might differ from another, though the multitude of monads were the same in both. My conjecture is that the words ἀλλ' ἢ &c. are one of these interpolations in which the text of Aristotle has been affirmed to abound: that ἀριθμός hovers between the senses I. and II., the ordinal and the cardinal: that Aristotle means only to affirm that the ἀριθμός, the item of enumeration, no where in the sequence exhibits a different quality or quantity from the monad, the *initium numeri*, which is presented as the unit. That the word has two senses in this chapter is certain: deny it, and we have a writer who is always seen to be exact whenever he is perspicuous, affirming in express terms that there is no difference of *quantum* between one unit and more than one, and giving as his reason that there is no difference between the first unit and any succeeding unit of the collection.

My impression is that *unity* is only μονάς when it stands alone; that the things which were *monads* when they stood alone, are severally ἀριθμοὶ when they are collected; that the force of ἀριθμός soon began to partake of our modern sense of *number*, by tacit reference to the highest ἀριθμός, or *sum*; but that it never lost its full competency to convey the original notion, that of the item or unit of numeration.

III.—SOME LATIN AND GREEK ETYMOLOGIES.

BY THEODORE AUFRECHT, ESQ.

ON THE DERIVATION OF *DULCIS* AND ΓΑΥΚΥΣ, ΓΑΛΥΚΟΣ,
ΗΟΛΥΑΕΥΚΗΣ.

The affinity, and even the identity of *dulcis* (for *dulcu-i-s*) and γλυκίς are indubitable, but whether the *d* of *dulcis* or the *g* of γλυκίς must be considered the older consonant, and whether the root of these adjectives was *gluc* or *dulc*, is the subject of the following investigation. We must not be misled by a gloss of Festus in Paulus Diaconus Exc.: '*glucidatum* suave

et jucundum. Graeci etenim γλυκύν dulcem dicebant', or another mentioned by the same grammarian: '*clucidatum* dulce et suave dicebant'. For this *glucidatum*, of which *clucidatum* is a more ancient spelling, is evidently derived from the Greek γλυκίζειν. The Aeolic form δεῦκος for γλεῦκος, and the Homeric ἄδευκίς (bitter) speak in favour of the priority of the *d*. It is true that this is denied by some comparative philologists who refer to the Sanskrit *gulya*, sweetness, *gula*, raw sugar, in order to prove that the *g* is more original. But it is to be regretted that these scholars did not even know how to use rightly the dictionary of Prof. Wilson, from whom they might have learned that *gula* is a modern corruption of *guda* and *gulya* a derivative of it; and a better acquaintance with the language would have taught them, that *guda* in that meaning is originally not Sanskrit. The root of both γλυκός and *dulcis* is *ruch* for *ruk*. This verb which, in its meaning of 'to shine', appears in *lucere*, λευκός and *light* (lumen), signifies also 'to please', *videri alicui*, φαίνεσθαι τινι; and several derivatives agree in their meanings with *dulcis*, γλυκός. These are *ruchi*, flavour, relish, taste, *ruchita*, sweet, *ruchira*, pleasing, sweet, *ruchishya*, pleasing. Compare the Mahratti *ruchne*, to be delicious or agreeable to the palate &c. I believe that *ruch* stands for *druch*, and find this conjecture confirmed by the complete accordance of γλυκερός with the Sanskrit *ruchirá*. *Dulcis* has, therefore, kept the original *d*, but transposed the *l* from the beginning to the end,—that is, *dulcis* stands for *dlucis*; while γλυκός has kept the ancient order of consonants, but, the Greek being unable to bear δλ at the beginning of words, has changed δλ into γλ.

We have sufficient traces to prove that the verb *ruk* or *luk* 'to shine, to give light' also originated from *dluk*. Would it not be all moonshine, if we believed that γλαυκός had received its name from the Indian moon (*glau*)? Γλαυκός agrees in every particle with the Sanskrit *roká*, light (Rv. iii. 6, 7), and is closely connected with *rukma*, adj. bright, m. sun, ornament. But we can dispense with the assistance of Sanskrit, for γλαυκός has its root much clearer in Greek.

