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](#)

Pauli on the Lemnian and Etruscan Languages *Altitalische Forschungen* ii. 2; Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos, von Dr. Carl Pauli. Leipzig: Barth. 1894. 14 Mk.

Edwin W. Fay

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 03 / April 1896, pp 163 - 165
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203661, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203661

How to cite this article:

Edwin W. Fay (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 163-165 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203661

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and essential *difference* between pure iambic words (*tona*) and impure (*parum*) or pyrrichs (~~); and this it is which Lachmann was I believe, the first to emphasize, and in doing so he appears to me to have drawn attention to a point of signal importance in Roman metric, even if some rashness has been shown by his followers in forcing some passages to fit into his rule against MSS. and probability. But in accepting the two elided iambi which Havet cites from Phaedrus *Tace, inquit* and *Veni ergo*, I quite agree with his verdict that they should be left untampered with; and Lachmann himself would not have altered them.

As a whole, however, the essay on the metre and prosody of Phaedrus is written with remarkable care, and will probably materially influence the future criticism of the *Fables*. Strange as it may seem from an editor who alters *every* case of a short syllable before a final cretic, the general tone of the discussion is one of adherence to MSS. and against unnecessary correction. For instance, Havet retains the one instance of an elision at the beginning of the first foot

Quam opprimere captans alapam sibi duxit
grauem

against L. Müller's *Quam premere*: rightly it would seem from the equally unique *Si ad uitulam spectes* of Vergil *Ecl.* iii. 48, the more frequent cases in Catullus, and the comparatively numerous specimens in Seneca's tragedies. Similarly he defends a tribrach formed like *Nēc ālūd, Et ālām*, in the first syllable (of which the *Fables* give three instances), and again of the proceleusmatic (~~~), also in the first syllable, of which Phaedrus' MSS. give five specimens:—

Sūpēr ōtīam iactas tegere quod debet pudor.
Itā cāpūt ad nostrum furor illorum pertinet.
Quīā uidēor acer, alligant me interdū.
Ālī ōnērant saxis: quidam contra miseriti.
Itāque hōdīe nec lucernam de flamma
deum.

I may again express my hope that Prof. Havet will not leave his task uncompleted, but will consummate his undertaking by a commentary as fresh and original as the present volume.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

PAULI ON THE LEMNIAN AND ETRUSCAN LANGUAGES.

Altitalische Forschungen ii. 2; *Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos*, von DR. CARL PAULI. Leipzig: Barth. 1894. 14 Mk.

THE work before us is by one of the two or three specialists who devote themselves to the study of Etruscan. Pauli's name and Deecke's stand in fact almost alone in this field of research, which, to use the language of an American professor, may be called 'special speciality.' It is perplexing to the layman, like myself, to note that these investigators are not in agreement. Deecke came forward in 1878 by reviewing in a rather caustic fashion Corssen's book, *Über die Sprache der Etrusker*, saying of Corssen, among other things, that he: 'durch Incorrectheit im Material, willkürliche Hypothesen, und abenteuerliche Etymologien auf den schlimmsten Abweg gerathen zu sein schiene.' Corssen laid himself open to an easy attack by interpreting six words found on a pair of dice, not as numerals, according to the most probable guess, but as a dedicatory inscription. These numerals, if such they be, do not lend themselves to

comparison with the Aryan numerals, and Corssen picked out from the almost entirely unintelligible Etruscan inscriptions a set of words he adopted for numerals. Deecke rightly objected to such methods, and insisted as Pauli now does that Etruscan must be interpreted by itself. From his original point of view Deecke has moved gradually to the belief that Etruscan is an Aryan language, and he now employs comparative etymology as a means of interpretation. Here Pauli has broken with him.

Dark and mysterious has the Etruscan question always been. Both the racial and linguistic affinities of this people are elusive. An Egyptian inscription gives the name of the Tuirsha in a list of their allies in the thirteenth century B.C., and this name has been associated on good archaeological evidence (Chabas, *Études de l'Antiquité historique*) with *Etrusci* || *Tusci*. There is nothing to show, however, whether this folk came from the lands north of Italy or from Asia Minor whence the ancients had a tradition that the Etruscans came. A new Egyptian connection with Etruscan was

discovered in 1891 when Krall of Vienna showed that an inscription on a mummy-cloth—brought with the mummy to Agram in 1848—was in Etruscan writing, and the language has since been shown to be Etruscan.

