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](#)

***Origin of the Greek, Latin, and Gothic Roots.* By James Byrne M.A., Dean of Clonfert. London : Trübner & Co. 1888. 18s.**

A. S. Wilkins

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 07 / July 1888, pp 220 - 221
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193163, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193163

How to cite this article:

A. S. Wilkins (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 220-221 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193163

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

which words dissimilar in form but similar in meaning are in some way 'levelled up,' as when *κέλευθος* becomes feminine on the analogy of *ἰδός*, or *pinus* on that of *arbor*. To the instances quoted by Mr. Wheeler we may add the whole group of French feminine substantives from Latin masculines in *-or*, where the gender of the former has been apparently affected by that of corresponding abstract substantives in German.

Space prevents us from giving the remaining categories, which are more interesting and more important than those we have quoted; but the whole pamphlet will well repay perusal, and affords a systematic classification of the phenomena such as has long been required. The distinction which Mr. Wheeler implies in his use of 'likeness,' 'resemblance,' and 'affinity' in the headings of his categories is not apparent at first sight, and might be more plainly expressed. On p. 16 the expression 'change in the reduplicating syllable' is unfortunate, unless Mr. Wheeler rejects the theory that *i* is the original reduplicating vowel of the present. *Tenus* (p. 22) is not related to *tenor* as *arbor* to *arbor*, but rather as *decus* to *decor*, and indeed *tenus* survives as a neuter substantive in *Plaut. Bacch.* 793. *φρασί* (p. 23) is surely for *φρησί* rather than *φρησι*. We do not follow Mr. Wheeler's meaning in saying (p. 21) that the *n* in *seven*, *heaven* is from the oblique cases. And perhaps the epic dative *vidai* may be an instance of a new formation from the constant use of phrases like *πατράσι καὶ μητράσι καὶ νίδσι, θυγατράσι καὶ νίδσι*, though there is certainly here something more than a mere contiguity of use. The pamphlet concludes with a sketch of the history of the recognition of analogy as a principle of investigation, and a useful bibliographical appendix. C. C.

Origin of the Greek, Latin, and Gothic Roots.

By JAMES BYRNE, M.A., Dean of Clonfert.
London: Trübner & Co. 1888. 18s.

DEAN BYRNE'S volume is one of those the pages of which can hardly be turned over without a feeling of melancholy approaching to despair. That a man should undertake to write upon philological questions without the least conception of what is meant by phonetic law, and in blank ignorance of everything that has been done during the present century to establish philology on a scientific basis, is a phenomenon far from uncommon. But the fate that such a man meets is well deserved, and his waste of time in writing and money in printing can hardly excite our pity. That must be reserved for any possible victims of his charlatanry. The case is however very different with Dean Byrne. He has read his Curtius and Max Müller, he has thumbed his Böhtlingk and Roth; he has attacked a problem which really demands attention, and has brought to bear on it considerable learning and unwearied diligence. And yet, to speak frankly, the book is worthless from beginning to end, and does not contain, so far as I can see, on any one of its nearly three hundred pages a single contribution of the slightest value to the etymologist. An elaborate fabric has been constructed on utterly rotten foundations, and at the faintest breath of criticism it tumbles into hopeless ruin. It is the combination of competent knowledge with sheer defiance of scientific method which gives to this work its curiously pathetic interest.

Dean Byrne starts from the admitted fact that our analysis, so far as we can carry it at present, brings us on the one hand to a number of roots wholly unlike in form, but expressing ideas between which only the very finest differences exist, and on the other hand

