

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](#)



Etymological Notes

Edwin W. Fay

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 01 / February 1898, pp 17 - 20

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025221, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025221

How to cite this article:

Edwin W. Fay (1898). Etymological Notes. The Classical Review, 12, pp 17-20 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025221

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

repeated here—possibly instead of some similar enumeration of things on the earth.

94(-95) = 108(-109) = 114(-115). Lines 94-95 are the fitting conclusion of the preceding discussion of the elements, but they have no meaning after 107. They stand in Simplicius 34r 159, 3 at the end of a long quotation, and it is not unlikely that they were repeated at the end of the next quotation (34r 159, 25) by the error either of Simplicius or of some copyist. The last half of 109 reads like a gloss that has been incorporated into the text. A negative argument of less weight for the omission of these lines (108-109) is the fact that they are omitted Simpl. 7v 33, 17. The same lines appear in Simpl. 8r 33, 21. Here they are intimately connected with the two preceding lines, but their connection with the following lines is forced, and the following lines—as I shall hope to show—belong better in another connection. Accordingly I propose to identify 114-115 with 94-95 and to insert 112-113 before 94-95. The order will then be 90-93, 112-113, 94-95 (= 114-115). The insertion of 112-113 between 93 and 94 is confirmed by the fact that 112-113 form the natural response to 93, and give a fitting introduction to 94-95.

67-68 = 116-117 (cf. 248). Lines 67-68 appear in this connection several times in Simplicius, and indeed 70-73 appear directly after 118 at Simpl. 8r 33, 26. Stein inserts Simpl. 8r 33, 26 as his line 69. My proposal is to insert both Simpl. 8r 33, 25 and 26 after 68, in which case there is no reason for

regarding 116-117 as different from 67-68. So I would read 67-68, 118, 69-73.

These two changes in the text of Simplicius, which cut out several repetitions, rest on the interpretation of Simpl. 8r 33, 19. Stein breaks this passage after 33, 25 and inserts 33, 26 as line 69. I propose to break it at the point where the meaning halts, namely after 33, 22; the first four lines I would place after 93 as I have suggested in the last paragraph but one, and the remainder after 66, as I have suggested in the last paragraph.

134 = 138. Line 134, which consists simply of the word *σφαῖρον*, has no reason for existence; as the reference in Simpl. 258r may perfectly well apply to line 138.

3 = 228. The close resemblance between these two lines may be due to the restoration of 228. We may notice however *μερίμνας* (3, 45, 228) and *δεῖλα* (3, 53, 228, 343, 400, 441, 446) are favourite words with Empedokles, so that perhaps there is no reason to discredit line 228.

In conclusion I should like to suggest a slight emendation of line 85. The text of Simplicius at 34r 158, 24 reads *μετ' ὅσοισιν* (so aE; DE *μετ' ὅσσοισιν*); Preller suggests *γ' ὅσσοισιν*; Panzerbieter, *μεθ' ὅλοισιν*. What is wanted is a reference to the four elements, with which Love works, though her activity cannot be discerned by mortal men. So I would suggest *μετὰ τοῖσιν*, since *ταῦτα*, *τάδε*, *τά* are commonly used to refer to the elements in the whole poem. ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

Yale University.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

I.—*Ingens* ONCE MORE.

REPLYING to Dr. Fennell (*Class. Rev.* July, 1897, p. 300), I would urge the following considerations against the derivation of *ingens* from 'an indeterminate preposition with the root of *gi-gnere*, etc.'

(i) As to Form.

This explanation requires that *-gens* be explained 1° as a nomen agentis of the type of *mens*, or 2° as an aoristic participle, say *in-g(n)ens*, or 3° as a participle to a root *g-ē*, parallel with *gen-*. The first of these explanations is morphologically unobjectionable, the second is plausible, but the third is a form-type usually accompanied by reduplication. Bréal (in his *Dictionary*)

does, to be sure, compare *indiges*, but the etymology of *indiges* has, as I shall submit below, been misunderstood.

(ii) As to Signification.

For all the above derivations of *-gens* we should expect a sense like 'growing up, increasing,' if in the prefix *in-* we have a preposition; but *ingens* means rather 'grown up, increased,' and there is some difficulty in this shift of meaning.

(iii) As to the Composition.

Here there is great difficulty to my mind, and this I hinted at when I called the preposition *indeterminate*. I find no such development of meaning in *ἐν-γίγνεσθαι* 'to be innate,' nor in *ingenuus* 'free-born,' and hence reject the preposition *in* for *ingens*.

If Latin has any cognate of *ἀνὰ* that cognate is *an-* in *anquiere*, *an-hēlare*¹ (cf. v. Planta Osk.-Umbr. Gram. i. p. 97, Brugmann Gr. Gram.² p. 218, Bréal et Bailly Dict. Etym. s.v. *halare*).

