IV. *On certain ANALOGIES observed by the GREEKS in the Use of their LETTERS; and particularly of the LETTER ΣΙΓΜΑ. By ANDREW DALZEL, M. A. F. R. S. EDIN. and Professor of Greek in the University of EDINBURGH.*

[*Read by the Author, Dec. 19. 1785, and Nov. 19. 1787.*]

INTRODUCTION.

THE power of pronouncing articulate sounds is one of the most obvious marks which distinguish man from the other animals. No philosophical investigation is necessary for pointing it out, and therefore it has not escaped the notice of the poets, the most ancient of all authors. In the works of HOMER and HESIOD*, we often meet with the expression *μέροπες ἄνθρωποι*, *men having an articulate voice*; the word *μέροψ* being evidently compounded of *μείρω*, *to divide*, and *ὄψ*, *the voice* †.

BUT

* *Vide Iliad. α', 250. γ', 402. σ', 288. Ὡς. Oper. & Dies, 109, 142.* ANACREON has also made use of the same epithet, but without the substantive; *Od. III. 4.*

† Διὰ τὸ μεμερισμένην ἔχειν τὴν ὅπα, says HESYCHIUS, *voce μέροπες*. In which SUIDAS agrees. EUSTATHIUS is more explicit. *Μέροπες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, παρὰ τὸ φύσει μεμερισμένην ἔχειν τὴν ὅπα εἰς τε λίξεις καὶ εἰς συλλαβὰς καὶ εἰς στοιχεῖα, ὃ μηδεμία τις ἄλλη ἔχει φωνὴ παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐδῆν.* *Men are called μέροπες, from their naturally having their voice divided into Words and Syllables and Elements, a quality which no voice possesses, except human Speech.* *Ad Iliad. α', 250.* The Bishop adds, 'That "those of his own sacred society, " the interpreters of holy Writ, derive the word from the division of tongues which " took place at the building of the tower of *Chalana*," as he calls it; which etymology ERASMUS has also taken notice of in his *Dialogue de recta Latini Græcique Sermonis pronuntiatione.*

BUT although man is plainly possessed of this faculty of articulation, or pronouncing distinct syllables; yet the analysis of those syllables into their constituent parts, or simple elements, or into what the Greek writers call *στοιχεῖα*, must originally have been a work of immense ingenuity. Perhaps it would even have been impracticable ever to have made a complete analysis of this kind, without the invention of visible signs for denoting each of those elements. Nor hath any sort of signs, symbols or characters been found so proper for that purpose, as those which we call *Letters*. Indeed, it seems impossible to comprehend any other visible mode of analyzing words into syllables, and syllables into simple elements, than that which is furnished by letters. For though we can conceive language to be, in some degree, conveyed by marks of imitation; as when, in expressing *an elephant*, we should set down the figure of that animal: yet we could never analyze such a representation, so as to convey any idea of the different syllables in the word *elephant*, or of the elemental sounds of any of those syllables*.

INDEED, the significant sounds of a language, even considered each in the aggregate, and without any resolution into its constituent

nuntiatione. But of this derivation, DAMM, in his Lexicon, justly says, “*Id piè magis quam verè.*” EUSTATHIUS has farther observed, “That certain birds are called “*μέγας*,” those, no doubt, he means of the parrot kind. But the manner in which these possess the faculty of articulation, forms but a very slight exception to this characteristic of human nature. Human articulation was defined by the Stoics as follows: *Φώνη ἑναρθεῖς καὶ ἀπὸ διανοίας ἐκτεταγμένη*, *Sound articulate, and proceeding from Sentiment*. See HARRIS’s *Hermes*, p. 322.

* EVEN Dr WILKINS’s *Real Character*, which he has, with such astonishing labour, invented, is not calculated to give any idea of syllables or elemental sounds; and therefore, in order to complete his scheme of an universal philosophical language, he has likewise invented two alphabets, one of which he calls a *Natural Character*; this being necessary for the expressing of proper names, according to his project. See *An Essay towards a real Character and a philosophical Language*, by JOHN WILKINS, D. D. *Dean of Ripon*, and F. R. S. (*afterwards Bishop of Chester*.) Lond. 1668. fol.

constituent elements, can be but very imperfectly expressed by figures of imitation; because there is of these sounds an immense variety, which cannot possibly admit of any such visible exhibition*. Those conventional signs, which we call letters, are the only proper and complete mode of denoting simple elemental sounds, and their infinite variety of combination in syllables and words. For although the alphabet of no one language contains a sufficient number of letters to express every possible modification of articulated sound; yet the letters composing the several alphabets of those written languages with which we are acquainted, especially the ancient Greek and Latin, have been found sufficient for denoting all the requisite elementary sounds in those particular languages †.

LETTERS are called by the Greeks *γράμματα*, a word whose etymology is evident; for if *γράφω* signify *to write*, *γράμμα* must signify *a thing written*, that is, a letter, or written character, denoting an element of articulate sound ‡. The original

VOL. II.

P

ginal

* See an excellent account of the difference betwixt imitative and symbolic language, by the late Mr HARRIS, supported by quotations from Greek authors. *Hermes*, Book III. Chap. 3.

† Dr WILKINS has endeavoured to shew the defects in common alphabets, as to the true order of the letters, their just number, determinate powers, fitting names, proper figures, &c. *Essay towards a real Character*, &c. Part I. Chap. v. And he has exhibited a table of such simple sounds as he thinks can be framed by men, with a twofold instance of a more regular character for the letters, together with several other curious particulars. Part III. Chap. x. xi. xii. xiii. xiv. After all, he concludes as follows: "These thirty-four letters, before enumerated, will suffice to express all those articulate sounds, which are commonly known and used in these parts of the world. I dare not be over-peremptory in asserting, that these are all the *articulate Sounds*, which either are, or can be in nature; it being as impossible to reckon up all such, as to determine the just number of *Colours* or *Tastes*."

‡ The etymology of the Latin word *Litera*, is not so well ascertained. See SCALIGER *de Gausis Ling. Lat. Lib. 1. Cap. 4.* AMMONIUS the Grammarian thus defines the difference betwixt *γράμμα* and *στοιχείον*. *Γράμμα* στοιχείῳ διαφέρει. *Στοιχείον* μὲν ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκφώνησις καὶ ὁ φθόγγος, ἐπὶ τὸ γράμμα ἐστὶ σημεῖον ἢ τύπος ἢ ἔκτυπος. *Γράμμα* differs from *στοιχείον*. For *στοιχείον* is the enunciation and the sound, of which *γράμμα* is a sign or type or figure. De affinium vocab. differentiâ, voce *γράμμα*, ubi vide quæ annotavit vir doctissimus LUD.

CASP.

ginal signification, however, of γράφω was not precisely what we now mean by the expression *to write*. In the earliest times of the Greek language, it meant *to carve*; and as the most ancient method of writing was to carve some sort of figures upon tables of wood or brass, which was expressed by γράφειν, (as we learn from HOMER *), that verb remained in use to express the

CASP. VALCKENAER. ARISTOTLE gives the following account of an element. Στοιχεῖον μὲν ἐν ἑστὶ φωνῇ ἀδιαίρετος* ἐ πάσα ζῆ, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἧς πέφυκε συνεστὴ γινέσθαι φωνή. καὶ γὰρ τῶν θηρίων εἰς τὴν ἀδιαίρετον φωνὴν ὧν ἐδεμίαν λέγω στοιχεῖον. *An Element is an indivisible sound; not every indivisible sound, but from the composition of which an intelligible sound [or word] is naturally produced. For the cries of wild animals are indivisible sounds, but I call none of these an Element.* De Poetic. cap. xx. See also DIONYS. Halicarn. de Compos. Verb. cap. XIV. et PLATO in Cratylō. Vol. I. p. 426. Edit. SERRANI. See the Stoic definition of an element, quoted by Mr HARRIS from DIOGENES LAERTIUS: *Hermes*, Book III. chap. 2. But though γράμμα and στοιχεῖον are clearly different, the one signifying a letter and the other an element, they are frequently confounded by the Greek writers; the sign being often taken for the thing signified. Accordingly, DIONYSIUS the Thracian, in giving the etymology of the words, has confounded their meaning. Γράμματα δὲ λέγεται διὰ τὸ γραμμαῖς καὶ ξυσμαῖς τυπεῖσθαι. γράφαι γὰρ τὸ ξύσαι παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ὡς καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ. [Iliad. λ', 388.] Τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ στοιχεῖα καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἔχειν στοιχεῖον τινα καὶ τάξιν. *They are called γράμματα, on account of their being formed by lines and incisions: for γράφαι, among the ancients, signified to make an incision, as we find from HOMER, [Iliad. λ', 388.] The same are called στοιχεῖα, because they are arranged according to a certain progression or series.* Ars Gramm. apud FABRICIUM in Biblioth. Gr. Vol. VII. p. 27. Nor has THEODORE GAZA attended to the distinction in his definition, though it is, in other respects, extremely accurate. Ἀρχαῖον δ' ἴσως ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου, οὗ τῶν στοιχείων. ταῦτα γὰρ ἡ πρώτη καὶ ἀμείνων ἐστὶ τ' ἀνθρώπου φωνή, ἐ γὰρ ὡς ἔτυχεν συμπλέκεται ἀλλήλοις εἰς σύστασιν συλλαβῆς, ἀλλ' ὡς καὶ τέτοια δηλοῖ, στίχοι τε καὶ ἐτάκτως κινεῖσθαι πῶς συντάσσεται κατὰ λόγον. *Perhaps we should begin with the first, viz. the Elements. For they are the first and indivisible voice of man; not being connected together at random, to produce the composition of a syllable; but, as the name imports, arranged in a rational manner, advancing in a certain series and regular order.* Grammat. Inst. Lib. IV. PRISCIAN has remarked this confounding of an element and a letter: “Abusivè tamen et elementa pro literis et literæ pro elementis vocantur.” Lib. I. In most cases, however, no great inconvenience arises from the neglect of this distinction.

* Πέμπει δὲ μιν Λυκίηνδε, πόρην δ' ὅγε σήματα λυγρὰ,

Γράψας ἐν πινάκι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά. Iliad. ζ', 168.

which, translated literally, runs thus: *He sent him into Lycia, and he moreover gave him destructive signs, having carved, upon a folding tablet, a variety of them fatal to his life.* The poet is speaking of PROETUS, who sent BELLEROPHON into Lycia with this fatal tablet.

the more commodious method of writing which was afterwards invented.

IN whatever part of the world, or at whatever time, the use of letters took its origin, (for I do not mean at present to enter upon that inquiry *), it cannot be denied that it is one of the most admirable of all human inventions. That we should be able, by means of twenty-four visible characters, to denote the various thoughts of our minds, uttered by articulate sounds, so as not only to convey them to persons absent and at a distance, but even to transmit them to posterity, must, if it did not, as some suppose, proceed immediately from the Deity, be considered as the most eminent of all the improvements which human art has yet made of those powers which he has been pleased to bestow upon our species †.

P 2

INDEED,

tablet. We have no authority to translate *σήματα*, *Letters*, or *γράψας*, *having written*, as is generally done. Indeed, no where in the poems of HOMER, do we find any part of the simple verb *γράφω*, except here, and in the 599th line of the 17th book of the Iliad, where *γράψεν* occurs; and there it signifies *to wound*, or *to make an incision*, being applied to what the spear of POLYDAMAS did to PENELAUS the Bœotian. Its compound *ἐνγράφω* indeed is found four or five times, and always signifies *to raze* or *graze* the skin with the point of a weapon. But neither *γράμμα* nor *τοιχῆον* are to be met with in HOMER, nor does he any where make mention of Letters or writing by any terms whatever. For *σήμα*, which occurs so often, can scarcely ever be said to signify what we mean by a *Letter*: And hence an argument has been adduced, though not by any means a decisive one, against HOMER's knowledge of the art of writing, or the use of letters. But this is an investigation which cannot properly be introduced in a note. See what the late Mr ROBERT WOOD has written upon this subject in the last section of his *Essay on the original Genius of HOMER*. Lond. 1775. 4to.