to roots, identical or at least undistinguishable in form, to which widely divergent notions are attached. Perhaps he overrates the extent of these phenomena, and he certainly ignores the way in which they are reduced by recent researches into the primitive vocalism; but there is undoubtedly something which calls for explanation. He explains it by the following hypothesis. In the utterance of a consonant 'there are seven distinct parts which may separately attract notice, and which are suggestive of classes of objects of thought. In the closure, there is first the closure itself, suggestive of ideas of contact, as junction, application, coincidence, position, what occupies place, &c.; secondly, the concavity formed by the closure of the organ, either when the lips enclose the concavity of the mouth, or when the tongue, applied to a part of the palate, forms a concavity with the remainder of it, this concavity being suggestive of enclosure, of flexure, of curvature, &c.; there is, thirdly, a sense of relaxation if the tongue or lips be applied in a relaxed condition, and this will be suggestive of softness, of weakness, of lassitude, &c.; there is, fourthly, the end of the closure, or its opening, suggestive of separation, of partition, of interval, &c. In the current of breath there is, fifthly, a suggestion of motion which may be variously modified by the tongue and lips as they give it passage or direction. In the pressure of the breath upon the organ, or its first breaking through the partial closure of the organ, there is, sixthly, a suggestion of impact, of tension, of force, of outburst, of growth, of increase, &c. In the friction of the breath on the organ as it passes, there is, seventhly, a suggestion of roughness, of smoothness, of penetration, of tearing, of attrition, &c. There are thus under each consonant seven different points of correspondence with seven different groups of the elements of thought; and the latter may be attached respectively to the former, suggesting them, and being suggested by them.'

This is the hypothesis on which Dean Byrne proceeds to base his analysis of the whole stock of Greek, Latin, and Gothic roots. It will be noticed that no distinct character is assigned to each consonant; the significance attaches to the 'particular part or phase of the utterance' to which attention is in each case directed. Thus p_1 suggests junction, p_2 enclosure, p_3 softness, p_4 partition, p_5 motion, p_6 increase, p_7 roughness (or smoothness!), and so on; and the same notions are suggested by $s_1, s_2, \text{ \&c.}$, or by $k_1, k_2, \text{ \&c.}$ Now the first question is, what is the evidence for these series of consonants? The answer to this is to be given by the analysis of roots. Is it possible to imagine a more circular argument? We are told that $s_1 p_1$ gives a sense of flatness (exemplified by Eng. *board*!), $s_2 p_2$ a sense of curvature, $s_3 p_3$ a sense of moisture, rest, quietness. We ask for evidence of the existence of s_1, s_2, s_3 , and the only answer is the worthless one, that it must have been so. It is asserted that $s_1 p_1$ suggests the same meaning as $k_1 l_1$, and an entirely different meaning from $s_4 p_4$; and the only proof given is that some words containing sp have a different force from other words containing these letters.

It would be trifling with the patience of the reader to pursue into detail the absurdities which result from the development of so baseless a hypothesis. If a *causa* is assigned for a phenomenon, we have a right to ask that it should at least be a *vera causa*; and for the real existence of Dean Byrne's causes, we have not the shadow of a proof suggested. To borrow a well-known illustration, the argument of the book is exactly parallel to the statement that the reason why the sea is salt is because of the whale in the centre of the Sahara. The seven modes of pronunciation of

each of the consonants have not left a trace in any language, and have been devised solely to serve as skeleton-keys to pick any lock to which they may be applied, in the hope that if one does not fit it, another may. Dean Byrne has taken the enormous pains to arrange more than 13,000 words of different languages according to this purely fictitious classification. He would have done at least as good service by drawing up name-lists of all the undergraduates of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, classified according to the Christian names of their fathers. The work has been pronounced 'an interesting, and perhaps an important one.' The interest is entirely melancholy; the importance lies wholly in the impressiveness of the lesson, which by this time ought hardly to be needed.

A. S. WILKINS.

Theorie der Musikischen Künste der Hellenen.

Von AUGUST ROSSBATH und RUDOLF WESTPHAL. Dritter Band. Erste Abtheilung: *Allgemeine Theorie der Griechischen Metrik*. Von RUDOLF WESTPHAL und HUGO GLEDITSCH. Leipzig, 1887.