Compare Hesychius: γλαίσσει, λάμπει, φαίνει, φαύσκει. Etymol. M. γλαυκῶπις — ἀπὸ τοῦ δεινὸν γλαύσσειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. Ibid. γλαύσσει, λάμπει, φαίνει, φαύσκει· καὶ γλαῦξον, ἐπίλαμψον. Callim. h. in Dian. 54: Φάεα δεινὸν ὑπογλαύσσαντα. Apollonius Rhodius A, 1281:

ἦμος δ' οὐρανὸν χαροπὴ ὑπολάμπεται ἠώς
ἐκ περάτης ἀνιοῦσα, διαγλαύσσουσι δ' ἀταρτοί,
καὶ πιδία δροσόεντα γαίην λάμπεται αἴγλη,
τῆμος—

Moschus 2, 86: ὅσσε δ' ὑπογλαύσσεσκε καὶ ἤμερον ἀστρά-
πτεσκεν.

Just as before we had δεῦκος for γλεῦκος, so we find the older form of γλανκός or λευκός in the name of Πολυ-
δέυκης, who is not 'the very sweet', but 'the very brilliant
star', in the same way as his brother Κάστωρ is the bright
god.

ON THE ORIGINAL FORM OF *μά*.

The particle *μά* is, just like *καί*, construed with an accusative in order to affirm a sentence, by taking a god or some object of worship as witness. It is never *negative* by itself, but the negation is expressed by the addition of *οὐ*, or the purport of the whole sentence. An affinity with *μή* is therefore improbable. Nor do I believe that the accusative is, as in the Latin *per deos*, really dependent on the particle, but am of opinion that *μά* means only 'truly, certainly', and that the accusative depends on an omitted ὁμνυμι. Compare II. Ξ, 271: ἄγρει νῦν μοι ὁμοσσον ἄατον Στειγὸς ἴδιον, or Ψ, 584: γαιήρχον εἰνοσίγαιον ὁμνυμι &c.

The older form of *μά* was *σμά*, as we learn from the Sanskrit where *sma* is an enclitic particle with the meaning of 'truly, verily, certainly'. It occurs so frequently, that two or three examples will suffice to show its application. Rv. i. 12, 8:

Yas tvâm Agne havishputir dûtam deva saparyati,
Tasya *sma* prâvitâ bhava.

'O divine Agni, whatever sacrificer worships thee as a messenger (to the gods), to him verily be a protector'. Rv. iv. 31, 9:

Nahi *śhmá* (for *śma*) te çatam chana rādho varanta āmuras.

'(O Indra,) verily not even a hundred destroyers check thy power'. Rv. vi. 2, 2:

Tvām hi *śhmá* charshanayo yajuebhīr girbhīr ilate.

'Thee truly, o Agni, worship men with sacrifices and prayers'.

ON THE DERIVATION OF *POLLEX*.

The usual derivation of *pollex* from *pollere* rests on a passage in Macrobius vii. 3, 14: '*pollex nomen ab eo, quod pollet, accepit*'. I should not object to this etymology, if *polleo* were ever applied to physical strength, but it never signifies anything else than 'to be powerful, to have influence' in a figurative meaning. The analogy of *index* as the name of the forefinger leads to the true derivation. *Pollex* is a compound of the preposition *por*, *pol* and *dicere*, *δεικνύναι*, and means either 'the shower', or 'the stretched out', because, when the fist is closed, the thumb alone remains distinctly visible. This conjecture is confirmed by the Sanskrit *pradeçinī*, the forefinger, literally 'the showfinger'. With regard to the assimilation of *ld* to *ll* compare *Pollux* from *Πολυδεύκης*, *mollis* for *moluis* (*ἀμαλδύνω*), *pollingo* for *poldingo*, &c.

It would be absurd to derive *pollex* from *polliceri*, from the custom of pressing down the thumb against the fist in order to show assent or approbation (*pollicem premere*). If we consider how coarse the Latin is in many of its expressions, it would not be impossible to assume the reverse, and to derive *polliceri* from *pollex* (compare *indicare* from *index*), in accordance with the above mentioned custom. But we cannot separate *polliceri* from *liceri*, though the connection in meaning of both verbs is not over clear.