* SEE a short but elegant Dissertation, printed at the conclusion of the 2d Vol. of HAVERCAMP'S *Sylloge Scriptorum qui de Ling. Græc. verâ et rectâ pronuntiatione commentarios reliquerunt*, entitled, *De Fœnicum Literis*, &c. GUILLIELMO POSTELLO Barentonio auctore. See also HARRIS'S *Hermes*, Book III. ch. 2.

† “ LA communication des pensées par l'Ecriture, n'est guères moins admirable que celle qui se fait par la Parole. Ce ne fut apparemment qu'après bien des meditations et des essais multipliés, que degoûté des difficultés, des équivoques, des obscurités, des bornes trop étroites de l'écriture hiéroglyphique, l'inventeur de l'écriture littérale reconnut

INDEED, the faculty of speech itself, not to mention the various arts and sciences, could not have been brought to any considerable degree of improvement, without the assistance of written language. Without this, the knowledge of one age of the world could not have descended distinctly to another, and consequently mankind must, in a great measure, have lost those advantages which they derive from the accumulated experience of former times.

THE variety of languages, however, both written and spoken, which takes place in the world, has been matter of regret to those who have considered the subject particularly; and it has been wished, that a method of speech, capable of being conveyed by writing, had been invented, which mankind, at least in every polished nation, might have been able universally to adopt and to understand. But the distribution of the world into so many different kingdoms and nations, seems to render the introduction of an universal language among mankind quite impracticable*. For although men possess

“ connu le nombre assez petit des sons élémentaires, et compris qu'en les représentant
 “ par autant de caractères distincts, on pourroit combiner ces caractères comme les sons
 “ qu'ils représentent; ce qui constitue en effet

“ ————— *Cet art ingénieux*

“ *De peindre la parole, et de parler aux yeux;*

“ art merveilleux, qui fixe à jamais la parole et la pensée qu'elle exprime, qui porte
 “ l'une et l'autre aux absents, qui les fait passer à la postérité la plus reculée, et dont on
 “ peut dire avec vérité et sans restriction, ce que dit M. DIDEROT d'un idiome qui di-
 “ viendrait commun à tout le genre humain: [*Encyclop. au mot ENCYCLOPEDIE.*] que
 “ par son moyen, *la distance des temps disparaît, les lieux se touchent, il se forme des liaisons*
 “ *entre tous les points habités de l'espace et de la durée, et tous les êtres vivants et pensants*
 “ *s'entretiennent.*” Grammaire Generale, &c. Par M. BEAUZEE. Tom. I. p. 2. See
 also CICERO. *Quest. Tusc.* Lib. I. and WILKINS's *Essay*, &c. p. 10.

* THE ingenious, laborious and truly admirable effort of Dr WILKINS, to invent and establish an universal character and philosophical language, has only tended to show more strikingly the impracticableness of such an attempt: At least, however feasible his project may appear, his method still remains unemployed by the learned; and as for the vulgar, it is quite beyond their comprehension.

possess universally the same organs of speech, and, by means of these, the same faculty of uttering articulate sounds; yet the manner of exerting those organs, so as to produce a particular language, being quite arbitrary, is a work, at first, of accident, and then of gradual improvement, and which cannot be carried forward, even by the help of writing, without a frequent intercourse, and a sort of mutual convention among the individuals of that society, who find it for their advantage to adopt such a language*. But an intercourse adequate to such an end cannot take place beyond a particular nation; therefore an universal living language cannot possibly subsist: For, according to an observation of D'ALEMBERT, "There is nothing, either in nature or in reason, which determines an object to be designed by one sound more than by another." To which BEAUZEE adds, That "there is nothing in nature or reason which determines a sound to be designed by one letter more than by another†." Accordingly, a variety of different tongues

* THE inhabitants of some nations, says M. DU MARSAIS, employ certain organs, and even certain parts of organs, of which others make no use. There is likewise a particular form or manner of exerting the organs, &c. "Il y'a des peuples qui mettent en action certains organes et même certaines parties des organes, dont les autres ne font point d'usage. Il y'a aussi une forme ou maniere particuliere de faire agir les organes. De plus en chaque nation, en chaque province, et même en chaque ville, on s'enonce avec un forte de modulation particuliere; c'est qu'on appelle *accent national*, ou *accent provinciale*." *Encyclop. au mot CONSONNE*.

† "SI, comme le dit l'illustre Secrétaire de l'Academie Françoisé, *il n'y a rien dans la nature ni dans la raison qui détermine un objet à être designé par un son plutôt que par un autre*; on peut dire avec autant ou plus de vérité, qu'il n'y a rien dans la nature ni dans la raison qui détermine un son à être designé par une lettre plutôt que par une autre." *Gramm. Generale, par M. BEAUZEE. Tom. I. p. 179.* See also p. 233, 234.

Dr WILKINS indeed has endeavoured to contrive a set of characters, which, in their shape, have "some resemblance to that configuration which there is in the organs of speech upon the framing of several letters." Upon which account, he thinks, such an alphabet may deserve the name of a *natural character* of the letters. *Essay, &c. p. 375.* But here he has not been very successful; and indeed he seems himself to prefer another alphabet, which he has also set down, although it has no such property, and yet is, as he confesses, "more facile and simple."

tongues has prevailed ever since the early ages of the world; and such of them as have ceased to be spoken would have soon perished, had they not been committed to writing; by which means, some of them have survived the wreck of nations, and the other vicissitudes of human affairs. Of these, though their genuine pronunciation be now, in a great measure, lost, we are still able, after a considerable degree of pains, not only to understand the meaning, but even to perceive the beauties; and, among the various sorts of instruction which they convey, we derive from them many essential advantages in improving and polishing our own language.

To none have we been more indebted in these respects, than to the language of the ancient Greeks. As this is acknowledged, by all who have studied it, to be the most perfect*; so the analogy perceived from an attentive observation of its structure, even in the most minute parts, is of all others the most complete and beautiful. Whence the Greeks borrowed their alphabet, which they used with such success, I am not here to enquire. That it did not originate with themselves, is universally agreed among the learned†. But it is no less certain,

* SEE Mr HARRIS's elegant encomium of the Greeks and their language, of which he was the great and rational admirer. *Hermes*, Book III. Chap. 5. Also, Dr GREGORY SHARPE, in the Preface to his *Origin and Structure of the Greek Tongue*.

† It is the uniform opinion of ancient authors, that the Greek alphabet at first consisted only of sixteen letters, which were imported out of Phœnicia into Greece by the celebrated CADMUS. [See HERODOT. *Terpsichor.* cap. 58. PLUTARCH. *Sympos.* lib. 9. IREN. lib. I. cap. 12. LUCAN. *Pharf.* lib. III. See also, Dr WILKINS's *Essay*, p. 11.] These sixteen letters, called *Καδμυία γράμματα*, and sometimes *σήματα Κάδμου*, were the two short vowels with the three *ancipites*; the three smooth and the three intermediate mute consonants; and the four liquids, with the solitary *Σίγμα*. PALAMEDES is said to have added the three aspirated mutes, and the double consonant *Ξι*, at the time of the Trojan war. And SIMONIDES is supposed afterwards to have invented the two other double consonants and the two long vowels. See MONTFAUCON. *Palæogr. Gr.* p. 115, 116, 117. And see an enumeration of the authors who have written on this subject in THEOPHILI CHRISTOPH. HARLES *Introd. in Hist. Ling. Gr. Proleg.* p. viii. seqq. *Altenburg.* 1778. 8vo.

tain, that wherever they got the first sketch of an alphabet, they improved it very much, not indeed instantly, but gradually, till they brought it to that state in which we now see it, in the twenty-four different characters whereof it is composed*.

To point out completely the analogy which the Greek writers observed in the use of each of those letters, would lead into a very wide field. At present, I propose only to enquire particularly into the nature and principal uses of one of them, I mean the Σίγμα. This, being the sign of a singular sort of sound, has been used, in the structure of the Greek tongue, in a manner different from every other letter; and therefore the Grammarians have generally allotted to it a singular place in their arrangement of the different component members of the Greek alphabet. It will be impossible, however, to treat of the Σίγμα, without making mention of certain circumstances incident to the other consonants.

P A R T I.

THE letter Σίγμα was commonly so called by the inhabitants of Greece, its islands and colonies, except the Dorians, who, as we learn from HERODOTUS, gave it the name of Σάν†. DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus also mentions this
Doric

* CALLISTRATUS, the Grammarian of Samos, is said to have arranged the Greek alphabet in the order in which we now find it, when EUCLIDES was Archon of Athens. See FOSTER's *Essay on Accent and Quantity*, p. 41. 2d Edit.

† Δαρείος μὲν τὸ σὰν καλεῖσσι, Ἴωνες δὲ σίγμα. Lib. I.

Doric name *; and ATHENÆUS further observes, that ARISTOPHANES, in his comedy of *The Clouds*, has called those horses who had this letter branded upon them, Σαμφόρας †. It has been by some thought absurd, that the letters, which are the signs of elemental sounds, should be called by any other names than the mere sounds which they denote. It may be said, however, in favour of the Greek names, that they always begin with the letter whose power they denote; and it is a good practical rule in grammar, to say, “ That the power of “ each letter may be known by catching the initial sound of the “ name ‡.” In speaking particularly of the letters, it is necessary to have a distinct articulate name to give to each of them, because the mere power, especially of the mute consonants, can scarcely be uttered without a vowel; and if the assistance of a vowel be employed in uttering them, then you give them a name somewhat different from their real power, and more likely to lead into error.

WITH respect to the elemental sound of which Σίγμα is the sign, there is no doubt that the Greeks used that letter to express precisely what we denote in English by the letter S in such words as the following, *same, designation, distress*. This we learn from a distinct description, which DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus has given of the position and effort of the vocal organs in the pronunciation of this letter. “ The Σίγμα, says “ he, is pronounced by an impulse of the tongue to the palate, “ while

* He mentions it as β called by PINDAR. *De compositione Verborum*, Sect. 14. of which more afterwards.

† ATHENÆUS, p. 467. *Edit. Commelin*. See also ISAACI CASAUB. *Animadverss. in ATHEN.* Lib. X. cap. 21. Σαμφόρας is evidently compounded of Σαν and φέρω, being always μ before π, β, φ, which will be remarked more particularly afterwards. See ARISTOPHANIS *Nubes*, 122. 1298. *Edit. Brunck. Argentor.* 1783.

‡ LITERÆ cujusque vis intelligitur ex initiali sono nominis. MOOR *Elementa, L. Gr.* p. 2.

“ while the breath rushes through the middle part of it, and
 “ emits a gentle and constricted sibilation about the teeth *.”
 The name itself is evidently derived from σίζω, *to hiss*; and
 from the hissing sound of which it is the sign, it has been
 called the serpentine letter. Some have even fancied, that vari-
 ous shapes of the serpent have been copied in the different forms
 it has assumed †. The forms most commonly in use, are two
 for the large or capital letter, thus Σ, C, and three for the small
 one, thus σ, C, ε, of which the last is always final, the other two
 initial or intermediate ‡. In order to comprehend more distinctly
 the use of the Σίγμα, it will here be proper to take a short view
 of the other consonants.

VOL. II.

Q

THE

* Το——σ [ἐκφανέται] τῆς μὲν γλώσσης προσαναγομένης ἄνω πρὸς τὸν ἔρανόν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα δὲ διὰ μέσων αὐτῆς φερόμενον καὶ περὶ τῆς ὀδόντος λεπτὸν καὶ συνὸν ἐξασθενεῖ τὸ σύριγμα.

CERATINUS's definition is nearly the same: “ Profertur lingua sursum adducta ad pa-
 “ latum, cujus medio spatio spiritus fertur et circa dentes exilem et angustum et quodam-
 “ modo tristem sibilum expellit.” *De Sono Gr. Litt. Libellus*. It ought never to be
 pronounced, as in some English and French words, as if it were the same with Z, or a
 double S. “ Hic quidem certe graviter errant et labuntur præter cæteros Galli, quoties
 “ σίγμα interjacet duabus vocalibus in una vel diversis dictionibus. Tum enim sonus qui
 “ est in ζῆτα, vel in ΖΑΙΝ Hebræorum ex eo percipitur: ac perinde pronuntiatur ac si
 “ μῆξα scriberetur. Quod certe vitium dum nonnulli subterfugere ac devitare volunt,
 “ utinam in alterum minime inciderent, nec quasi per geminum SS effet scriptum MUSSA
 “ proferrent.” HEN. STEPH. *Apologet. pro vet. L. Gr. Pron.* In which opinion LAN-
 CELOT agrees. “ Sa prononciation doit estre ferme et entiere, aussibien entre deux
 “ voyelles qu'en tout autre lieu. C'est pourquoy il le faut prononcer dans Χρῆστος de mê-
 “ me que dans σῆς ΤΥΑΕ: quoiqu'en François nous prononcions autrement CHRYSÈS que
 “ SES.” *Nouvelle methode pour apprendre facilement la Langue Greque*, p. 16.

