

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Wharton's *Etyma Latina Etyma Latina*, by E. R. Wharton, M.A. Pp. xxxiv. and 152. Rivingtons, 1890. 7s. 6d.

H. D. Darbishire

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 05 / May 1891, pp 217 - 220  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167022, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00167022](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167022)

### How to cite this article:

H. D. Darbishire (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 217-220 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167022

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Boeotian formation. ἔθηκα is inflected in all persons.

The commentaries of Choeroboscus are too discursive and academic to admit of a concise abstract.

The strongest general impression carried away from these pages is that of the substantial immutability of grammatical ter-

minology on the one hand, and the *à priori* dogmatic attitude of grammatical τέχνη in those Byzantine times, as if the human body had been created according to the canons of the anatomist.

E. G. SIHLER,  
New York.

## PRONUNCIATION OF ANCIENT GREEK BY F. BLASS.

*Pronunciation of Ancient Greek*, by F. BLASS.

Translated from the Third German edition with the author's sanction by W. J. PURTON, B.A. Cambridge University Press. 1890.

THIS is a good translation of an excellent book. Whatever may be the opinion of teachers as to what is pedagogically desirable or practicable in the pronunciation of Greek, there can be no doubt as to the importance of knowing the phonetic value of the alphabetic symbols in their ancient use. To those who seek such a knowledge this book is the one safe resort.

It is the purpose of this notice to call attention however to the English edition rather than to the original, and it is therefore with the translation that it must busy itself. This is, as we have said, on the whole a good one. The English idiom has in most cases asserted the mastery, but the German *schon, noch* and *wohl aber* are no easy prey, and here and there have maintained themselves; witness such expressions as, 'It appears then, that *already* in the Roman period etc.' (p. 63); 'This was in the course of the fourth century *already* employed for the short sound *also*.' A clumsy and even misleading translation of *wohl aber* occurs on p. 89: 'Modern Greek has in such cases no nasal, omission on the other hand occurs as in γίνονται: πρᾶμμα.' The original is: 'Das Neugr. hat in solchen Fällen keinen Nasal,

wohl aber Tilgung wie in etc.' It seems hardly possible that the translator could have understood his author here.

Certain renderings strike us too as somewhat forced; thus (p. 8): 'So shifting is pronunciation, and so stable writing, juggling away (*über — hinwegtäuschen*) as it does the most important changes. But the enquirer must not allow himself to be juggled with (*sich täuschen lassen*) etc.' So (p. 42) 'Every one knew by the light of nature (*wusste ohne weiteres*) that οἶκος and ὑπός were, etc.' 'Falls foul of' (e. g. p. 12) is repeatedly employed as the equivalent of 'steht im Gegensatz zu.'

On page 53, line 11, 'inscriptions of the third century' should read 'of the fourth to the first century.' In the preface, p. vi., are given the phonetic value of the letters used in transliteration; thus 'ā must be pronounced as in *father*, ā as in *man*, ī as in second syllable of *quinine*, ī as in first syllable of *quinine*, etc.' What more unfortunate illustration could be chosen than this Protean *quinine*?

It seems to us furthermore a serious impairment of the usefulness of the book that the pagination of the original edition has not been, as it easily might have been, preserved in the margin, and most especially, that the current numbering of the foot-notes has been changed to a numbering by pages.

BENJ. IDE WHEELER,  
Cornell University.

## WHARTON'S ETYMA LATINA.

*Etyma Latina*, by E. R. WHARTON, M.A. Pp. xxxiv. and 152. Rivingtons, 1890. 7s. 6d.

THIS book consists of a Preface, a note on Hidden Quantities, list of Abbreviations, a

select list of Authorities, Introduction, Etymological Lexicon, and Comparative Etymology.

We are inclined to regret that Mr. Wharton has brought his peculiar views on classical philology before the public in a

form which lays him specially open to criticism. As far as we can gather from a study of his work Mr. Wharton seems to belong to an entirely different school from the writer of this article, and might justly reply ὅτι δὲ μὴ τὰδ' ἐστὶν ἐν γνώμῃ φίλα | κείνός τ' ἐκείνα στεργέτω καὶ γὰρ τὰδα. Since however his methods bear a dangerous similarity to those of the modern science inaugurated in Germany and not without exponents in England, we feel compelled for the purposes of review to assume that Mr. Wharton belongs to that school, hoping that, if he intends to revolutionize the science once again, he will accept our apologies and disclose his methods in a more definite and tangible form.

Assuming then, as we are bound to do in default of other evidence, that Mr. Wharton accepts the methods of Brugmann, Paul, Osthoff and other names which will be found in the list of authorities, what are we to say of this book? It undoubtedly shows much labour; contains useful hints, not few even brilliant derivations; and yet it must be condemned.