THE third edition of Rossbach and Westphal's great work on Greek metres, of which this volume is the third instalment, is separated from the second edition by about twenty years. During this interval Westphal has published, besides other books on kindred subjects, a German translation of the fragments of Aristoxenus, with a commentary. The results of this work are incorporated in the third edition of the *Metrik*, which thus differs in some important respects from the earlier editions. About a hundred pages of this volume are new (exclusive of the revised chapter on prosody), but most of this has already appeared in a very slightly different form in the *Aristoxenus* and in the first volume of this third edition of the *Metrik*. This is the case with the principal additions in chapter I., which consist of a discussion of the distinction drawn by Aristoxenus between singing and speaking, and of the so-called 'cyclic' dactyl. According to Westphal, Aristoxenus holds that singing is distinguished from speaking by the fact that in singing the voice dwells for a longer time on each syllable, so that it appears to rest upon it before proceeding to another syllable, whereas in speaking the voice is in continual motion, never resting on any syllable for an appreciable length of time. This interpretation seems very questionable. What Aristoxenus says is that both in singing and in speaking there is a *κίνησις κατὰ τόπον*, but that in the former it is *διαστηματική*, in the latter *συνεχής*. Does not this mean that in speaking the voice is in continual motion with regard to *pitch*, so that it never rests on any one note, but is always gliding without a break from one pitch to another, whereas in singing the voice passes from note to note with a leap over the interval between them? This is apparently the view of H. Weil, which is quoted and rejected by Westphal. But whatever may be thought of Westphal's interpretation of Aristoxenus on this point, the inference which he draws is probably correct, viz. that in Greek, no less than in modern, poetry the rhythm of song was more definite than that of mere recitation, that *e.g.* in the former the long syllable was normally just double of the short syllable, whereas in the latter the exact relation between them was not determinable, so that no good recitation would have given each syllable precisely the value required by strict scansion. In

the section on the 'cyclic' dactyl Westphal maintains that it was employed in recitation only, not in song. The passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus on which the doctrine of the 'cyclic' dactyl rests certainly does not justify the popular modern theory of the value of the dactyl in logaoedic metres. The other additions to chapter I. are mostly concerned with the metres of other branches of the Indo-Germanic family, especially those of the Zend Avesta and of Indian poetry. Chapter II. deals with prosody, a subject on which there is comparatively little room for differences of opinion. It follows the lines laid down in the corresponding chapter of the second edition, but has been almost entirely rewritten and brought up to date by Hugo Gleditsch. Chapter III. on the different kinds of feet and *κῶλα* is new, but is mainly a statement of the doctrine of Aristoxenus as understood by Westphal, which has been expounded at greater length in the *Aristoxenus* and in the *Griechische Rhythmik* which forms the first volume of this edition. Chapter IV. has two new sections defining the meaning of the terms *κῶλον*, *μέτρον*, *ὑπέρμετρον*, *στιχός*, *περίοδος*, *στροφή*. In chapter V. there is a new section stating and criticising Bentley's theory of asynartete verses. Westphal still maintains the opinion expressed in the second edition of the *Metrik*, that asynartete verses are those in which there is internal catalexis. There are difficulties involved in this theory, especially, as Westphal admits, in its application to some episynthetic verses which are quoted as asynartete by Hephaestion. There is perhaps not sufficient evidence to determine with certainty the exact meaning of the term 'asynartete,' but Westphal gives all the existing materials for arriving at a conclusion on the subject. In this part of the book as well as elsewhere there are some bad misprints which are sometimes puzzling, *e.g.* in the list of *ἀσυνάρτητα ἀντιπαθῆ* on pp. 342, 343, where *τροχαϊκοῦ* is four times printed instead of *ιαμβικοῦ* in combination with ionics. The only other addition in this chapter is a short account of Hephaestion's *μέτρα πολυσημάτιστα* coupled with a discussion of the abnormal values of long and short syllables, *e.g.* of dactyls used in three-time metres and of trochees in four-time metres, the three-time dactyl, as Westphal has already shown elsewhere, being probably $= 1\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{6}$, the four-time trochee $= 2\frac{2}{3} + 1\frac{1}{6}$. The only important omission in this edition of vol. III. as compared with the second edition is that of the secondary metres (paeonics, ionics, choriambics), which are here dismissed on the ground that their treatment depends on rhythmical and not metrical tradition, and that therefore all that needs to be said of them in general has already been stated in vol. I.

The importance of this new edition of the *Metrik* is that it follows the doctrines of the ancient writers on rhythm and metre, and especially of Aristoxenus, even more closely than its predecessors. It is not always sufficiently recognised that the study of these writers, taken in connection with the Greek poets, forms the only solid basis for a knowledge of Greek metre, and that its principles cannot be learnt from Greek poetry alone. Westphal has probably done more than any one else to elucidate the remains of the ancient authors on the subject, and to show their value. The remaining instalment of the book will contain the 'Specielle Metrik,' which is to be rewritten by Rossbach.

C. B. HEBERDEN.