† “ SIGMA—merus est sibilus: ideoque ab Hebræis specie quadam serpentis caudam
 “ ad caput retorquentis, et a Græcis, in gyrum sese revolventis, hac videlicet figurâ Σ
 “ vel veluti caput vibrantis, ut σ: denique ut sese sinuantis, pingitur, nempe C, quam fi-
 “ guram Latini imitati.” BEZA *de pronunt. Gr. L.* p. 21. *Edit.* H. STEPH. 1587.

‡ Father MONTFAUCON has given ten different figures of the Σίγμα, and mentioned
 the different periods when each of them was used. *Palæogr. Gr.* p. 336, 337. “ The
 “ disability of pronouncing this letter is called *Blæstus*, *Lisping*, whence it is corruptly
 “ founded like (*tb*.)” WILKINS, p. 369.

THE general difference betwixt vowels and consonants has been very accurately stated by Dr WILKINS, in the following words: “ Those letters are called *Vocales*, vowels, in pronouncing of which by the instruments of speech, the breath is freely emitted; and they are therefore styled *Apert*, or open letters. “ Those letters are styled *Consonants*, in the pronouncing of which the breath is intercepted by some collision or closure amongst the instruments of speech; and for this reason are they styled *Clausæ Literæ* *.”

THE seventeen Greek consonants were divided by the elder grammarians into eight femivowels and nine mutes. “ Of the consonants, says THEODORE GAZA, ~~some~~ are femivowels, as ζ, ξ, ψ, λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ, of which ζ, ξ, ψ, are double, and λ, μ, ν, ρ, are immutable and liquid †.” According to this arrangement, σ is a femivowel; but in the subdivision of the femivowels into double consonants and liquids, it is tacitly omitted. For this GAZA had the authority of DIONYSIUS the Thracian ‡, and probably of APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS, whom he very much followed. CONSTANTINE LASCARIS has expressed himself very nearly in the same words §. But EMANUEL CHRYSOLORAS is more explicit. His Grammar is in the form of question and answer. “ How are the seventeen consonants divided? Into two sorts, femivowels and mutes. How many are femivowels? Eight, ζ, ξ, ψ, λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ. How are the femivowels divided? Into three sorts, double consonants, immutable consonants, and σ. How many

* *Essay towards a real Character*, &c. p. 363. and 366.

† Τῶν δὲ συμφώνων, τὰ μὲν ἱμάφωνα, οἷον ζ. ξ. ψ. λ. μ. ν. ρ. σ. ὧν διπλᾶ μὲν ζ. ξ. ψ. ἀμετέωλα δὲ ἡ ὑγῆ λ. μ. ν. ρ. THEOD. GAZÆ *Introductionis Grammaticæ libri* IV. fol. 3. *Basil. apud VALENT. CURIONEM.* 8vo.

‡ Vide DIONYSII *Thracis Art. Grammat.* Extat in FAB. *Biblioth. Gr.* Vol. VII. p. 26.

§ Vide CONSTANTINI LASCARIS *Grammaticæ Compendium*, p. 2. apud PAULUM MANUTIIUM, ALDI F. Venet. 1557. 12mo.

“ ny are double? Three, ζ, ξ, ψ. How many are immutable?
 “ Four, which are also called liquids, λ, μ, ν, ρ*.” The remaining nine consonants are called mutes by all the grammarians: Of which three, to wit, π, κ, τ, are termed ψιλὰ, *smooth*; three, to wit, φ, χ, θ, are *δασέα*, *rough*, or *dense*; and three, to wit, β, γ, δ, are μέσα, *intermediate*; in such a manner, that each smooth one has an intermediate and a dense one to correspond to it, which three are said to be of the same rank, because they nearly resemble each other in the manner in which the vocal organs exert themselves in pronouncing them; the first rank π, β, φ, being *labial*, the second κ, γ, χ, being *palatine*, and the third τ, δ, θ, being *dental*, as is well known to every one who has the smallest acquaintance with the principles of the Greek tongue. ARISTOTLE has defined, with his usual acuteness and precision, the difference betwixt a vowel, a semivowel and a mute. “ A vowel (says he) is that which, without any allision of the organs, hath an audible sound, as α and ω. A semivowel is that which, with an allision, hath an audible sound, as σ and ρ. A mute is that which, with an allision, hath by itself indeed no audible sound, but is audible in conjunction with the vowels, as γ and δ †.”

I AM sensible that the arrangement of the consonants by the Greek grammarians, has not been approved of by some late writers on the subject of grammar; and there is no doubt but another might be shewn which would seem better adapted to

Q 2

the

* Εἰς πόσα διαιρῶνται τὰ δεκαεπτὰ σύμφωνα; εἰς δύο, εἰς ἡμίφωνα καὶ ἄφωνα. πόσα ἡμίφωνα; ὀκτὼ ζ, ξ, ψ, λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ. εἰς πόσα διαιρῶνται τὰ ὀκτὼ ἡμίφωνα; εἰς τρεῖς, εἰς διπλᾶ, εἰς ἀμετάθετα, καὶ εἰς τὸ σίγμα. πόσα διπλᾶ; ἰεῖα, ζ, ξ, ψ. ποσα ἀμετάθετα; τέσσαρα, ἃ καὶ ὑπερὰ λεγούσιναι, λ, μ, ν, ρ. EMANUELIS CHRYSOLORAE Gr. Gram. Institutiones. Ven. apud Jo. FARREUM et Fratres. 12mo. Paginis defunt numeri.

† Ἐστὶ δὲ φωνῆν μὴν, ἃνεν προσβολῆς ἔχον φωνὴν ἀκυστήν. οἶον, τὸ α καὶ ω. Ἡμίφωνον δὲ, τὸ μὲν προσβολῆς ἔχον φωνὴν ἀκυστήν· οἶον, τὸ σ, καὶ τὸ ρ. Ἄφωνον δὲ, τὸ μετὰ προσβολῆς καθ' αὐτὸ μὴ ὑδριμία ἔχον φωνήν, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἔχόντων τινα φωνῆν γινόμενον ἀκυστήν· οἶον, τὸ γ καὶ τὸ δ. Περὶ Ποιητ. Κεφ. κ'.

the natural order of the elemental sounds, and the affinity subsisting among certain classes of such sounds. All such as are labial, for instance, might be classed together, whether mutes or semivowels, as $\beta, \mu, \pi, \phi, \psi$; all such as are dental, to wit, ζ, ϱ, σ ; all such as are lingual, to wit, $\delta, \theta, \lambda, \nu, \tau$; and all such as are palatine, to wit, $\gamma, \kappa, \chi, \xi$. And accordingly this has been done by HULEWICZ, one of the best modern writers on Greek grammar*. But this he has proposed, without rejecting the usual arrangement, which he knew to be so important in examining or explaining the structure of the Greek tongue. For though a division and arrangement of that sort might answer the purpose of a minute anatomical or physiological inquiry concerning the organs of speech, yet as this was not the circumstance chiefly attended to by the Greeks in the progress of their language, though they did not by any means neglect it, we must adhere to that other distribution by the grammarians, if we would wish to comprehend clearly the real use of the Greek letters. There is, for instance, no doubt that μ is a labial consonant, as well as π, β , or ϕ and in fact the Greeks in some measure attended to this, as will be afterwards shewn; but the use of μ as a liquid, and its partaking in this respect of the same analogy with λ, ν, ϱ , was a connection much more striking, and much more attended to in the practical application of the Greek alphabet†. In the case of the nine mutes, it is of very great consequence to consider how, in

* See ALEX. GABR. WOJUTYN HULEWICZ, *nobilis Poloni, Institutiones Ling. Græcæ*, p. 14. *Lugd. Bat.* 1746. 4to. M. BEAUZEE, an ingenious French Grammarian, has also proposed a very minute arrangement of the letters, according to an idea of this kind. See *Grammaire Générale, ou Exposition raisonnée des Elémens nécessaires du Langage*. 2 tomes, Paris, 1767. 8vo. See also BISHOP WILKINS's *Essay*, &c. p. 357.

† “ Appellantur LIQUIDÆ, — quod post mutam positæ quasi liquefcentes ac evanescentes, vim consonantes interdum amittant, neque vocalem præcedentem longam efficiunt, ut aliæ consonantes.” ANTESIGNANUS *apud* CLENARDUM, p. 3. *Hanovix*, 1617. 4to.

in the inflections, and in certain other syllabic combinations, each of the letters which compose the different ranks changes its place occasionally with one of its own rank, and not with that of another ; and in the case of the liquids, how, if any one of them occur in the nominative of a noun, it must remain unchanged in the oblique cases ; and if it occur in the present tense of a verb, it must remain unchanged in the futures ; from whence the liquids have also got the name of ἀμετάβoλα, *immutable* ; likewise, in the case of the double consonants, how each of them is occasionally resolved into the mute of which it is composed, and σῖγμα. All this might be shewn particularly, and at great length. But I return to the Σῖγμα.

IN treating of the Greek characters, some distinguished modern grammarians have not paid due attention to this letter. GRETSEr, the Jesuit, in his arrangement of the consonants, has assigned no place to it at all *. He does not even mention it as one of the semivowels, although it be evidently entitled to that distinction. LANCELOT, author of the Port-Royal Grammar, at a loss, it should seem, what to do with it, has classed it, awkwardly enough, with the double consonants. “ Although “ the Σῖγμα, says he, be the only one of its own set, we may “ nevertheless join it with the double consonants, not only be- “ cause it forms one of their constituent parts, but also because “ they all resemble it, by being sibilant in the pronuncia- “ tion †.” Other grammarians, particularly CLENARDUS, ANTESIGNANUS and HULEWICZ, have judged much better in taking the hint from the Greek writers already quoted, especially

* *Institutiones Ling. Gr. Ingoldstadii*, 1605. 12mo.

† “ Quoique le σ soit seul de sa bande, nous pouvons néanmoins le joindre avec les “ doubles non seulement parce qu’il en fait partie, mais aussi parce que dans leur pro- “ nonciation elles sont toutes sifflantes comme lui.” *Nouvelle Methode pour apprendre facilement la Langue Greque. Paris, 1754. 8vo.*

especially EMANUEL CHRYSOLORAS, and allowing the Σῖγμα to be a femivowel ; but perceiving that it is neither a liquid, nor a double consonant, nor a mute, they have called it *litera solitaria, et suæ potestatis, vel sui juris* ; the *solitary*, and the *absolute* or *independent* letter ; the letter which possesses a singular and independent power, nowise fettered by that relative analogy to which the other consonants are obliged to submit. That is to say, there has been a singular sound observed to subsist in the Greek language, expressive of a great many varieties in the changes and inflections of words independent of certain other classes of changes and inflections ; and that singular sound has been denoted by the Σῖγμα. For it is certain, that languages were used previous to the invention of letters, though they must have been very rude in that early state. But they would afterwards be much refined by those very letters, the use of which must doubtless have suggested many essential improvements, which would not otherwise have been thought of.

Now, upon what grounds the Σῖγμα is entitled to an exemption or distinction, such as I have mentioned, it may be worth while to examine. The inquiry will tend to shew the great use, and indeed absolute necessity of such a character in the alphabet of this most exquisite of all languages.