The difficulty which meets the uninitiated at the outset in studying modern philology is its technical symbolism; people are unduly frightened by the appearance of -iign and a 'non-labialised velar' is regarded with dismay. Under these circumstances and just when the accepted signs are beginning to be handled with more familiarity, it is surely unwise to add to the confusion by appearing before the public with a rival system, especially when no explanation is afforded, and with the aggravation of colloquialisms which may be exemplified by the following quotation.

'anser, goose = \*hansis Mlr. gēis swan, Lit. žāsīs goose O. Slav. gasi (with g- from Teutonic), cf. (1) GHANS- Ags. gōs, Sk. haṇsas, GHĀNS- χῆν; (2) GHAN- Ags. gandra gander E., ganot gannet E.

Not add Arm. sag goose quasi = \*gas: as soon make dog the Classical form whence Teutonic cat quasi = tac.<sup>1</sup>

Another essential which ought to be borne in mind is that the non-technical world should be given whole truths only and not conjectures. The belief that in philology every man does what is right in his own eyes has not yet vanished, and assuredly this book will not do much towards dispersing it. Not only are all the modern methods of getting round a difficulty employed without scruple, but most of the

ancient ones are also used, and if all else fails the word is either 'borrowed' or 'dialectic.' The frequent use of the latter term can only be justified by a subversal or renegation of Paul's position, which, as it is not forthcoming, need not be discussed.

These objections are taken from the point of view of the untechnical reader and, to sum up, we fear that he will only derive advantage from the isolated facts on other subjects which are found in the book, although he may by careful study pick up sufficient jargon to disguise ignorance.

If on the other hand we regard the work not as a popular manual but as a contribution to the literature of the science, it contains, as was said above, many brilliant conjectures. But here also many objections must be taken. The form of the work is unhappy. Latin is and always will be the despair of scientific philology for reasons which are obvious: in the first place what we are told of the origin of Rome is strongly against any original purity of stock, so that, as Mr. Wharton would put it, they must all have begun by talking 'dialectically'; and in the second place, our records are doubly imperfect—imperfect in that we have, comparatively speaking, no archaic records, and in that the literature on which we mainly rely is as far from representing the spoken language of the people as any literature could well be. If then—provided that no new storehouse of information becomes accessible—the rules of scientific philology ever reduce to order all the words in the Latin dictionary, it will mean that the rules themselves are so elastic as to be valueless. The extent of our ignorance could not be more clearly exposed than by adopting the dictionary form, and consequently the temptation to wild conjecture is great. We are told in the Preface that 3055 out of the 4320 Latin words which do not 'sufficiently explain their own formation' are 'treated' in this work; there could not be a better illustration of our remarks above than the fact that with all Mr. Wharton's ingenuity, of which specimens will be given below, over 10 per cent. of these 3055 have to be 'treated' in silence. About 450 are derived from Greek—many of which seem to us 'sufficiently to express their own formation,' e.g. '† philyra lime-tree: φύλιρα'—under 50 with some plausibility from other languages, and about 100 on the assertion of Roman grammarians (which counts for nil on such a point) or with a mere pretence at reason, as when *buxus* is traced (through πύξος) to Paphlagonia because Catullus has *Cytore buxifer*: and *rosa* is given as Os-

<sup>1</sup> This is not meant seriously. It is either a joke to relieve the dry study of linguistics, or a self-congratulatory 'How much taller I am than Papa.'

can because Vergil has *rosaria Paesti*. So *Gallia cantheris* relegates *cantherius* to Gaul, *Maurorum ategias* makes the latter word Moorish, and the Celtic origin of *petorritum* assigns all names of wheeled vehicles to the same language. Nay, we have to go to 'some Celtic dialect' (which is scientific but vague) for *quadru-* and *quadra*, the reason being that they conflict with a rule of Mr. Wharton's that *d* before *r* becomes *t*. Parenthetically we may here observe that most of the derivations by which this rule is supported may be considered matters of opinion, but not when we find *nutrio* ascribed to a root NED in *νήδυμος* (!): we think most readers will prefer the normal analysis *νη-δυ-μος* from the root of *δύη* &c. with the negative prefixed. The testimony of grammarians to the origin of a word is accepted or not according to the urgency of the case: thus under *lanista* (of which we may in passing notice the brilliant identification with *damista*) we find

'Isid. calls it Etruscan, only because the use of gladiators came from Etruria'; but under *andabata*, 'Gaulish (cf. *Gallus* for *mirmillo* Fest.)?', while as to Isidore's reasoning it may be paralleled by numerous instances such as '*cantharis* beetle: Egyptian (the beetle worshipped in Egypt)?' Other conclusions are reached on grounds which are even more extraordinary: thus it is suggested that *gingiva* is Gaulish 'as first in Catullus': the derivation of *carbo* from *corbis* a basket is quaintly supported by 'Ar. Ach. 333 *λάρκος* charcoal-burner's basket'; after this, no one will be surprised to find that *cortina* is from *curtus* because Lucretius speaks of *dolia curta*.

