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](#)

L. Meyer's *Greek Etymology Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie*. Von Leo Meyer. 4 vols. Pp. 656, 859, 488, 608. 1901–2. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. Price 60 mk.

P. Giles

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 07 / October 1903, pp 364 - 365

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208573, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208573

How to cite this article:

P. Giles (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 364-365 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208573

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the view that I.-Eu. *bh*, *dh*, etc. were first made voiceless fricatives, even medially, and then voiced again in Latin to become *b*, *d*, etc. Postgate (*C. R. ibid.*) holds that medially they were always voiced, and that the Oscan and Umbrian *-f-* denoted medially some sound like Eng. *v*. Neither view is susceptible of proof, but there are some considerations, especially the history of the different symbols for *f*, of which two at least (*F* itself and *ʃ*) were certainly derived from signs representing a *u*-sound¹ which incline me decidedly to the second of the two.

It would be out of place, I think, to attempt to discuss here single points² in the

¹ See *Cl. Rev.* 12, 462, *It. Dial.* pp. 463, 467.

² In one or two places which I have noticed in the Latin sections Brugmann seems to have given his sanction to some recent theorising which hardly deserved it—notably to some guesses of Sommer's. What, for instance, is gained by explaining (p. 84) the *oe* of *foedus*, *poena*, *Poenus* as due to the preceding labial, when *Bellum Punicum* gives us the actual form of the sound as it was spoken? *Poenus* like *moenia*, is the old name, surviving only in poetry and written language generally; *foedus*, (subst.)

phonology. On nearly every page I have found something new and striking; every section is marked by the *curiosa felicitas* of statement that distinguishes Brugmann (and Leskien) from all other living 'Indo-germanists.' And perhaps the secret of the unalloyed sense of satisfaction which this volume produces lies in the fact that the languages it deals with are all within the limits of its author's independent study. The larger volumes include a great deal of other people's writing, notably in the Celtic sections. In this volume there is no clay beneath the gold.

R. S. CONWAY.

CARDIFF, June 13, 1903.

and *poena* are legal terms, *foedus* (adj.) a religious term (of omens, etc., *visu foedum*), all equally kept by the written form. Or again, why did the *-r-* of the suffix preserve *-s-* from change in the root syllable of *miser* (p. 201) but not in *queror*; and why was an adjacent *r* powerless to prevent the change in forms like *horreare*, *pareve raris*, *roris*, *terere*, *terroris*? I am inclined to believe that both Lat. *miser* and Gr. *μισαρός* are borrowed from some South Italic word meaning 'accursed.'

L. MEYER'S GREEK ETYMOLOGY.

Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie.

Von LEO MEYER. 4 vols. Pp. 656, 859, 488, 608. 1901-2. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. Price 60 mk.

No etymological work comparable in size to these four handsome and well printed volumes has been published since the second edition of Pott's *Etymologische Forschungen*. The treatise, however, to which this work stands in closest relation is Curtius' *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*, and Curtius was able to dispose of his subject in far less than the 2,600 and odd pages with which we are presented here. This, however, is a dictionary, while Curtius's was a work on Comparative Philology.

It is to be regretted that neither preface nor epilogue accompanies these volumes to explain the object which the author set before himself. For it is possible that the reader will find some things here which etymological Dictionaries do not always supply and will at the same time be disappointed not to find some things which they do. The author is careful to quote the earliest passages—and at considerable

length—in which a particular word is found. Nothing could be more excellent. Another good feature of the book is its careful treatment of stem suffixes, parallels to rare suffixes being regularly cited and when hardly any exact parallel exists as to the rare *κόμης*, attention is called to the fact.

On the other hand the arrangement of the sounds which has been adopted by the author is a serious detriment to the usefulness of the book. When one takes up a work in lexicon form devoted to Greek Etymology one naturally expects that the words will occur in the usual order in which they are found in the Dictionary. Here, however, everything is arranged differently. In vol. i are treated words beginning with *α*, *ε*, *ο*, *η*, *ω* and in this order, in vol. ii those beginning with *ι*, and its diphthongs, *υ* and its diphthongs, *κ*, *ξ*, *π*, *ψ*, and *τ*, while vol. iii deals with *γ*, *β*, *δ*, *ζ*, *χ*, *φ*, *θ*, and iv with *σ*, *ν*, *μ*, *ρ*, *λ*. Nothing could be more scientific in theory, nothing could be more tiresome in practice. And if it is further remembered that within the word the same order of sounds is adopted as for the beginnings of the words, it will be realised