Dr SAMUEL CLARKE, one of the most acute and ingenious of all the commentators, has, in a note upon the word πέλασσε, at the beginning of the thirteenth book of the Iliad, mentioned a probable reason, in his opinion, why the ancients held the Σῖγμα to be *suæ potestatis*. “ Πέλασσε, says he, must
 “ certainly be written with a double σ, because the second syllable of πέλασσε is short. It may, however, (continues he), be
 “ questioned, whether the more ancient Greeks made use of
 “ that mode of writing. For when they called σ an arbitrary
 “ letter, perhaps they meant, that whereas the letters ζ, ξ, ψ,
 “ are necessarily double, and all the rest of the consonants
 “ simple, σ alone has this peculiarity, that, in a great many
 “ places,

“ places, especially the aorists of verbs, it may be pronounced “ either as a simple or a double letter *.” This reason is ingenious ; but, upon examining it narrowly, it does not appear to be satisfactory. Indeed Dr CLARKE himself does not seem quite satisfied with it, and offers it only as a conjecture. There is no doubt, however, of what this accomplished scholar has elsewhere † shewn, that the *penult* of the first aorist of such a verb as *πελάζω* is short, but that the poets, as HOMER has frequently done, may make it long, by doubling the *σ*, or rather by restoring the *σ*, which had been thrown away in the formation of the first future ‡. Nor is it improbable, that when the poems of HOMER were first committed to writing, the *σ* was set down single, even when the verse made it requisite to pronounce it double. It happens, however, that this privilege of being occasionally doubled, is not peculiar to the *σ*. We find, among the poets, other consonants, mutes as well as liquids, frequently in the same situation. Thus,

“Ως ἴφαρ· ἔΔΔεισεν δ' ὁ γέρον καὶ ἐπείδετο μύθῳ ἥ.

And

Τὸν καὶ ὑπέΔΔεισαν μάκαρες θεοὶ, ἐδὲ τ' ἔδῃσαν §.

Here

* *πύλασσι.*] “ Ita jam scribendum, necessariò ; quia *πύλασι* secundam corripit. Dubitari tamen potest, utrumne Græci antiquiores isto modo scripserint. Nam quum *σ*, *σua potestatis literam* dixerunt, haud scio an hoc sibi voluerint ; literas ζ, ξ, ψ, necessariò quidem *duplices* esse ; consonantium reliquas omnes, *simplices* ; unicam autem *σ*, istiusmodi esse, ut permultis in locis, ac præcipue in verborum Aoristis, *simplex duplexve* ex æquo pronunciari possit.” *Ad Iliad.* v, 1.

† *Vide ad Iliad.* α, 140. ζ', 432.

‡ ACCORDING to the rule, which directs, that, in verbs not liquid, the first future should arise from the present, by inserting a *σ* before *ω*, *πελάζω*, which is the same with *πελάδω*, would have in the first future *πελάζω*, or *πελαδσω*. But a special rule directs, that before *ω* we must, in the future, throw away τ, δ, θ, σ, which makes that tense of *πελάζω* to be *πύλάσω*· hence the first aorist *ἔπύλασα*, to which restore the rejected *σ*, and it becomes *ἔπύλασσα*. *Vide Moor Element. L. Gr.* p. 128.

§ *Iliad.* α, 33.

§ *Ibid.* α, 406.

Here the δ is double in $\epsilon^{\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu}$ and $\upsilon\pi\epsilon^{\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu}$, that $\epsilon^{\delta\delta\epsilon\iota}$ may be a spondee, which it could not otherwise have been. We find the τ also frequently doubled, as $\epsilon^{\delta\delta}, \tau\tau$ *, instead of ϵ^{δ}, τ . In which cases, it is fully as probable, that in the early copies of the poems of HOMER, such words were always written with a simple δ or τ , as that $\pi\epsilon^{\delta\delta}\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon$, and others of the same sort, were always written with a simple σ . Sometimes we find ρ , contrary to the rule by which it is said to be always doubled after the syllabic augment, (as $\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$, $\epsilon^{\rho\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$), written single by the poets: thus, $\epsilon^{\rho\rho}\acute{\rho}\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$, in the imperfect from $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omega$, is written first single, and then double, in the following verses:

Ἄλλος δ' ἄλλω ῥερεζε θεῶν αἰειγενετᾶων †.

Οἷη δ' ἐκ ῥερεζε Διὸς κέρεη μεγάλοιο ‡.

In the first of these lines, $\delta' \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega \epsilon^{\delta\delta}$ is a dactyl, in which the ω , one of the four diphthongs, is short before the first syllable of $\epsilon^{\rho\rho}\acute{\rho}\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$, by a well known practice of the poets. Nay, we find, that even in the modern editions of HOMER, the liquid λ occurs written single, when the verse requires it to be pronounced double, which Dr CLARKE himself, with his usual acuteness, has shewn to be the case in the exordium of the Iliad.

Ἡρώων, αὐτὰς δ' ἐλῶρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν—

where $\epsilon^{\lambda\omega}\acute{\rho}\iota\alpha$ must be pronounced as if it were written $\epsilon^{\lambda\lambda\omega}\acute{\rho}\iota\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta\epsilon$ being here a spondee. After all, it must be owned, that σ is much oftener doubled by the poets than any other consonant. Indeed, no consonant but itself admits of being doubled in the penult of the first aorists ||.

THERE

* Iliad. α , 294.

† Ibid. β , 400.

‡ Iliad. ϵ , 532. In some editions, $\epsilon^{\rho\rho}\acute{\rho}\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$ is written $\epsilon^{\rho\rho}\acute{\rho}\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$ in the first aorist, which answers the present purpose as well.

|| In the middle voice it is the antepenult.

THERE are, however, several other grounds on which the claim of this letter to the appellation of *solitary* or *independent*, may be supported.

I. ΣΙΓΜΑ alone of all the consonants employs its power in assisting the mutes to make up the double letters. Thus, any one of the labial mutes π, or β, or φ, assisted by σ, makes ψ· any one of the palatine mutes, κ, or γ, or χ, assisted in the same manner, makes ξ· and any one of the dental mutes, τ, or δ, or θ, with the same help, makes ζ. In the case of ψ and ξ, this is evident from the mode of resolving those double letters in the inflections, especially in the oblique cases of nouns of the imparisyllabic declension. Thus, in the case of ψ, we perceive that λαίλαψ, *procella*, is the same with λαίλαπς, because its genitive is λαίλαπος· that Ἀραψ, *Arabs*, is the same with Ἀραβς, because its genitive is Ἀραβος· that κατῆλιψ, *scala*, is the same with κατῆλιφς, because its genitive is κατῆλιφος· and in the case of ξ, we perceive that κόραξ, *corvus*, is the same with κόρακς, because its genitive is κόρακος· that φλόξ, *flamma*, is the same with φλόγς, because its genitive is φλόγος· that ὄνυξ, *ungula*, is the same with ὄνυχς, because its genitive is ὄνυχος. But the same analogy in the case of ζ is not so easily traced; and indeed the critics and grammarians, who have written in Greek, do not even assert that ζ is equivalent to δς, but to σδ*. Their reason seems to have been, that they never observed ζ resolved into two simple consonants, except in the Doric manner, as μελίσδω, instead of μελίζω, *modulor*; ὄσδω, instead of ὄζω, *oleo*. The learned HULEWICZ even denies that ζ is a double letter; “ because, “ (says he) it never is equivalent to two consonants, like ξ and “ ψ· for if ζ were a double consonant, it would occur in the “ termination of Greek words, as well as ξ and ψ, which it
VOL. II. R “ never

* Vide DIONYS. Hal. περὶ συνθ. ὀνομ. ιδ'. DIONYS. Thracem apud FABRICIUM in *Biblioth. Gr.* Vol. VII. p. 28. THEOD. GAZAE *Grammat.* fol. 24. These are followed by CLENARDUS, &c.

“ never does *.” But, in answer to this, it may be said, that the argument against ζ being a double consonant, because it never terminates a word, cannot be admitted, as it is no where asserted, that to be a final letter is absolutely necessary to the existence of a double consonant. But, granting this to be the case, ζ may in fact be said, as well as ξ and ψ, to be a final letter, if the following circumstances be properly attended to. It is observed by HULEWICZ himself, as well as other grammarians, that the dental mutes τ, δ, θ, are thrown away before σ. This happens evidently in the formation of the first futures of verbs: thus, *τύπτω*, *verbero*, not *τύπτσω* in the future, but *τύψω*, which is written *τύψω*. *ἄδω*, *cano*, not *ἄδσω*, or *ἄζω*, but *ἄσω*. *πλήθω*, *impleo*, not *πλήθσω* nor *πλήζω*, but *πλήσω*. One reason for this seems to be, that if τς, or δς, or θς, had been permitted to remain in the first futures of verbs, they must have produced ζ, and this would have confounded the termination of those futures with that of the present tenses of a great many verbs in ζω, and thus have given rise to a great ambiguity in the case of present and future tenses; an inconvenience which the Greeks carefully avoided, and in the present instance the more willingly got rid of, because the throwing away of τ, δ, θ, before σ, gratified an antipathy, which the Grecian ear, during the progress and refinement of their language, seems to have conceived against the combination of those consonants †; for it is evident, from the analogy of certain genitives which end in τος, δος and θος, that, in the early times of the Greek language, a great many nouns terminated in τς, δς and θς, which is the same with terminating in ζ: thus, *λείβητς*, or *λείβηζς*, by rejecting the τ before ς, becomes

* *Institut. Gram.* p. 13.

† ANOTHER reason is, that, in many verbs, it would produce too great a concurrence of consonants. See this illustrated above, p. 127. note ‡.

comes *λίβης*, *lebes*, but *τ* remains before *ο* in the genitive, *λίβητος*· *λάμπαδς*, or *λάμπαζ*, by rejecting the *δ* before *ς*, becomes *λάμπας*, *lampas*, in the genitive *λάμπαδος*· *ὄρνιθς*, or *ὄρνιζ*, by rejecting *θ* before *ς*, becomes *ὄρνις*, *avis*, in the genitive *ὄρνιθος* *. Farther, it may be inferred, that *ζ* is equivalent at least to *δς*, from what happens in the formation of the second future of such verbs as *ὄζω*. For as *τύπτω* hath in the second future *τυπῶ*, by throwing out the *τ*, which is the latter of the two consonants, the former being the characteristic of the tense; so *ὄζω* (*ὀδσω*) hath *ὀδῶ*, by throwing out the *σ*, which is the latter of the two component consonants in *ζ*, the *δ* being properly the characteristic of the tense. In the same manner, *φράζω* (*φράδσω*) hath *φραδῶ*, and *ἰζω* (*ἰδσω*) hath *ιδῶ*. But that *ζ* was considered by the Greek writers as a double consonant, may be clearly evinced from this, that, like the other two, *ξ* and *ψ*, it obliges a vowel immediately preceding it, though naturally short, to be long by position, as is well known to all who have the smallest acquaintance with Greek prosody. It may be concluded then, that *ζ* is not only a double consonant †, but is equivalent either to *τς*, or *δς*, or *θς*, though the general practice of the Greek writers was to reject *τ*, *δ*, *θ* immediately before *σ*, or to set down *σ* in most cases where the general analogy requires *ζ*, and this, it should seem, in order to produce a sound more pleasing to the

R 2

ear.

* SOMETIMES *τ* is thrown out betwixt *κ* and *ς*, after which the *κς* coming together must make *ξ*· thus, *ἄνακτς*, *ἄνακς*, *ἄναξ*, *rex*, Gen. *ἄνακτος*, where the *ξ* is resolved into *κς*, and the *τ* is restored. See a most ingenious Dissertation, ascribed to the late learned Mr JER. MARKLAND, entitled, *De Græcorum Quintâ Declinatione Imparisyllabicâ, et inde formata Latinorum Tertiâ, Quæstio Grammatica*. Extat cum Editione alterâ EURIPIDIS Dramatis *Supplicium Mulierum*, quam Londini excudebat doctus typographus GUL. BOWYER, nuper defunctus, ejusque discipulus J. NICHOLS. 1775.

† THE other arguments adduced by HULEWICZ, to prove that *ζ* is not a double consonant, do not seem to have any weight. *Vid. Institut. Gram. Gr. ubi supra.*

ear*. Σίγμα, therefore, not only lends its assistance to the dental mutes, in order to form ζ, but even frequently occupies the place of ζ, the component mute being rejected.

