* as = the breasts. *Cæremonia* from *χαίρει* and *monium* (= *munium*), 'the duty of saying Hail,' passes the limits of probability. *Cæremonia* means 'care,' 'thoughtfulness,'

and is thus sometimes in Cicero connected with *cura* (see *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, p. 398). It seems to me to be most naturally referred to *kū-* = think, *cavilla*, *cura*, *κοεῖν*, and Sanskrit *kavis*, wise. I find it difficult to accept Mr. Wharton's reference to *caedo*. That *persona* (p. 7.) should come from *per* and *ζώνη* ('Verkleidung') is against the analogy of most other words compounded with *per* in this sense, which denote action (*per-iurium*, *per-fuga*, *per-perus*, etc.). And was *ζώνη* so far domesticated in Latin as to mean clothing? *Propero* is as easily derived from *pro-paro* ('to get something out') as from *προ-φέρω* (p. 10). There is more to be said perhaps for identifying *prosperus* with *προσφερός* (p. 9.), and Dr. Stowasser has done good service by calling attention to the form *proseruari* in good manuscripts of Nonius. He objects to deriving *omen* from *os*, and proposes *obs-minari*, to threaten or pretend, from which *omen* should be a later formation. May not *omen*, however, be directly descended from *au-* to speak, and be thus connected with *au-tumo*, which modern etymologists, with no particular reason, derive from *avis*?

There are however a good many cases in which Dr. Stowasser appears to have hit the truth. *Alapa* (p. 22) he regards as Semitic (Hebrew *khelaphh* a hammer) and as thus identical with the Greek *κόλαφος*. The Semitic origin of *tunica* and *χιτών* (Aramaic *kithuna* and Hebrew *kithonet*) is excellently defended by evidence from Latin poets (p. 6); and Dr. Stowasser is quite right in insisting on the adjectival character of the form *tunica*. *Mica* has been for some time connected by etymologists with *μικρός*; Dr. Stowasser (p. 3) goes further, and makes it a borrowed word (Greek *μικρός*, *μίκης*, *μικρίζομενος*). So too with *stuprum*, which means properly a hard blow, so defeat, disgrace, shame, and is borrowed from the Greek *στυφρός* hard. (p. 8). *Tuditare* is quite right-

ly referred to *tudes tuditis*, a hammer (p. 22); not less happy is the derivation of *fundito* from *funda* through a lost *sfundare* to sling (p. 23), and of *violare* (p. 26) from *viola*, 'to make red,' so to mar or defile. *Parricidium* from a lost adjective *parrus* = 'open' (*si parret*, 'if it is clear') is a very plausible etymology (p. 19).

It would be wrong to take leave of this most interesting and suggestive essay without mentioning several excellent textual emendations proposed by its author. In the *Gromatici* p. 306. 21 *terminus coctus testacius ullageris*, *ullageris* is corrected into *vel lagenaris* (p. 3). On pp. 6 and 7 *absedet*

is restored from the MSS. to Novius ap. Nonium p. 148. 25, and *cilotrum* changed to *silotrum* = *psilotrum*. *Absedeo*, by the bye, is found in Boethius. The verse out of Plautus's *Cornicularia* quoted by Varro (*L. 7. 52*) *qui regi latrocinatus decem annos Demetrio* (*annos x* Nonius p. 134) is simply and convincingly restored *qui regi latrocinatus decimano's Demetrio* ('a first-class king.')

It is much to be hoped that Dr Stowasser will continue and extend his fruitful labours.

H. NETTLESHIP.

STUDIES BY STUEMUND'S PUPILS.

Studemund's Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins. Erster Band, Zweites Heft. (Weidmann, 1890.) 7 Mk.

THE present volume belongs to the valuable collection of papers written by members of the school of Studemund. The first part of the first volume contained *Quaestiones Metricae* by A. Luchs, *De Retractatis Fabulis Plautinis* by L. Reinhardt, *De Syntaxi Interrogationum Obliquarum* by E. Becker (the best treatise on dependent questions in old Latin). The second volume has just been published (1891). The second part of the first volume, now under review, contains treatises (i.) on the Genitive of the Latin Pronouns by A. Luchs, (ii.) on Exclamatory Particles by P. Richter.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance to the critic of such carefully sifted collections of instances as are here given to the world. They do the work of Bacon's 'tabulae instantiarum,' supplying the means by which the soundness of an emendation may be tested. If emendation is to be 'sober,' i.e. scientific, it must proceed on the basis of rigidly excluding what cannot be shown to be in accord, even in details, with the usage of the author in question; the proposers of emendations must be prepared to sacrifice what seem to them their happiest thoughts, if their conjectures can be shown not to rest on evidence—in particular the evidence of what the author himself thought fit to write in similar instances. Without this check emendation loses itself in a wide field of possibilities, and all safe ground is removed from under the feet. Working under these limitations the critic may be able to

make permanent contributions to the improvement of texts. No doubt the difficulty of his task is increased, but he has the satisfaction of knowing that he is perhaps not 'writing in sand.' 'In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister.'

The centre of Luchs' position is the doctrine that the genitives *illius, istius, ipsius*, etc. were pronounced in two ways, and two ways only, in old Latin: (i.) as palimbacchiaes (_ _), (ii.) as two syllables—*illis istis, ipsis* etc. before vowels, *illi, isti, ipsi* etc. (or perhaps *illis* etc.) before consonants. He disbelieves in a short middle syllable in old Latin; and also in the accentuation on the first and the last syllable (*illius* etc.), showing that the few passages that can be quoted (e.g. *Casina* v. 4, 16) in favour of this accentuation are by no means of unimpeachable authority. As to the scansion as two syllables, it is well known that the forms *illi, isti, ipsi*, etc. are expressly attested by Priscian (vi. 3). Luchs explains them as originating, not by analogy with the so-called 2nd declension of nouns, but by loss of the final syllable of the fuller forms *illius, istius, ipsius*, etc., the final *s* being dropped, the preceding vowel weakened to *i* and the resulting *ii* contracted to *i* (*illius, illiu, illii, illi*). One of his arguments against the analogy theory is that in that case analogy ought also to have produced datives in *o*, which however do not make their appearance until comparatively late, when the analogy of the gen. in *i* had set up association between nouns of the 2nd decl. and the pronouns in question. Incidentally Luchs denies that the genitives *equi, boni* etc. are properly locatives, and ascribes their