Two years before this however an inscription in Greek characters, but not a Greek inscription, was found on the island of Lemnos. The Etruscan specialists are substantially agreed that this 'Lemnian' language is closely akin to Etruscan. Modern discoveries thus seem, on the face of it, to have made good the traditions connecting the Etruscans with Egypt and with the neighbourhood of Asia Minor. As to the Egyptian mummy-cloth however all are agreed that the Etruscan inscription must be charged to some Italian Etruscan, engaged in trade with Egypt. Pauli undertakes to discuss the bearings of the Lemnian inscription in the volume before us.

He begins with some polemic against the methods of the 'Indogermanisten,' protesting against the interpretation by comparative etymology of a language not known to be Aryan. It is not fair, however, to charge on them reasoning in a circle (as he does on Deecke, p. 123); for all linguistic argumentation rests, first and last, on a *petitio principii*. Pauli does show quite conclusively the danger of the etymological interpretation of a not understood language. Thus we see that Bugge's interpretation of our inscription (p. 2) and Deecke's (p. 4) do not agree. As concerns Etruscan Bugge has at different periods claimed that this language was (1) an independent member of the Aryan family most like Greek and Latin, and with some special connections with Balto-Slavic; (2) much closer to the Italic languages than to Greek or any other speech; (3) a member of the same group with Armenian. Such a variety of opinions does shake one's belief in the value of the etymological interpretation for a fossil language. What Pauli thinks of this method may be shown by recalling that in 1883 he claimed a special relation with Lithuanian, all by way of joke, though this joke was taken seriously by not a few. In our volume he says (p. 12): 'Ich halte auch jetzt noch in voller Schärfe aufrecht dass ich nach dieser Methode jede beliebige etruskische Inschrift aus jeder beliebigen Sprache, die verlangt wird, mit völlig annehmbaren Sinn und unter strikter Beobachtung der Laut- und Formenbildungsgesetze zu erklären vermag.'

The chief purpose of our book is to demonstrate that 'Lemnian' is akin to Etruscan. I believe for my own part that Pauli demonstrates this kinship by a comparison of their modes of word-formation, and by the correspondence of 'Lemnian' *aviz*: [si] *alχviz*: with Etruscan *avils* [ce] *alχls*. Whether his special interpretation of the Lemnian inscription, which he reaches after a very minute comparison with Etruscan, is correct one dare not affirm, for it is guessing that gives us the meaning of the words in both languages. For certainty of interpretation we must bide our time till some good fortune gives us a long bilingual inscription in Etruscan and some known language; then only can we be sure of the flexions and the definition of Etruscan words, as Pauli himself declares (p. 243).

The second large question our author discusses is the ethnological grouping of Etruscan. The layman wonders whether so much weight is to be given to names of places and of persons as these ethnological investigations seem inclined to give; and he feels hopelessly at sea when the ethnologists differ as to the type of the Etruscan skull. To me at least Pauli's argument is in some regards evanescent to the point of disappearance, I cannot see that he proceeds in a very different way from the 'Indogermanisten' when he employs the Ligurian gloss *σιγύννας* = *καπήλων* 'hucksters' in a comparison with *zicu* of a bilingual inscription, 'Zicu being possibly Etruscan for *Scribonius*, which is, in its turn, a popular etymology for **Scruponius* (p. 169)'! It must be admitted however that Pauli ever and anon acknowledges the tenuity of some of his arguments; I cite e.g. his *résumé* of the ethnological discussion (p. 223): 'Als *sicheres* Ergebnis ist nur das anzuerkennen dass die Etrusker und die lemnischen Pelasger verwandt sind. Für die anderen der untersuchten Völker reichen zur zeit unsere wissenschaftlichen Hilfsmittel noch nicht aus zu einem wirklichen Beweise, aber die *Möglichkeit* einer Verwandtschaft hat sich doch auch bei den Karern, Lydern und Lykern, bei den Susiern, den Südkaukasiern, den Rätern, den Ligurern und den Iberern, wenn auch bei allen nicht mit der gleichen Wahrscheinlichkeit, ergeben.'