In the above statement I have tried to set forth at its strongest the argument for the derivation supported by Dr. Fennell, as well as the other side. I need hardly say that the counter-arguments seem to me the stronger.

I also reject the cognation Dr. Fennell instances of *γῆρας* with the *γέρος*-group, though that derivation is in current use (cf. Prellwitz *Etym. Wört.* s.v.). On the side of the signification *γῆρας* meets its very best explanation when regarded as a doublet of *βῆβας* 'high-stepping' (cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xiii. 226). The 'velars' were in all probability not labialised before *ā* (cf. de Saussure *Mém.* 119, n. 2, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*² 35, Anm., and the author, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 1895, p. lxvi., in answer to Bechtel's contention to the contrary in his *Hauptprobleme*, p. 354). If this be true **g-ā* would have given normally in Greek **gā-* that is in an isolated word like *γῆρας*, while *βῆβας* was affected by *βαίνω* and its group.

Dr. Fennell holds that there are no certain examples of Sk. *ā-* or Grk. *ā-* akin to words beginning in *m* followed by a vowel. He will, I take it, not object to my citing the initial gradation *na^x-/n_o-* any more than to *ma^x-/m_o-*. All scholars agree without any prominent exception, so far as I recall, that the privative *a-* of Sanskrit and Greek is a weak form of *ne* 'not.'

Fick (*B.B.* v. 168, vii. 95), Bury (*ib.* vii. 80-, 338-), Bezzenberger (*ib.* v. 168 footnote) suggest a large number of cognations based on the phonetic change denied by Dr. Fennell. I agree with G. Meyer (*Gk. Gram.*³ p. 52 Anm.), that very few of these have any claim to probability. But some of them are, we must allow, very plausible,

more particularly the following, all from Fick's first article.

{ *ἀγα-*, *ἀγαν* 'sehr': *μέγα* 'gross, sehr.'
{ *ἀγαμαι* 'bewundern, hochhalten': Sk. *mah-*
verherrlichen, herrlich sein.²

Noreen (*Ungerm. Lautlehre*, § 31, 5) adds Sk. *mādhyas*, Lat. *medius*... 'in der mitte befindlich': Germ. *untar* 'zwischen, unter,' cf. Sk. *ādhas* < **mādh-* 'unten.'

We can hardly refuse to consider that **n_o-sme* (or **n_s-sme*), the base reconstructed for Lesbian *ἀμμε* 'us,' Sk. *asmā-*, is in gradation either with *me-* of the acc. sg., or *ne-* of the plural stem (Lat. *nōs*).

The following examples of *na^x-/n_o-* are accepted by Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, § 7.

(1) Sk. *ābh-ri* 'Hacke': *nabh-* 'bersten' (Fick, *B.B.* vi. 238, Hoffmann, *ib.* xviii. 287).

(2) Sk. *āsta* Heimat: *nas-* 'einkehren' (Bartholomae, *K.Z.* xxix. 438 Anm.).

(3) Sk. *aktū-* 'night': Lat. *noct-is* 'of the night' (Benfey, *S.F.* 3, Bury, *B.B.* vii. 338, Bartholomae, *ib.* xv. 20).

(4) Sk. *addhā* 'gewiss,' Avest. *azdā* 'Gewissheit': Sk. *medhā* from **mazdhā* 'Einsicht' (Johansson, *I.F.* ii. 30).

(5) Sk. *abhrā-* 'Wolke,' Grk. *ἀφρός*, Lat. *imber*: Sk. *nābhas*, Gk. *véφος*.

The above examples will convince the reader that a large number of scholars recognise the probability of the existence of the gradation called in question by Dr. Fennell.

It is altogether likely that *ἀγαν* is an acc. fem. adverb from a stem **āgo-* as Dr. Fennell explains. Still the loan-word theory is not a very cogent one, and there is nothing either to disprove the claim that *ἀγαν* is a neuter adverb of participial nature like *πᾶν*.

I submit again that the comparison of Lat. *ingent-* (from **ngent-*) with Sk. *mahánt-* presents fewer difficulties than either of the current etymologies.

II.—LATIN *mons*, 'PEAK.'

Cognates of the stem *mont-* have seemed to be lacking almost entirely. Wackernagel *K.Z.* xxxiii. 571 sq. explains very attractively the word *μοῦσα* 'muse' from

¹ The derivation of *anhēlare* from a preposition with *hālare* is, I am convinced, erroneous. The root of Lat. *anima*, Grk. *ἀνεμος*, Sk. *ānīla-s*, is *an-*. As other 'dissyllabic' roots frequently show in Sanskrit *-i* ('from *ā*'?), I would connect *anhēlus* 'gasping' directly with Sk. *ānīla-s* 'wind' (cf. *ānīti* 'he gasps'). The *ē* of *anhēlus* shows the same riddlesome variation in colour (*ē* and not *ā*) shown by *ἀνεμος*; while its length as well as the *h* may well be of secondary origin—by association with *hālare*—or we may here have the result of an Aryan *ā* (?).