II. ΣΙΓΜΑ is the only consonant whose power is employed in the formation of the dative plural of the imparisyllabic declension; and this is done by interposing it immediately before ι of the dative singular: as, ῥήτωρ, *orator*, Dat. Sing. ῥήτορι, Dat. Plur. ῥήτορσι. So κόραξ (κόρακς), *corvus*, D. S. κόρακι, D. P. κόρακσι, which is κόραξι· φλόξ (φλόγς), *flamma*, D. S. φλόγι, D. P. φλόγσι, which is φλόξι· βήξ (βήχς), *tussis*, D. S. βήχι, D. P. βήχσι, which is βήξι. So also ὤψ (ὠπς), *oculus*, D. S. ὤπι, D. P. ὤπσι, which is ὤψι· Ἀραβ (Ἀραβς), *Arabs*, D. S. Ἀραβι, D. P. Ἀραβσι, which is Ἀραβι· κατήλιψ (κατήλιψς), *scala*, D. S. κατήλιφι, D. P. κατήλιφσι, which is κατήλιψι. Also, δαίς (δαίτς), *epulum*, D. S. δαιτί, D. P. not δαιτσί, nor δαιζί, but δαισί, because τ, δ, θ, are thrown away before σ. λάμπας (λάμπαδς), *lucerna*, D. S. λάμπαδι, D. P. not λάμπαδσι, nor λάμπαζι, but λάμπασι. ὄρες (ὄρειδς), D. S. ὄρειδι, D. P. not ὄρειδσι, nor ὄρειζι, but ὄρεισι †.

III. IN

* It deserves to be remarked, that one of the liquids, viz. ν, is also thrown away before σ of the nominative, and restored again in the genitive. Thus, μέλας, *niger*, for μέλαις, has, in the genitive, μέλανος. From some nominatives, both ν and τ are thrown away, and restored in the genitive: thus, γίγας for γίγαντς, Gen. γίγαϊτος* and they are again thrown away before σ in the dative plural, which is not γίγαντσι, but γίγασι. And when, in the presents of verbs, ν and δ occur together, they are both thrown away before σω of the future: thus, κυλίνδω, *volutō*, κυλίσω, evidently for the sake of a more pleasing sound. Vid. MOOR *Elementa L. Gr.* p. 128.

With respect to what HULEWICZ asserts about the final σ, in nouns of the third declension being changed into δ, θ, ν, τ, in the genitive, as ἔρις, *lis*, Gen. ἔριδος· ὄρεις, *avis*, Gen. ὄρειδος· μέλας, *niger*, Gen. μέλανος· χάρις, *gratia*, Gen. χάριτος· this arises from his not having observed, with Mr MARKLAND, that the full nominatives of those words are, ἔριδς, ὄρειδς, μέλαις, χάριτς· and that σ is not changed into the above mentioned consonants, but that these having been thrown away in the nominative, *euphonia causā*, are restored in the genitive, where that reason no longer takes place. See above, p. 130.

† In the dative plural, ν is also thrown out, as ποιμήν, *pastor*, D. S. ποιμένι, D. P. ποιμήσι. Other changes are made in this case in certain nouns *euphonia gratiā*, but σ is always inserted.

III. IN the formation of the Greek verb, where a system of the most beautiful kind may be traced, the singular or peculiar power of Σιγμα is very conspicuous.

1. IT is *always* the characteristic of the first future, in verbs that are not liquid, a station which it maintains without a rival. Thus, in pure verbs, *τίω, βοοοο, τίσω, λύω, λύω, λύσω, τίμαω, βοοοο, τιμήσω, φίλειω, αποο, φιλήσω, πλήρωω, impleo, πληρώσω* in mute verbs, *πλέκω, plico, πλέκω, which is πλέξω, φεύγω, fugio, φεύγω, which is φεύξω, βρέχω, irriigo, βρέχω, which is βρέξω* also, *βλέπω, video, βλέπω, which is βλέψω, τρίβω, tero, τρίβω, which is τρίψω, γράφω, scribo, γράφω, which is γράψω* and so also in verbs ending in *τω, δω* and *θω*, in which the *τ, δ, θ*, are rejected before *σω* of the future, as has been already observed and exemplified *.

2. IT is *never* the proper characteristic letter of the present tense, and therefore in that respect also it is singular. There are indeed a great many verbs which end in *ζω* and as it has been said that ζ is composed of δ, &c. it may be supposed that σ is here the characteristic of the present. But as in some verbs, such as *τύπτω* and *ρίπτω*, the former of the two consonants, to wit *τ*, is reckoned the characteristic; so in such verbs as *φράζω* and *νομίζω*, δ perhaps is the characteristic, as if they were *φράδσω* and *νομίδσω* †. With respect to those verbs which end in

* P. 130. It is to be remarked, that in pure and mute verbs, the σ, which is the characteristic of the first future active, is also that of the first aorist active, the first future, and first aorist middle; which it is needless to exemplify, as it is quite familiar, even to young scholars.

† In the Doric dialect, they are *φράδω* and *νομίδω*. Σ, however, is certainly the characteristic of their first future, where τ, δ, θ, are always thrown away. In this case, the propriety of throwing out the δ is apparent; for, if it were retained, *φράζω* would have in the first future *φράζω*, which is the same with *φράδσω* and *νομίζω* would have *νομίζω*, which is the same with *νομίδσω*, where it is necessary also to throw away the σ which came from the present tense, on account of the σ which was assumed by the formation as the characteristic of the future, and therefore the futures actually are *φράσω* and *νομίσω*. See this hinted at above, p. 127. note †. See likewise, Mook *Elementa Ling. Gr.* p. 129.

in $\sigma\omega$ in the present, in which a σ must be supposed to be the characteristic, this termination is plainly incident to a particular dialect, and those futures in $\xi\omega$, which are said to arise from them, are actually derived from obsolete presents: thus, $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, the future, which is said to come from $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, is evidently formed from the obsolete $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$, which may be learned from the second future, which is $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\tilde{\omega}$. Indeed, $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, and other verbs of that termination, cannot have a first future regularly formed, as σ , which is improperly adopted as the characteristic of the present, cannot also be the characteristic of the future in the same verbs. I may add, that the later Attics rejected that termination in $\sigma\omega$, and substituted $\tau\tau\omega$, saying $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$, instead of $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ *. I must not omit observing too, that a few verbs occur which terminate in $\psi\omega$ and $\xi\omega$, in the present, in which σ may be supposed the characteristic of that tense. But these seem to be futures substituted in place of certain obsolete presents from which they are derived, and whose meaning they have assumed. I know not that there are any more of them than the following, $\epsilon\psi\omega$, *coquo*; $\omicron\delta\alpha\xi\omega$, *mordeo*; $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\xi\omega$, *opitulator*; $\alpha\upsilon\acute{\xi}\omega$, *augeo*. At any rate, so few exceptions, and those too of such a questionable shape, can have no effect against a general rule. The consequence, however, is, that such verbs, by having a σ in their present, must be defective; for there is no proper way of distinguishing their first future, the σ already being employed as the characteristic of the present.

3. ΣΙΓΜΑ *never* is the characteristic of liquid verbs, the liquid of the present always remaining in the future, and some other change being employed to mark this last tense, such as the shortening of the penult, if it be long, and the circumflexion of the final $\tilde{\omega}$ †. The reason is, the analogy of the Greek tongue does not permit a liquid to precede σ , except, sometimes in the Doric dialect, as, $\delta\rho\omega$, *excito*,

* Vide LENNEP in *Analogiam L. Gr.* p. 55, 56, &c.

† See MOOR *Elementa L. Gr.* p. 128.

cito, ὄρω or for some special cause, as in the case of the preposition ἐν in composition, for example ἐνσπείρω, *insero*, as will be shewn more particularly afterwards *.

IV. THE singularity and independent nature of the σ is also very striking, when we take a view of the state in which the liquid ν is found, when it precedes the different letters of the alphabet †. This may be successfully exemplified in the case of words compounded with the prepositions ἐν and σὺν where we may remark one scheme of analogy for the vowels, one for each rank of the mutes, (which includes also the double consonants, as these all begin with a mute,) and one for all of the liquids; but the solitary and absolute Σῖγμα possesses a sort of analogy peculiar to itself, different from all the rest, though no less regular and beautiful.

1. EN and σὺν, in composition, remain before the vowels without any change; as, EN-Αλλάσσω, *immuto*; ΣΥΝ-Οίκεω, *una habito*, &c.

2. BEFORE the first rank of the mutes, ν is changed into μ. Thus,

EM-	Πίπτω,	<i>incido.</i>	ΣΥΜ-	Πείθω,	<i>una persuadeo.</i>
	Βάλλω,	<i>injicio.</i>		Βαίνω,	<i>congreddior.</i>
	Φόρῳ,	<i>importo.</i>		Φρονέω,	<i>consentio.</i>

The reason is, that μ, being a labial liquid, coalesces better than ν with the labial mutes π, β, φ, which may be observed in every such union in the language ‡.

3. BEFORE

* See below p. 137.

† THE liquids are called immutable for the reason formerly given; but their immutability applies chiefly to their situation in the inflections of nouns and verbs; for ν is mutable in different parts of the analogy here remarked.

‡ PARTICULARLY in those new presents in ανω, which are formed from the second future of other presents by changing ω into ανω, and inserting ν immediately after the vowel in the antepenult: thus, λείπω, λιπῶ, λιπάνω, λιπείνω, which is λιμπάνω λήβω, λαβῶ, λαβάνω, λαβείνω, which is λαμβάνω. The same thing happens before ψ, which is compounded of any labial mute and σ, thus, ΕΜ-Ψύχω, *refrigero*. See p. 120. note †.

3. BEFORE the *second* rank of the mutes, *ν* is changed into *γ*. Thus,

ΕΓ-	Κλείω,	<i>includo.</i>	ΣΥΓ-	Καλέω,	<i>convoco.</i>
	Γράφω,	<i>inscribo.</i>		Γελάω,	<i>simul rideo.</i>
	Χρίω,	<i>inungo.</i>		Χέω,	<i>confundo.</i>

The reason is, there being no palatine liquid, *γ*, the intermediate palatine mute, coalesces better than *ν* with the mutes of its own order; and this is a combination of very frequent occurrence in the Greek language*; the sound of the *ν* being at the same time retained and incorporated in the pronunciation with that of *γ*, though the former is thrown out in writing, to avoid the concurrence of three, and sometimes of four consonants.

4. BEFORE the *third* rank of the mutes, *ν* remains unchangeable; thus, ΕΝ-Τείνω, *intendo*, ΣΥΝ-Ταράσσω, *commoueo*, &c. The reason is, *ν* being a dental liquid easily coalesces with the dental mutes, without any change.

5. BEFORE a liquid, *ν* passes into a liquid of the same kind with that which it precedes; thus,

ΕΛ-Δάμπω,	<i>illuceo.</i>	ΣΥΛ-Λέγω,	<i>colligo.</i>
ΕΜ-Μιγνύμι,	<i>immisceo.</i>	ΣΥΜ-Μάρπτω,	<i>corripio.</i>
ΕΝ-Ναίω,	<i>inhabito.</i>	ΣΥΝ-Νοέω,	<i>mecum reputo.</i>
ΕΡ-Ριγώω,	<i>inalgesco.</i>	ΣΥΡ-Ρέω,	<i>confluo.</i>

All this evidently was done *euphonia causa*. But it is to be observed, that before verbs beginning with *ρ*, the preposition *ἐν* seldom passes into *ἐρ*, because, in that case, certain persons of the present tense of the compound verb would be confounded with certain persons of the imperfect tense of the simple verb; for in verbs beginning with *ρ*, the *ρ* is doubled after the syllabic augment; wherefore the euphony was generally here sacrificed, in order to

* Thus, from φαίω, *ostendo*, we have in the perfect, not *πίφανκα*, but *πίφωκα*. And in the new presents in *ων*, formed from a second future, as already mentioned in the preceding note; *ἐρεύω*, *ἐρυγῶ*, *ἐρυγάνω*, *ἐρυγάνω*, which is *ἐρυγγάνω*· *λάχω*, *λαχῶ*, *λαχάω*, *λαγχάνω*, which is *λαγχάνω*. The same thing happens before *ξ*, which is compounded of any palatine mute and *σ*· thus, ΕΓ-Ξίω, *insculpo*.

to obtain a greater advantage, ἐνράπτω, *insuo*, for instance, being preferred to ἐρράπτω*.