The last of the larger questions to which our author devotes himself is to determine the relations of the Lemnians and Etruscans to one another. Against Bugge's theory that this Lemnian inscription is the work of a sort of Etruscan Vikings, our author

maintains that it harks back to Pelasgians out of Attica, and that the Etruscans are but another branch of the same Pelasgian stock.

I add a few words suggested by Pauli's general polemic against the methods of the 'Indogermanisten,' a polemic which is, in a certain sort, '*Reclam*' for his own method. He insists that kinship of languages must be recognized by similar grammatical structure, not by apparent similarities of sound, i.e. morphological comparison precedes etymological. He gives us (p. 149) a table comparing Etruscan and Lycian with some (modern) languages of the Caucasus. I will not object to the fact that the case-endings are here suspiciously alike for languages so far separated in time: I will but note that in his Etruscan paradigm the only case-endings are *ši, ś, -sa* (Gen. Dat. Loc.), and *θi || θ* (Loc.), and that these endings are almost as much like Aryan as they are like South-Caucasian. I call attention also to the author's argument (p. 139) against the Aryan character of Lycian, drawn from the loss of all final consonants: by such argumentation it is possible to disprove the Aryan character of Greek. 'Susisch' is also (p. 210) compared with Etruscan in respect of its numerals and relationship words; that *tur* 'son' and *sak* 'son' should be compared with Etruscan *θura* 'descendant' and *seχ* 'daughter' is allowable enough, but nothing can be proved by comparing *hatē || atta* 'father' with Etruscan *atiu*, now interpreted with some regard to etymology, as it would seem, by 'mother' (Deecke, 'sister' or 'widow'). Words like *atta* are mere babbling of children, and liable to occur in Hottentot or Choctaw, and so are devoid of any value to prove kinship of languages. The same remark is applicable to 1st person pronoun forms with *m-* (p. 209).

Touching his claim of kinship between Etruscan and Lycian, Pauli has been reproached with the dissimilarity of their nouns of relationship. He instances the divergence of Lettish and Sanskrit as a parallel, and pleads geographical remoteness. To this it may be answered that Lettish diverges in this particular rather widely from its sister dialect, Lithuanian.

Our volume contains two rather extensive lapses into 'Indogermanismus,' (1) in a discussion of Phrygian epitaphs (p. 56), where our author disports himself with the evident pleasure of a practised poacher, and it must be admitted that he goes along light of foot; (2) in an examination of Deecke's claims that Lycian is an Aryan language (p. 116); but sharp-sighted as he is in his critique of Deecke's treatment, particularly of the numerals, Pauli will not remove, even with the sacrosanct phoneticians, all doubt as to the correspondences claimed by Deecke for the numerals, if the words in question prove to be really numerals as Deecke thinks. It is easy to magnify your opponent's variation from strict phonetic law, but Pauli admits about as important variation of vowels into his own interpretation of the Phrygian inscriptions.

I would repeat, in fine, that our book seems to me to demonstrate the kinship of 'Lemnian' with Etruscan almost, if not quite, conclusively; and contributes, I feel quite sure, valuable suggestions for the interpretation of the inscription. It is interesting to note in passing that some of his definitions seem even to reinforce the pleas of the 'Indogermanisten.' Not to mention *zivai* 'aetate' (: *√jiv* 'live') and *zeronaiθ* 'conditus est' (: *√χαράσσω* 'plough into furrows') we have *morinail* 'sepelivit,' based on *mor-* 'grave,' which reminds of course of *mor-s* 'death.' The Lemnians seemed, by the way, to have quite a large vocabulary for the notion 'death.' In the first inscription of fifteen words Pauli renders *naφoθ* 'sepulcrum' and *tav[:jarzio* 'sepulcri-est,' *zeronai* 'condidit,' *zeronaiθ* 'conditus est,' and *morinail* 'sepelivit.' The second inscription of eighteen words, which is claimed to be a corrected version of the first, adds in *tove-roma* — 'Grab(!)' still another term for this idea. Thus there are, counting *mor-* as the base of *morinail*, four words here for 'sepulcrum.'

The proof-reading of the volume has left much to desire, but I content myself with asking if *römischen* (p. 183, l. 5) should not be *rätischen*.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.