I am also not in accord with the derivation of *hālare* from a noun-stem **an-s-lo-*, even though this is a very neat phonetic feat. To me *hālare* looks very much like an extension of *hā*, the sighing interjection.

² Accepted by Brugmann with a qualifying 'wol' (*Gr.* ii. § 575), and cited without expression of opinion by G. Meyer (*Gk. Gram.*³ § 448); disputed by the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 427, footnote 1, on grounds no longer cogent if *ingent-* is a cognate of Sk. *mahánt-*.

**μοντ*-*ya*- 'a mountain dweller, oread.' Wharton in his *Etyma Latina* s.v. *mons* writes a base *MONTI*- and compares *μῆτι*-Ags. *münd.* protection, Eng. *mound*: 'refuge.' Just what his conception is I am not sure that I grasp from so abbreviated a statement. Perhaps it is that this stem belongs to the root *men*- 'think' and *mons* was first a memorial or grave mound, and then came to be metaphorically applied to a natural elevation of land. The implicit metaphor is not impossible, and may even have been natural if the Italians came from a flat country to Italy.

Wackernagel's explanation of *μῶσα* just mentioned would set the problem back of the Italic period, and it remains to see whether other cognates do not show themselves in a sense susceptible of a more direct connection with *mons*.

I propose to apply to *mōnt*- the gradation *ma^xn-*, and I further assume that **nnt*- would give *ynt*- while the latter might be in certain cases indistinguishable from *nt*-. Homer uses the adverb *ἀνάρτα* 'uphill' and *-avta* might be explained on the lines of our assumption. We may explain as further cognates O.H.G. *andī* 'brow,' O.Ir. *étan*, and, with generalised meaning, Sk. *ánta-s* 'end.' Our common use of the phrase 'brow of the hill' is guarantee enough for the relation of O.H.G. *andī* 'brow' to Lat. *mont*- 'hill.'

There is still another Greek word that suggests itself in this connection viz. *μενθήρη* 'brow,' not given in Liddell and Scott, but to be found in Prellwitz's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I still believe (cf. *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvi. p. 3 footnote 2) that the question of the *tenuis aspirata* in Greek is unsettled and that neighbouring nasals and liquids exercised an aspirating influence on the *tenuis* (spite of G. Meyer, *Grk. Gram.*³ § 207). Thus it seems to me possible that the root of *μενθήρη* is *ment*-. We might with so solitary a word operate with a vulgar aspiration, or fall back on the Boeotian verb ending *-vθn*=Attic *-vται*, and suspect dialectic variation. If we may set up an Aryan stem *ma^xnt*- 'peak, point' we may refer to it the Latin words *mentula* 'membrum virile' and *mentum* 'chin.' In Sanskrit the stem *mathī* means 'twirling stick.' Such a stick was pointed and twirled rapidly about in another bit of wood to create fire by friction.

Beside the stem *mathī* stands one entirely like it in inflexion, viz. *pathī*- 'road.' The latter is represented in Latin by *pont*- 'bridge,' and if *mathī*- meant primitively

'point,' then Latin *mont*- 'peak' is its cognate, and has preserved the same flexional type.

III.—*Indigetes*.

The etymology current for *indigetes* (*indu* + *gen*-) is obviously of the popular variety, and may be read between the lines of Servius himself on Verg. *Georg.* i. 498: *patrii Dii sunt, qui praesunt singulis civitatibus, ut Minerva Athenis, Juno Carthagini: Indigetes autem proprie sunt Dii ex hominibus facti, quasi in Diis agentes*. Here, passing over the etymological *lusus* of Servius himself, we note that the Great Gods were *indigetes*. This is also seen in a passage from Macrobius (S, l. 17): *virgines vestales ita indigetant, Apollo Medice, Apollo Paeon*.

Alongside of *indigetes* stand *indigetare* 'invoke' and *indigitamenta* 'book of rites, prayers,' and the relation of meaning between them, if *indigetes* be taken to mean 'home born,' like *indigena*, is very far to seek.

I propose therefore to divide our word *ind-ig-et-es*, and compare Sk. *yajatā*- 'holy, divine': the root *yaj*- 'honour, sacrifice to.' Thus *ind-ig-et-es* means 'divine, consecrated, deified.' In Greek we receive great support for this explanation in *ἀγίλειν* 'hallow by sacrifice,' and *ἐναγίλειν* 'make offerings to the dead or Manes.' The Greek preposition *ἐν*- is of course identical with *ind*- in *indigetare*.