6. IN the case of the solitary Σῖγμα, *v* before *σ*, if a vowel follows the *σ*, becomes another *σ*: thus, ΣΥΣ-Σιτίω, *una cibum capio*. If a mute follows the *σ*, then, in the case of *συν*, the *v* is struck out; but in the case of *ἐν*, it remains: thus,

στ	ΣΥ- {	ΣΠάω, <i>contrabo</i> .	ΕΝ- {	ΣΠείρω, <i>infero</i> .
σβ		[No example †.]		[No example †.]
σφ		ΣΦαττω, <i>simul jugulo</i> .		ΣΦραγίζω, <i>signum imprimo</i> .

σν	ΣΥ- {	ΣΚάπτω, <i>simul fodio</i> .	ΕΝ- {	ΣΚήπτω, <i>ingruo</i> .
σγ		[No example †.]		[No example †.]
σχ		ΣΧηματίζω, <i>conformo</i> .		ΣΧολάζω, <i>immoror</i> .

στ	ΣΥ- {	ΣΤρατεύω, <i>simul milito</i> .	ΕΝ- {	ΣΤρέφω, <i>intorqueo</i> .
σδ		Ζάω , <i>una uiuo</i> .		Ζέομαι , <i>inferueo</i> .
σθ		[No example ‡.]		[No example §.]

VOL. II.

S

The

* THE inconvenience which was thus prevented by *ἐν* remaining unchanged, may be perceived by declining the present tense of the compound verb, and the imperfect of the simple verb; thus,

COMPOUND VERB : PRESENT TENSE.

S. ἐρράπτω,	ἐρράπτεις,	ἐρράπτει,
D. ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΟΝ,	ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΟΝ,	ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΟΝ,
P. ΕΡΡΑΠΤΟΜΕΝ,	ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΕ,	ἐρράπτουσιν.

SIMPLE VERB : IMPERFECT TENSE.

S. ἐρράπτον,	ἐρράπτεις,	ἐρράπτει,
D. ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΟΝ,	ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΟΝ,	ἐρράπτετην,
P. ΕΡΡΑΠΤΟΜΕΝ,	ΕΡΡΑΠΤΕΤΕ,	ἐρράπτον.

† THIS cannot be exemplified, because there is no Greek word which begins with *σβ*, except σβέννυμι, *extinguo*, with its verbals.

‡ THERE is no Greek word which begins with *σγ*.

|| FOR ζ, which we shewed above to be equivalent to δ, is also, at least in the Doric dialect, equivalent to σδ.

§ THERE is no primitive Greek word which begins with *σθ*, except σθίω, *valco*.

The reason why ν remains in the case of $\epsilon\nu$, is, that if ν were omitted, as in the case of $\sigma\nu$, certain persons of the present of the compound verb would be confounded with certain persons of the imperfect tense of the simple verb, as in the case of $\epsilon\alpha$ becoming $\epsilon\varrho$ before ϱ , which has been already mentioned *.

V. *Lastly*, THE peculiar nature of $\Sigma\gamma\mu\alpha$, and that which seems to have suggested its various functions in the structure of the Greek tongue, arises from this, that it is the only letter which is sibilant or hissing in the whole Greek alphabet. For ζ , which by some is considered as a sibilant letter, is no farther so than the two other double consonants ξ and ψ and whatever sibilant is observed in their sound, they plainly derive from σ , which is half of their composition.

IN what manner then the improvers of the Greek language availed themselves of this singular letter, I have now endeavoured to show. From the various uses to which it has been applied, some have considered it as a servile letter; and from its hissing, and, as they thought, disagreeable sound, some of the ancient writers, notwithstanding its great use in their language, conceived a violent dislike at it. But this, with several other particulars relative to the same letter, I propose to consider in a second part of this Essay.

IN the mean time, if the authority of names be deemed of any use in justifying inquiries of this nature, I may ask with QUINCTILIAN, "An ideo minor est M. TULLIUS orator, quod idem artis hujus diligentissimus fuit, et in filio (ut in epistolis apparet) recte loquendi usquequaque asper quoque exactor? Aut vim C. CÆSARIS fregerunt editi *de analogiâ* libri? Aut ideo minus MESSALA nitidus, quia quosdam totos libellos non de verbis modo singulis, sed etiam literis dedit †?"

IF

* This will appear evident, by declining the present tense of a compound verb, with the ν thrown out, as $\epsilon\sigma\pi\iota\epsilon\nu$, &c. and the imperfect tense of the simple verb, as $\epsilon\sigma\pi\iota\epsilon\nu$, &c.

† *Institut. Orat. Lib. I. Cap. 7.* "Vilescit tibi hic sermo. Itane? Scilicet MURETO. et LIPSIO indignum decurrere Grammaticum hoc æquor, quod tot olim Senatores. imò.

If a farther apology ſtill be requiſite for a long diſcourſe upon a ſubject ſeemingly ſo frivolous as a ſingle letter, I might deny that the ſubject is frivolous. Nothing, it might be ſaid, is frivolous, which has for its object an inveſtigation into the moſt minute cauſes of the cultivation of that faculty, which, next to our intellectual powers, is the moſt important the human ſpecies enjoys ; without which indeed our intellectual powers themſelves would, in a great meaſure, be deſtitute of the means of improvement, but with the elegant and correct uſe of which, elegance and correctness in ſcience muſt ever go hand in hand. I may add, that it is an exerciſe ſurely of no illiberal fort, to explore, and to produce to view, thoſe marks of minute attention which the moſt accompliſhed people in the world beſtowed upon the conſtituent elements of their language, and which contributed to render that language of all others the nobleſt in every reſpect, and to all thoſe who attain to a knowledge of it, the object of enthuſiaſtic admiration.

P A R T II.

ALTHOUGH the letter Σίγμα be of ſuch eſſential uſe in the inflections of the Greek language, as I have endeavoured to explain, yet when it happens, either in proſe or in poetry, to be frequently introduced without neceſſity, the re-

S 2

peated

“ imò addo, Imperatores. MESSALA orator, è clariffimâ CORVORUM gente, non librum
 “ integrum De unicâ literâ S compoſuit ? et cum laude quidem nominis fui, adeò ſine
 “ fraude. CLAUDIUS Imperator, quantâ curâ, et pænè dicam ambitione, tres novas
 “ literas invexit, iſſque Romanam linguam auxit ? non aliâ, quam ſi totidem regnis im-
 “ perii fines. Jam CÆSAR ille JULIUS De Analogiâ, id eſt de infimis Grammaticorum
 “ ineptiis, binos libros conſcripſit : et triumphales illas epulas variare et interſtinguere
 “ non erubuit ſcholicâ iſtâ dape.” LIPSIVS de rectâ pronunc. Ling. Lat.

peated fibilation thereby occasioned is undoubtedly very disagreeable to the ear. Of this, a noted passage in the *Medea* of EURIPIDES, which has been severely censured by some critics, is a sufficient proof.

Ἔσωσα σ', ὡς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι

Ταυτὸν συνεισέβησαν Ἀργῶν σκάφος *.

The poet, however, had not attended to this circumstance, otherwise he would have avoided such an offensive tautology. CICERO, from inadvertence of a similar sort, has begun his *Topica* with the following sentence: "Majores nos res scribere
" ingressos, C. TREBATI, et iis libris, quos brevi tempore satis
" multos edidimus, digniores, e curfu ipso revocavit voluntas
" tua." Several such passages might be produced from the best authors, both Greek and Latin, if it were worth while to collect them.

It is remarkable, that in the English tongue, where almost no inflection takes place, and consequently where the S has no peculiar duty to discharge, that letter is of more frequent occurrence than in any other language, and occasions, especially in the ears of foreigners, a constant and disagreeable hissing †. Such a language would have been considered as harsh and barbarous in an extreme degree, by those ancient authors who were
offended

* Verse 477.

† "S (says JOHNSON) has in English the same hissing sound as in other languages, and
" unhappily prevails in so many of our words, that it produces in the ear of a foreigner
" a continued fibilation." *Dict. Letter S.* ADDISON too had observed, "That a change
" has happened in our language, by the abbreviation of several words that are terminated in *eth*, by substituting an S in the room of the last syllable, as in *drowns*, *walks*,
" *arrives*, and innumerable other words, which, in the pronunciation of our forefathers,
" were *drowneth*, *walketh*, *arriveth*. This (adds he) hath wonderfully multiplied a letter which was before too frequent in the English tongue, and added to that hissing in
" our language, which is taken so much notice of by foreigners." *SpeEtator*, No. 135.

offended even with a moderate use of Σῖγμα in the Greek. DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus, in particular, has said, that “ the Σῖγμα is harsh and unpleasant, and when unnecessarily repeated, exceedingly offensive ; for its hissing seems to be connected with what is wild and irrational, rather than with the voice of rational beings. Wherefore (continues he) some ancient authors used it but seldom, and with caution, and others composed whole odes without this letter *.”

To condemn, however, the use of this letter on all occasions, either because its sound resembles the hissing of a serpent, or perhaps because the sound of hissing has been an usual mode of expressing dislike in different ages and nations of the world, would be a fastidious and hypercritical method of judging. HERODOTUS, the sweetest of all prose writers, furnishes a variety of such periods as the following : Κροκοδείλους δὲ Ἴωνες ἀνόμασαν, εἰκάζοντες αὐτῶν τὰ εἶδεα τοῖσι παρὰ σφίσι γινομένοισι κροκοδείλοισι τοῖσι ἐν τῇσι αἵμασιῇσι †. From this we may infer, that the Ionic Greeks were not very much disgusted even with a frequent repetition of the Σῖγμα. But such a passage, not only on account of the frequent occurrence of Σῖγμα, but also of Ἰῶτα, would have been intolerable to an Attic ear, which seems to have had a particular aversion to the repeated use of the letter in question, and induced that refined people to prefer the double ττ to the double σσ in a great many of their words ; as when they said θάλαττα instead of θάλασσα, πρᾶττω instead of πρᾶσσω, and even συρίττω instead of συρίσσω, *to hiss*. The propriety of such a change, however, seems to have been the subject of dispute among some of the ancient writers, and gave occasion to a *jeu d'esprit* of LUCIAN, which has descended to our times,

* “ Ἀχρεὶ δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ σ, καὶ ἐὶ πλεονάσσει, σφόδρα λυπεῖ. Σηριώδης γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγῃ μᾶλλον ἢ λογικῇ ἐφάπτεσθαι δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ συριγμός· τῶν γὰρ παλαιῶν σπανίως ἐχρᾶντο τινες αὐτῷ καὶ πεφυλαγμένως· εἰς δὲ οἱ ἀσίγμους ὥδας ὅλας ἐποίησαν. Περὶ συνθ. Ὀνοματ. Edit. REISKIUS, Vol. V. p. 80.

times, under the title of *Δίκη Φωνήεντων* *The judgment of the Vowels*; where that exquisite author, with his usual talent for ludicrous composition, has introduced the letter Σίγμα arraigning the letter Ταῦ before the tribunal of the seven Vowels, and calling out loudly for justice against the encroachments made upon him by this atrocious delinquent. It is scarcely possible to render the performance intelligible to a mere English reader, as the ridicule chiefly arises from the solemnity with which an unimportant substitution of certain Greek letters in the place of others, is treated. But it may be translated in such a manner as to amuse this learned audience, and serve perhaps as some sort of atonement for the trespass committed against their patience, in the former part of a dry grammatical discussion. The humour of the piece is heightened, by its being a very successful and well supported imitation of an ancient pleading.

LUCIAN'S *Judgment of the Vowels*.

“ IN the Archonship of ARISTARCHUS of Phalerum *, on the
 “ 7th of November †, the letter Σίγμα commenced a prosecution against the letter Ταῦ, at the bar of the seven
 “ Vowels, for violent distraining of goods, alleging that he
 “ was plundered of all those words usually pronounced with
 “ a double Ταῦ.