that Dr. Meyer could not, if he had tried, have made his book more difficult of reference. An example will make this clearer than any description. At the beginning of vol. iv the arrangement of the first few words is this: *σά-ειν, σάο-ς, σό-ς, σό-εσθαι, σόο-ς, σή-ν, σῶ-ς, σῶ-εσθαι, σιάγον-, σιάλο-ς, σιάλο-ν, σιαλίδ-, σίο-ν, σιωπή, σείειν, σύ*. This is only the beginning of our difficulties. After *σύαινα* comes *σεύεσθαι*, then *σάκος* and similar words, next *σηκός, σηκείν, σῶκος, σίκιννις, σίκυς, σικχός*. These are followed by *σαικωνίζειν, σῦκάμινον, συκαλίδ-, σῦκον*, after which to our dismay we find *σᾶπέρδης* and the like. The stem *σωματ-* is to be found on page 41 and the last word under *σ*, *σμίλα*, occurs on p. 230. After some considerable experience of the book, I calculate that the time required to make a reference is at least quadrupled. No doubt if Greek scholars found it necessary to use the book all day long, practice would bring greater rapidity and in time they might remember without reference the order of the sounds which has been adopted. But the enthusiasts who make of such books their daily food are extremely few and no harm would have befallen them if the usual order had been preserved, while there can be little doubt that the ordinary scholar, who does not realise why he should be expected to look for *σείειν* between *σιωπή* and *σύ*, will be deterred from using the book altogether.

There is, moreover, a deficiency in information regarding difficult questions which is much to be regretted. Under the negative prefix *ἀν-*, no hint is given of the controversy, which has raged during the last twenty-seven years, regarding the negative forms which show *ἀ-* only, nor is there any reference to the great mass of philological literature on the subject. Even if the author desired to stand aloof from the controversy, he ought surely to have supplied his readers with references to the chief treatises on the subject. Similarly though *ἔρεβος* and *τίβεσθαι* are derived, as by others, from roots which appear in Sanskrit with a *j*-sound, nothing is said in either place as to why Greek should show *β* when Sanskrit shows *j*. The transliteration of the Sanskrit words, it may be said in passing, follows the system in common use forty years ago. There are other indications that the work has been long in preparation. Many of the identifications now accepted by large numbers of etymologists as that of the stems of *βρεθῆναι* and *grandis*, of *αἰγι-* in *αἰγίος* with the *αἰγίς* 'Kernholz der Fichte' which stands next to it, or again confusions of two words in one, as according to Wackernagel is possibly true of *ἄσμενος*, are not referred to at all.

P. GILES.

HAYMAN'S *PASSING OF ARTHUR IN GREEK HEROICS*.

The Passing of Arthur in Greek Verse, with a stanza in Catullian metre from Dryden's 'Alexander's Feast.' By HENRY HAYMAN, D.D. Eton. Spottiswoode. 1903. 1s. net.

In a prettily written Latin Preface Dr. Hayman tells how his bookseller warned him that translations into Latin and Greek verse no longer sell. We are sorry to think that this is so; but we must accept it as one of the unalterable laws of the hateful Zeitgeist. The task which Dr. Hayman has set himself is far more difficult than it might at first seem; for the 'Passing of Arthur,' though it has the setting of the ancient epic, has much that is alien from the conceptions of the ancient world, and that resists the process of casting it into the mould of ancient poetry. Dr. Hayman has overcome these difficulties with wonderful ingenuity, and has

shown how deep and wide are the resources of his scholarship. A few verbal criticisms might be made. For instance, *κάμνυσα* (321) rests only on the *Batrachomachia*, the penult of *ἔμνυσα* is always short in Homer; and *βλαφθεῖς* (208) seems to be used in the post-homeric sense of 'to hurt,' while in Homer the verb always means 'to impede,' 'to hamper.' The general word for 'hurting' in Homer is rather *σίνομαι* which is opposed to *δίνημι*, as 'ban' to 'bless,' 'mar' to 'make,' as in *αἰδὼς ἦτ' ἄνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἦδ' δίνησιν*.

But it is ungrateful to descend to minute details in a poem which as a whole so admirably maintains the epic diction. The only broad criticism which might justly be brought against the version is that it ignores the rule against the trochaic caesura in the fourth foot, first we believe clearly enunciated