Perhaps however most discredit will be cast on philological method by Mr. Wharton's too lively imagination both on the treacherous ground of analogy and in tracing connexions in sense. As regards the former it may be possible to believe that *posca* owes its termination to *esca*, but who can credit the statements that *marmor* has the ending of *aequor*, *celox* (= *κέλης*) of *velox*, *autem* of *septem*, *spinter* of *tuber*, that *caepe* is 'quasi Adj. Neut. (like *turpe*)' and the like? This dangerous weapon is even employed without necessity, as when *facilis* is pressed in to account for *dapsilis* which, like *facilis* itself, is only another example of the absorbing power of *-i-* adjectives in Latin as a class. As for the unexplored region which rejoices in the name of semasiology, we fear that any system will fail to take in the following flights. *Norma* a square is derived from *nonus* 'ninth' as being 'shaped like L the

9th letter in the Etruscan and Faliscan alphabets.' Now, to begin with, the essential part of a 'square' is its right angle: the angle of an Etruscan L is anything but a right angle. Nevertheless a Roman preferred to use it as a simile, and, lest he should make himself too clear, he simply described the letter by its numerical order in a foreign abecedarium, leaving it to the hearer's ingenuity to 'work out the connexion. Astounding as this is, it is still more astoundingly paralleled by 'Rev. 22, 13 ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ, πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος.' There is no other example to vie with this, but one or two others are worth quoting: *parra* 'a bird' (surely a misleading translation) is from '*\*parsa* a companion' and goes with *parricida* which is thus reduced to an infraction of the game-laws: as it was important to have as many original derivations as possible (the Preface contains a list) no mention is made of Fröhde's convincing equation of the first element in *pāri-cida* with the Homeric *πῆρι* 'kinsfolk.' Sometimes a needlessly tortuous sense-connexion is traced, as when *\*bracchium* is accounted for as being 'shorter than the leg': it of course denotes the fore-arm which is shorter than *lacertus*, the upper arm. Again the derivation of *patro* from *pater* (which we had independently formulated) is detracted from by the far-fetched explanation of *pater patratus* 'the father who acts as such.' It really means the *pater* who had a *pater* and so excluded all but free-born citizens (of two generations, if *pater* be taken = senator).

The reader who has been trained on the exact methods will find many severe shocks awaiting him. Words are attributed to the *Ursprache* such as *ō-v-eom*, *som-lós*, *tṃ-ṇ*, and even *sm-ḷo-*. For this he will be partly prepared by the statement in the Preface that the same symbol (fr.) means both 'from' and 'connected with'; i.e. it signifies alike the relation which *mors* bears to *morior* and that which *δίκη* bears to *dicāx*. After this we need not be surprised to find three stems given under *aevum* (we use Mr. Wharton's orthography throughout) in this order *AIPOS*, *AIVÓN*, *AIVES-* although the first and third are connected by Ablaut, and the second has a quite different formative suffix corresponding to *ai-ṇen* in the Gk. *αἰέν*. Amid these heresies smaller transgressions like *δαρὺς* = *δῆρ-ύς* pass almost unobserved, but we cannot leave unnoticed the assertion in the Preface that the older Iguvine Tables are written in the Etruscan alphabet. The appendix on Comparative

Etymology we are compelled to leave untouched, merely noting that Mr. Wharton is to be added to the number of those who confuse *πρόθεσις* and *πρόσθεσις* (p. 133).<sup>1</sup>

Before concluding this notice it may be well to explain why we condemn this attempt, when no better is forthcoming and when scientific methods confessedly yield so imperfect results. The reason is that making etymologies is no more the end of scientific philology than making new fossils is the end of geology. New etymologies, if sound, are welcomed, but it is not for themselves, nor even for the laws to which they lead, but for the proof of those laws, *i.e.* the reason which underlies them. Mr. Wharton, by many of his ingenious derivations, does give

<sup>1</sup> The latter at least ought to be written in English characters as to the best of our belief it is not used by any Greek grammarian.

some new laws, but without any attempt at proof and in the republic of science ipse dixit even backed by the highest reputation are not current coin. Thus the rule that original 'pretonic' *e* becomes *a* in Latin has a very good *prima facie* case made out for it by the examples, but no proof, and we must moreover take it, on Mr. Wharton's assertion, that the accent was pitch, despite all current theories upon Latin accentuation.