“ YE

* THE learned CORSINI, merely upon the authority of this passage of LUCIAN, has inserted in his *Fasti Attici*, the name of ARISTARCHUS Phalereus, as *Archon Eponymus* at Athens, in the 1st year of the CCXXII. Olympiad, and of the Christian æra, 109. It may be supposed, however, that, in a ludicrous composition of this sort, LUCIAN would not mind an adherence to the truth of chronology, but might pitch upon an Archon on this occasion called ARISTARCHUS, in allusion to the famous grammarian of that name who was born in Samothracia, and flourished at Alexandria about the CLVI. Olympiad; and who was so eminent in his art, that the name ARISTARCHUS became synonymous with the word *Critic*. See CORSINI *Fasti Attici*, Tom. II. p. 104. and Tom. IV. p. 165.

† SCALIGER and others suppose Πανεψιών to correspond to the month of October. I have preferred the opinion of PETAU and CORSINI, who make it to agree with November.

“ YE VOWELS, before whose tribunal I stand, as long as
 “ the injuries I received from this Ταῦ here were but of a tri-
 “ vial nature, whilst he abused my property, and encroached
 “ upon me where he had no just right or title, I bore the loss
 “ without repining; and out of the deference which you know
 “ I observe both to you and the other syllables, I lent a deaf
 “ ear to certain insinuations which were circulated to his dis-
 “ credit. But since he proceeds to such a pitch of avarice and
 “ folly, as to be constantly adding more heinous acts of vio-
 “ lence to those which, with a reluctant silence, I used to suffer,
 “ I am forced to arraign him before YOU, who are well ac-
 “ quainted with the disposition of us both. And I am under
 “ no small apprehension, on account of this expulsion to which
 “ I am exposed; for while he is continually adding something
 “ more violent to what he has already perpetrated, he will soon
 “ thrust me completely out of my own province, so that by be-
 “ having thus tamely, I shall run the risk of being no longer
 “ accounted a *letter*, and all of us shall have some reason to be
 “ alarmed*.

“ It is therefore expedient, that not only YOU who at pre-
 “ sent sit in judgment, but likewise the other Letters, should
 “ be upon your guard against this daring attempt. For if any
 “ one who has amind shall be permitted to quit the post as-
 “ signed

On the 7th of Πυανήσιων, were celebrated at Athens the festivals called Πυανήσια and Ὀρχοφύγεια. See CORsINI *Fasli Attici*, Vol. I. p. 63. and Vol. II. p. 383. Also, POTTER'S *Archæol.* Vol. I. p. 418. & 423.

* In the Greek, the last member of this sentence is, ἐν ἴσῳ δὲ κείσθαι τῷ φόβῳ to which BOURDELOTIUS proposes to add, τὰ λοιπὰ γράμματα which he found on the margin of one MS. and the rest of the letters be in the same alarming situation. Instead of τῷ φόβῳ, the celebrated HEMSTERHUIS seems disposed to read τῷ [i. e. τινι] φόβῳ, and to render the sentence as follows: *Ita ut parum absit, quin, si quietus injuriam ultra feram, e numero literarum expungar, neque alio sim loco, quam sonus aliquis, vel, sibilus.* I have no doubt that the phrase, as it is in the printed books, came from the pen of LUCIAN, ἐν ἴσῳ δὲ κείσθαι τῷ φόβῳ, i. e. δὲ τι τῷ φόβῳ κείσθαι ἡμιν ἐν ἴσῳ, and all of us have some reason to be alarmed. This meaning is confirmed by what immediately follows.

“ signed to him, and violently to intrude himself into that of
 “ another, and this too by *your* connivance, without whose aid
 “ nothing is written to any purpose, I cannot see how the fe-
 “ veral ranks will maintain their just rights, according to the
 “ original arrangement. But I trust that neither you will ar-
 “ rive at such a pitch of negligence and sloth as to permit the
 “ perpetration of injustice, nor, though *you* should decline all
 “ participation in this struggle, must I, who am the sufferer,
 “ abandon my plea.

“ WOULD to heaven! the audacity of certain other letters had
 “ received a check the instant they began to violate the law,
 “ and then Δάμβδα would not at this day have been at daggers-
 “ drawing with Πῶ, disputing whether a *pumice-stone* should be
 “ written κισσῆρις or κισσῆλις, or a *headach* should be κεφαλαγία
 “ or κεφαλαργία* nor would Γάμμα have been perpetually
 “ wrangling, and even frequently upon the point of coming
 “ to blows, with Κάππα, in the fuller’s shop, insisting that *the*
 “ *flocks of wool shorn off by the fuller*, should be γναφάλα and not
 “ κνάφαλα* and the same Γάμμα would have no longer con-
 “ tended with Δάμβδα, by taking away from him, and indeed
 “ totally robbing him of, the word *hardly*, calling it μόγις in-
 “ stead of μόλις* and the rest of the letters would have aban-
 “ doned every attempt to introduce an illicit confusion. For it
 “ is fair that each should abide by his appointed station; as
 “ every transgression of the bounds prescribed marks the cha-
 “ racter of a subverter of justice.

“ WHOEVER at first established these laws for us, whether it
 “ was CADMUS the islander*, or PALAMEDES the son of NAU-
 “ PLIUS,—(some ascribe this important charge to SIMONIDES)
 “ —not only determined who should be first and who second
 “ in

* See above, p. 118. note †. The famous CADMUS, son of AGENOR, is here called ὁ κισιώτης, from his connection with Tyre, according to ancient authors originally built in an Island, which ALEXANDER is said afterwards to have joined to the Continent. See the notes of DU SOUL and HEMSTERHUIS, in the 4to Edit. of LUCIAN’S Works. Tom. I. p. 87. *Amst.* 1743.

“ in that order wherein the seats of precedence are fixed, but
 “ also fully understood the qualities and powers which belong
 “ to each of us. And on you, ye Judges, he hath conferred
 “ the larger portion of honour, inasmuch as you are capable
 “ of expressing a sound by yourselves; on the semivowels, the
 “ next share to yours, because they require a small degree of
 “ your assistance, in order to be distinctly heard; and he hath
 “ allotted the least of all to some who, by themselves, possess
 “ no sort of sound whatsoever*. Wherefore, it is the province
 “ of you Vowels to be the guardians of these laws.

“ BUT this Ταῦ, (for I have not a more opprobrious appellation for him than his own name †) who, unless, by Jupiter!
 “ two of yourselves, I mean Ἀλφα and Υ, excellent both, and
 “ seemly to behold, had come propitious to his aid, would not
 “ even have been heard,—this very culprit dares to injure me
 “ in a more atrocious manner than ever any other of the letters,
 “ by expelling me from my native nouns and verbs, at the
 “ same time chasing ‡ me away from conjunctions and prepositions, inasmuch that I am no longer able to endure his excessive rapacity. But it is now time to state whence, and from what circumstances, these outrages originated.

“ I ONCE was sojourning at Cybelum, an agreeable enough
 “ little town, a colony, as is reported, of Athenians, and took
 “ along with me the best of my neighbours, the robust Πῶ.
 “ I lodged at the house of a certain comic poet, whose name
 “ was LYSIMACHUS, by extraction evidently a Bœotian, but
 “ who was ambitious of passing for a native of the very centre
 “ of Attica. While I remained in the house of this landlord,
 “ I detected the avarice of this same Ταῦ. As long as, by depriving me of my congenial friends, he seized only on a few
 VOL. II. T “ of

* See ARISTOTLE's definition of a Vowel, a Semivowel and a Mute, p. 123.

† See below, p. 149.

‡ I have adopted the reading proposed by HEMSTERHUIS, viz. ἀπιδάσαν and ἐνδιόξαν.

“ of them, so as, for instance, to call *forty* τεσσαράκοντα instead
 “ of τεσσαράκοντα, I imagined it to be a common practice among
 “ the letters who were there educated together. And even
 “ while he claimed a right to force *to day* into his train by the
 “ name of τήμερον instead of σήμερον, and used the same freedom
 “ with other words of that kind, as if they had been his own
 “ property, I tolerated what I heard with some degree of pa-
 “ tience, and was not very violently provoked upon the occa-
 “ sion. But when, after beginning in this manner, he had the
 “ impudence to metamorphose the word signifying *steel* from
 “ κασσίτερον into καττίτερον, and to call *cobler's leather* κάττυμα
 “ instead of κάσσυμα, and *pitch* πίττα in place of πίσσα; and,
 “ in short, having divested himself of all sense of shame, to
 “ insult the name of *Queen*, by pronouncing that βασίλιττα
 “ which ought to have been βασίλισσα, I got into a most furi-
 “ ous paroxysm of rage, being apprehensive that some one, in
 “ process of time, might venture to say τύκα instead of σύκα,
 “ and so not leave me so much as a single *fig*.—I beseech
 “ you, in the name of Jove! to bear with this just indigna-
 “ tion, when you reflect that my spirit is so much depressed,
 “ and that I have none who are ready to help me; for when
 “ the question is about depriving me of words that have been
 “ my wonted and familiar companions, surely no trivial and
 “ vulgar objects are at stake. Having torn my prattling κρίσσα,
 “ my favourite *magpie*, as it were out of my bosom, he calls it
 “ his κρίττα, and, in defiance of the command of ARISTAR-
 “ CHUS, he hath seized on my *ringdove*, which he calls φάττα,
 “ on my *ducks*, styling them νήτται, and my *ousel*s, to which he
 “ gives the odious name of ποττύφοι. He hath borne off whole
 “ hives of my *bees*, calling them μελίτται instead of μελίσσαι.
 “ Nay, having made an incursion into the Attic territory, he
 “ hath even carried away, in the most outrageous manner, the
 “ region of bees, mount *Hymettus* itself, and that too before
 “ your own eyes and those of the other syllables. But why
 “ do

“ do I mention such circumstances as these? He has banished
 “ me entirely out of *Thessaly*, to which he insists upon giving
 “ the name of *Thettaly*, and he has claimed an exclusive right
 “ to the very *sea*, which he calls *θάλαττα* instead of *θάλασσα*.
 “ Nor does he even abstain from the *beets* in my garden, inso-
 “ much that he has not, I may say, left me a single *πάσσαλος*,
 “ or *little pole*, which I can call my own. But you yourselves
 “ can bear me witness what a patient *character* I am; for I
 “ never so much as found fault with ζ, when he stole my pre-
 “ cious *σμαράγδος* *, or *emerald*, from me, and thrust me out of
 “ the city of *Smyrna*; nor with ξ, when he violated every sti-
 “ pulation †, and even has *THUCYDIDES* the historian as the
 “ abettor of his guilt. As to my next neighbour *Pō*, it was
 “ but an act of humanity in me to forgive *him*, when, in the
 “ *delirium* of a disease, he planted my *myrtles* in his own garden,
 “ as if they had been called *μυρρίναι*, and not *μυρσίναι*, and,
 “ under the pressure of a deep melancholy, struck me a blow
 “ on the cheek. Such is the patient natural temper with which
 “ I am endowed.

“ But the violent disposition of this *Tαῦ* will be still more
 “ apparent, when we reflect, that he has also injured, not only
 “ *Δέλτα*, *Θῆτα* and *Ζῆτα*, but almost every one of the other
 “ letters. Call in the plaintiffs. Hear, O ye Judges, what
 “ *Δέλτα* has to say.—Δ. He hath bereaved me of my faculty of
 “ *perseverance*, requiring, in the face of all law, that it shall be
 “ called *ἐντελέχεια* instead of *ἐνδελέχεια*.—Listen, I beseech you
 “ to the wailing of *Θῆτα*, who is tearing his hair in anguish for
 “ the loss of his *gourd*, which has been changed from *πολυκύνδη*
 “ into *πολυκύντη*; and to *Ζῆτα*, complaining that he no longer
 “ hears the *music of the pipe* nor the *sound of the trumpet*, *συρίζειν*

T 2

“ and

* WHICH is sometimes written *ζμαράγδος*; as *Σμύρνα* is written *Ζμύρνα*. See the annota-
 tion of *HEMSTERHUISIUS*.

† σύνθηκη,—which *THUCYDIDES* writes *ξύθηκη*, and so in many other words, using ξ
 for σ, as is well known.

