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](#)

Etymology of Latin *Ingens*

C. A. M. Fennell

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 06 / July 1897, pp 300 - 300

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032364, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032364

How to cite this article:

C. A. M. Fennell (1897). Etymology of Latin *Ingens*. The Classical Review, 11, pp 300-300
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032364

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

In all this matter too little notice has been paid to the function of the hearing ear. Our English language with its single *n* designates the sounds for the hearing ear quite sufficiently; the Sanskrit exactness of *ñ*, *ṇ*, *ṇ* and *n* is a finesse due to the speaking tongue. The hearing ear in all of these cases takes cognizance of nasality, the speaking voice makes the closure for the nasal at a point convenient for the neighbouring consonants. So, to my mind, the

gutturals shift parasitically to suit contiguous vowels. The guttural would tend to permanence for any group of words so far as its members were felt to be akin, but a change in the character of the contiguous vowel would form a counter-tendency, the stronger in proportion to the isolation of any word from its group in meaning.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

ETYMOLOGY OF LATIN *INGENS*.

MR. Fay (*Class. Rev.* Feb. 1897, p. 12) gives two objections to the connection of *ingens* with *γένος*, etc. 'compounded with an indeterminate preposition.' As neither reason concerns the preposition itself, it may be concluded that it is unobjectionable. It is curious that he should not have mentioned that the last syllable of the reduplicated stem *γγαυτ-* is the exact phonetic equivalent of the Latin *-gent-*. In the face of this it is

undesirable to connect *ingens* with the Greek *ἄγαν*, which of course looks like the accusative of a substantive *ἄγᾱ* (borrowed in Attic) connected with *ἄγαμαι*. I hold that there is not a single certain example of initial Skt. *d* or initial Grk. *ā* occurring in words akin to forms beginning with *m* followed by a vowel.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

ON ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS* c. 25.

AR. *Poet.* xxv. 6. οἶον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἶους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἶοι εἶναι.

Prof. Butcher thus translates this sentence, 'just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be drawn; Euripides, as they are.' In the first clause he understands *ποιεῖν* with *δεῖ*, herein agreeing with Dr. Verrall, who in the *Classical Review* for 1889 (vol. iii. p. 27), in a notice of Berlage's *De Euripide Philosopho*, writes as follows upon this sentence, 'it seems that the author renders this *dictum*, according to the strangely persistent error, as if the infinitive to be supplied with *δεῖ* were *εἶναι*. This is not merely impossible by the form of the sentence, but makes Sophocles' criticism absurdly untrue. The infinitive supplied is *ποιεῖν*: Sophocles admitted reality only within the limits imposed by poetic art, or rather by the Greek conception of dramatic art. Euripides, with or without reason, overstepped those limits.' Before Dr. Verrall, it appears that Welcker also took

the sentence in the same way. In a note Prof. Butcher says,¹ 'Vahlen, however, understands *εἶναι* with *δεῖ*.' I have not met with any commentator (though I admit there are many I have not seen at all) except the three above named who does *not* understand *εἶναι* with *δεῖ*. Dacier, Hurd, Lessing, Twining, Tyrwhitt, Stahr and Prickard all agree on the grammatical construction of the sentence, however much they differ among themselves as to its meaning. The 'error' then, if it is an error, is, as Dr. Verrall remarks, 'strangely persistent,' but is it an error? While agreeing with Dr. Verrall and Prof. Butcher upon the explanation I venture to doubt the correctness of their rendering.

Before dealing with the rendering it is well to consider the meaning which is intended to be conveyed. There are two interpretations given. (1) When Sophocles said he drew men 'as they ought to be' he referred to moral goodness. Thus Dacier

¹ *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 343, note 3.