All this, as well as his statement (also *ex cathedra*) that the *Ursprache* had a *ü* (short and long) and that the *Ursprache* was once spoken, bears out the hypothesis which we mentioned at first, that Mr. Wharton belongs to, or is founding, a different school from that of Brugmann and Paul. If this be so, we can only apologise once more for treating his book according to our lights.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

**Telegraphing among the Ancients.**—This monograph, by Mr. Augustus C. Merriam, is No. 1 of the Classical Series iii. of the *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America*. Mr. Merriam begins by a collection of passages from poets and prosewriters in which any system of telegraphy, by beacons, shields, mirrors or torches, is alluded to or described. The collection, however, is incomplete, for the best and simplest system of transmitting actual words is omitted. It is described by Sextus Julius Africanus in *Κεκοί* c. lxxvi., and is an obvious improvement on the method invented by Cleoxenus and Democlitus (Polyb. x. 45). In the latter method, each party of signallers has a board, showing the alphabet in five columns, and the operator, by the number of torches in his right and left hands, indicates what letter of what column is to be read. Africanus says that his system was used by the Romans, though it is founded on the Greek numerical alphabet. Set up three posts, one for units, one for tens, and one for hundreds. The number of torches attached to each post will indicate a numeral of which the symbol is a letter of the alphabet. Clearly this system could be employed more rapidly, and for much greater distances, than the other.

But Mr. Merriam's chief concern is with the famous passage in the *Agamemnon*, 272-307, where the fall of Troy is said to be telegraphed to Argos by beacon-fires on the following points, viz: Ida, Lemnos, Athos, Euboea, Messapium, Cithaeron, the Megarid (Aegiplantus), Arachnaeus. Mr. Merriam suggests that this line was selected in order to convey the news to many Greek peoples engaged in the common enterprise, and, though no contingent seems to have been sent to Troy from the neighbourhood of Athos, still the inhabitants of that mountain may have been paid to furnish a beacon, especially as there were Ciconians and Paenonians in the Greek host. It is a more serious question whether such telegraphy was possible. *Solvitur navigando et ambulando*. From Mt. Chigri (1648 feet), on the mainland opposite Tenedos, both Lemnos, 60 miles away, and Athos, 109 miles away, are distinctly visible. The highest point of Lemnos is at the N.W. corner (1,410 feet). Hence Athos (6,500 feet) is very conspicuous indeed. From Athos

to Macistus (probably Kandili, 'a long line of precipitous cliffs' above Chalcis in Euboea) is 110 miles. Could a beacon be seen at this distance? Mr. Merriam cites evidence, from the officers of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, of which the following extract is typical. Mr. Assistant Colonna writes: 'I have seen from the top of Snow Mountain, in the Coast Range, fires burning on the summit of the Sierra Nevada, where certainly no light was of an intensity equal to what an ordinary ten by twelve framehouse would give if set on fire; yet the whole was plainly visible to the naked eye at a distance of about 160 miles. I think if you were to take a cord of well-seasoned pine wood, and pile it into pensso that it would burn with a good draught, you would have a blaze that could be seen at night, in fair-seeing weather, with the naked eye, 200 miles or over, provided the wind did not blow from the fire to you.' The evidence from mirror-flashing is still more precise and convincing. The ensuing stages are easier. From Macistus to Messapium (3,392 feet) is fifteen miles: thence to Cithaeron (4,620 feet) is twenty-six miles. Mr. Merriam identifies the Gorgopian lake with a small lake called Mavrolimné 'on the coast exactly between Bisa and Cithaeron' (Meliarakes, *Geogr. of Argolis and Corinthia*, p. 133, is cited as authority), but he is uncertain whether Aegiplantus ought to be identified with Mt. Bisa (3,465 feet) or with Mt. Geranea (4,490 feet). From hence to Arachnaeus is twenty-six miles, with very high cliffs between, and from Arachnaeus to Argos fifteen miles. It is suggested that the zigzag line from Cithaeron to Argos was that actually used by the Athenians in B.C. 459 when they were in alliance with Argos but hostile to Corinth, so that the latter country could not be used.

J. G.

**Ferguson's Aid to Greek at Sight.** Pp. 360. Chicago, 1890.

THE author gives long lists of words to be committed to memory. Such a method is cumbersome, mechanical, and of questionable helpfulness. The second part of the book groups related words, and would be more useful to a student than the first part. The work could be used to advantage by those who have