“ and σαλπίζειν being now supplanted by σερύττειν and σαλπύττειν
 “ and that he is not allowed even to *grumble*, the proper word
 “ γρύζειν being now no more. Who could have patience to en-
 “ dure such indignities? or what punishment is adequate to
 “ the demerits of this most execrable Ταῦ?

“ BUT, in short, he is not only injurious to his kindred tribe
 “ of letters, but has already begun to encroach upon the hu-
 “ man race, in such a manner that he permits them not to
 “ make a proper use of their tongues. *Apropos* of tongues,
 “ which this mention of human affairs has introduced, it
 “ brings to mind how the miscreant has usurped my province
 “ here too, by metamorphosing γλῶσσα, *a tongue*, into γλῶττα.
 “ O thou villanous Ταῦ! thou very bane of all tongues!—
 “ But to return from this digression to the defence of men,
 “ whom he has so grossly injured. He attempts to torture their
 “ voice, and bind it with chains. When one person beholds
 “ a beautiful object, and wishes to style it κάλον, *fair*, up comes
 “ this Ταῦ, and most impudently obliges him to call it τάλον;
 “ such is the violence of his claim to be at the head of every
 “ thing! When another is speaking of a *vine-branch* by the
 “ appellation of κλημα, he himself being τλημων, *a wretch*,
 “ makes the poor word wretched too, by calling it τλημα.
 “ Nor are his injuries confined to vulgar men; he even forms
 “ a plot against that tremendous Monarch, to whom the earth
 “ and the sea, in a supernatural manner, are reported to have
 “ yielded*; and instead of giving him his proper name Κύρος,
 “ CYRUS, he speaks of him by the appellation of Τῦρος, as if
 “ he were a *cheese*.

“ SUCH then are the ways in which he injures men in their
 “ speech. But how does he still more materially injure them?

“ They

* LUCIAN seems here to allude to the magnificence of the oriental style. XENOPHON, in the *Anabasis*, relates, that CYRUS the younger, with his army, passed the Euphrates on foot, which had never been forded in that manner before, and adds—ἰδοὺν θᾶτον εἶναι, καὶ σαφῶς ὑποχωρῆσαι τὸν ποταμὸν Κύρῳ ὡς βασιλεύουσιν. Lib. I. See the annotation of HEMSTERHUIS.

“ They lament and deplore their hard fate, and often execrate
 “ CADMUS for introducing this Ταῦ among the number of the
 “ letters. For they say that tyrants, taking the hint from the
 “ appearance, and imitating the form, of this letter, did fa-
 “ bricate gibbets to hang men upon; and hence this most
 “ mischievous contrivance obtained its odious name *. For all
 “ these crimes, how many deaths do you suppose this Ταῦ de-
 “ serves? For my own part, I reckon the only punishment
 “ adequate to his guilt would be to hang him upon a machine
 “ of his own shape; for it was owing to him that there was ever
 “ such a thing in the world as the figure or the name of a
 “ gallows.”

THUS far LUCIAN; and it must be owned that the ludicrous manner was the most proper that could be employed in treating such a subject. LIPSIUS, in his Dialogue *de rectâ pronunciatione Latinæ linguæ*, has observed, “ That many attack the reputation
 “ of the letter S, and even form a design against its life.”—*famam ejus multi petunt, imo vitam.*—And he adds an enumeration of those enemies. “ PINDAR (says he) reproaches it, and
 “ calls it κίβδηλον, *spurious*, and, out of hatred to it, is said to
 “ have composed verses without its assistance. DIONYSIUS the
 “ rhetorician, in exalting the ‘Pō, undervalues this letter, and
 “ brands it with the vile epithet of θηριώδη, *savage*. All the
 “ Attics detest it, and generally have substituted Ταῦ in its
 “ room. Latin authors seem to join in the conspiracy; and,
 “ among men of rank, MESSALA says it is not even a *letter*,
 “ but only a *biss*. Among teachers, QUINCTILIAN pronounces
 “ it to be a rough letter, and harsh in the combination of
 “ words. Nay, even the ancient writers rejected it, in imita-
 “ tion

* “ VERISSIMA VOCIS σταυρός originitio: ταῦ, ταυρός, hoc est in modum ταῦ effor-
 “ matus: et per contractionem ταυρός, et præposito sigma ut fieri solet, σταυρός.” ME-
 NAGIUS.

“ tion of the Attics ; and their method was, to use *mentare* and
 “ *pultare* instead of *mersare* and *pulsare*, just as ENNIUS used
 “ *adgrettus fari* instead of *aggressus fari*. The poets also have
 “ taken a sile ; and, in their verse, this letter, when a conso-
 “ nant follows, is commonly expunged. Thus,—*vitâ illâ dig-*
 “ *nu’ locoque*. And—*omnibu’ princeps*: And in the Plays of
 “ PLAUTUS and TERENCE, examples frequently occur.”

AGAINST all this hostility which has been declared against the S, LIPSIVS undertakes its defence. The passage is curious; but being too long for a quotation, I refer to the work itself. The elegant MURETUS is a speaker in the Dialogue, and on him LIPSIVS devolves the task of vindicating his favourite letter ; but, like other strenuous advocates, he appears to carry his zeal for his client too far *.

THERE

* I SHALL translate some excerpts from it in this note. In answer to PINDAR’s charge, MURETUS insists, “ That Σίγμα has a genuine sound, and every other mark of a genuine “ letter.” And with respect to the epithet of Σίγμα, given to it by the Halicarnassian, if the meaning be, that Σ denotes a sound similar to the hissing of serpents, this he thinks a very strange objection. “ Why then (says he) don’t you despise the letter R, because “ it is expressive of the noise of dogs ? M, because that of oxen ? B, because that of “ sheep ? For dogs *snarl*, oxen *low*, or utter a noise which in Greek is *μουνδν*, and in “ Latin *mugire*, and sheep *bleat*. But since you call this hissing of serpents detestable, “ tell me, what shall you think of winds, of trees, of men ? You will not deny that they “ *whisper*, and that most agreeably.—The ancient inventors of names, as if nature had “ been their guide, denoted the most delightful of all objects by this letter. Look up to “ the heaven, there you behold the *sun*, the *stars*. Look down to the earth, among the “ things that are *sweet*, you find *sesame* and *sugar* ; among the charms of love, *whispers* “ and *kisses* ; and among the joys of life, *sleep*, *safety*, *soundness*.” And a little after he adds, “ The Attics, you say, despised it. Why should I be surprised that the most fasti- “ dious of mortals did so ? But the Lacedæmonians and Thebans were of a different opi- “ nion. At this very day, the robust inhabitants of Germany delight in this strong si- “ bilating sound, which (let not my LIPSIVS be offended) is avoided by you, the delicate “ inhabitants of the Netherlands. You are in the wrong. But I do not point out your “ error, because LUCIAN has already pleaded and discussed the cause before the tribunal “ of the Vowels.” The speaker next proceeds to answer the objections of MESSALA and QUINCTILIAN, and then shews that the ancient writers made very frequent use of this letter, inasmuch that their insertion or substitution of it seemed, in his opinion, to favour of affectation ; and, after producing a great many instances of this, and accusing those poets

THERE seems, however, to be no good reason either for applauding or condemning the sound of this letter in the extreme. Passages have been already quoted from EURIPIDES and CICERO, which, if read with attention, must convince every one, that its frequent recurrence is disagreeable to the ear, though that circumstance seems to have escaped the notice of the authors themselves in composing those sentences. But MILTON has, with manifest design, availed himself of the discordant sound produced by such a repetition, and that with powerful effect, in the following verses, where SATAN, when described as having arrived at Pandæmonium, and in a boasting manner related his success against Man, is received by his infernal audience with a general hiss.

So

poets of ignorance who despise this letter, he puts the question, "Have not I now said enough, LIPSIUS, about the fondness and respect which the ancients had for this letter?—Yes, quite enough."

THIS Dialogue betwixt LIPSIUS and MURETUS, is dedicated to the renowned Sir PHILIP SIDNEY. The scene is laid on the Quirinal, in a garden belonging to the splendid HIPPOLYTUS of ETTa, the patron of MURETUS. LIPSIUS represents himself as a young man on his travels at Rome, possessing an ardent desire of knowledge. Having paid a visit at the apartments occupied by MURETUS in the house of his patron, he was shewed into the garden, where he found that accomplished scholar so deeply engaged in reading, as for some time to pay no attention to the approach of the stranger. The book he had in his hand happened to be a work of LIPSIUS himself, entitled *Varia*, which had been lately published at Antwerp. A pleasing description of this interview is given by LIPSIUS in the commencement of the Dialogue, "*Cubiculum ejus cum pulsassem,*" &c. They afterwards enter upon the proper subject of the piece, in which MURETUS is represented as the principal speaker. But the style, in point of elegance, is far inferior to what MURETUS would have really made use of. The work indeed is confessedly the composition of LIPSIUS, whose Latinity, though he was one of the ablest critics of the sixteenth century, has with justice been censured. His merit was such, however, that even his style procured a numerous tribe of imitators. But no modern writer of Latin has surpassed the elegance of MURETUS. His orations in particular, in point of ease and fluency of expression, may perhaps even vie with those of CICERO. It must give every scholar pleasure to hear, that the celebrated RUHNKENIUS of Leyden, is at present engaged in preparing for the press a new and complete edition of the works of MURETUS. "Il faut (says BAYLE) bien aimer les mauvais modeles quand on est capable de préférer le style de LIPSE à celui de PAUL MANUCE, ou à celui de MURET; un style qui va par fauts, et par bonds, herissé de pointes et d'ellipses, à un style bien lié et coulant, et qui developpe toute la pensée." *Dict. Artic. LIPSE, Not.* [L.]

So having said, awhile he stood expecting
 Their universal shout and high applause
 To fill his ear : when contrary he hears
 On all sides from innumerable tongues
 A dismal universal hiss, the sound
 Of public scorn. —————

He would have spoke,
 But hiss for hiss returned with forked tongue
 'To forked tongue : for now were all transform'd
 Alike, to serpents all, as accessories
 To his bold riot : dreadful was the din
 Of hissing through the hall ; thick swarming now
 With complicated monsters, head and tail
 Scorpion and asp, and amphibia dire,
 Ceraustes horn'd, hydrus and elops drear
 And dipfas*.

ON the other hand, it is certain, that a judicious introduction of this letter produces, on many occasions, a very pleasing effect ; such as may be perceived from the two concluding words of the following verses of the same poet. Our first parents are the subject.

—————He on his side
 Leaning half-raised, with looks of cordial love
 Hung over her enamoured ; and beheld
 Beauty, which whether waking or asleep
 Shot forth peculiar graces ; then with voice
 Mild, as when Zephyrus on Flora breathes,
 Her hand, soft touching, whisper'd thus †.

THEOCRITUS, in the very beginning of his first Idyllium, represents THYRSIS, a shepherd, addressing a goatherd in the following manner : “ Goatherd, this pine, which is beside
 “ the

* Par. Lost, Book X.

† Ibid. Book V.

“ the fountain, melodiously utters its whispering strains with
 “ inexpressible sweetness : thou too playest exquisitely on the
 “ pipe :”——

‘ Ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ αἱ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα,
 “ Ἀ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσδεται· ἀδὺ δὲ καὶ τὸ
 Συρίσδες· ——

With respect to the whispering or gentle rustling produced by the pines, the Greek Scholiast remarks, “ That the pines whisper
 “ when they are gently fanned, the breeze being broken by
 “ the closeness of the leaves *.” He has likewise observed,
 “ That the word ψιθύρισμα is contrived on purpose, from the
 “ peculiarity of its sound, to imitate the sound which it ex-
 “ presses †.” I may add, that the Doric words μελίσδεται and
 συρίσδες, instead of μελίζεται and συρίζεις, by bringing σῖγμα be-
 fore δέλτα, considerably augment, in this instance, the sweet-
 ness of the sound.

* Ψιθυρίζουσι αἱ πίτυς, ὅταν ῥιπιοῦνται, τῇ στενότητι τῶν φύλλων συχνομένης τῆς πνοῆς.

† Ὀνομαστικοῦται δὲ ἡ λέξις παρὰ τὴν τῷ ἤχῳ ιδιότητα, κατὰ μέμνησιν τῆς φωνῆς.
 HOMER abounds in instances of Ὀνομασποία, as is well known.