It is an interesting phenomenon that in Sanskrit there is a *te*- suffix instead of a *t*- suffix and the development of meaning was doubtless from 'honoured' to 'honourable' (cf. Lat. *acceptus* which has passed from 'accepted' to 'acceptable'). The *t*- suffix is of course prevaillingly active (but compare *ἀγνωτ*- 'unknown, not knowing,' *προβλητ*- 'thrown forward, springing forward,' and *δορικμητ*- 'spear-pressed,' Brug. *Gr.* ii. p. 368, § 123), and the *te*- suffix prevaillingly passive. This furnishes us with the clue to the difference in the stems in Latin *ig-et-* and Sk. *yajatā*- which last has been assimilated to a past participle in regard of its suffix.

From the phonetic standpoint there is no difficulty in Latin: *ind-ig* from *in* + *iag*- shows the same treatment as *inicere* from *in* + *iacere*. The *d* of *indigetes* either comes in by way of popular association with *indigena*, or was patterned after metrical archaisms like *indalbare*, *indaudere*, etc. If we may judge from *inicere* the initial

syllable of **inīgetes* would also have been long by position. This factor too must have been of weight in the orthography of *indīgetes*, particularly as we know there was a vulgar or dialectic variation between

nd and *nn*, as in *tennitur* for *tenditur* (Terence, *Phormio*, 330).

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

CONSUS, the god to whom the Consualia were sacred, is expressly stated by Varro and Dio. Hal. to be the same as Neptunus Equestris: in other words Consus was an ancient god of horses—cf. Tertullian *de Spectaculis* Cap. V: *Exinde ludi Consualia dicti, qui initio Neptunum honorabant*. Cf. old Slavonic *koni*, Russ. *kon'*, horse.

Grādivus seems hard to separate from IUVE KRAPUVI (Iovi Grabovio) of the Umbrian Iguvian tables: the meaning seems to be 'the shouter' from the root $\sqrt{\text{gra}}$, found in Slavonic *igrá*, play, dance: $\sqrt{\text{gra}}$ signifies 'shouting' vide Miklosich

Wbh. der Slav. Sprach. p. 95. This will tally with Juvenal's simile of 'Gradivus Homericus.'

The word *viverra* (a ferret), Plin. *N.H.* viii. 81, used in Pliny's time, as now, to chase rabbits, and imported from Africa for the purpose, is a loan-word brought by trappers from the north with the skins which they supplied to the Romans. The Slavonic word is *věvera* a squirrel: in O. Prussian *vaivaras* signified a weasel; cf. Miklosich p. 389.

H. A. STRONG.

ON THE QUANTITY OF NAMES IN *-ωνης*

IN my *History of Greek Literature* I marked the ι of *Λεπτίνης* long as contrasted with the short ι in *Αισχίνης*. I have been asked by several scholars to state my authority for this distinction, and am the more anxious to do so, as I now realise that it goes to some extent beyond the evidence.

The scansion *Αισχίνης* is proved by Theocr. xiv, 2 &c. For *Λεπτίνης* my authority was Fick *Griechischen Eigennamen* xxxv seq. After quoting names in *-ίνος* like *Ἐρμίνος*, *Χαρμίνος*, Fick proceeds: 'Neben-*-ίνος* erscheint seltener die Nebenform *-ίνης*, *-ίνας* wie *-ίας* neben *-ιος*, *-είας* neben *-ειος* auftritt.' He then quotes 14 names in *-ίνης*, *-ίνας* (not including either *Αισχίνης* or *Λεπτίνης*): e.g. *Καλλίνης* (*Καλλίνος*), *Λευκίνης* (*Λευκίνος*), *Πρατίνας* (*Πρωτίνος*). The last case seems the clearest; *Πρατίνας* being regular Doric, with the characteristic *-ας* = *-ος*. The name *Leptines* occurs, so far as I know, only twice in poetry. Archil. 70 Bgk.

Τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμὸς, Γλαυκε, Λεπτίνεω πᾶι.
and Rhianus Anth. Pal. xii. 93.

*Ὦν δ' ἐπὶ Λεπτίνεω στρέψης δέμας, οὐκετι γυῖα.

The first of these is inconclusive: the latter tends in favour of τ , since the Ionic Genitive in *-ων* 'must always be read as one syllable.' (Weir Smyth, *Ionic*, § 428 cf. § 446: 'Ionic *-ων* is invariably monosyllabic.') For this reason I marked 'Leptines' in accordance with Fick's rule and with the apparent usage of Rhianus.

However, Rhianus is not quite conclusive: he may have taken an unusual licence with a name otherwise unmanageable in elegiacs, and have sought to justify himself by **Ἀλτεω ὅς Δελέγεσσι* in Φ 87; (cf. the late epigram in Weir Smyth's note l.c.) And as for Fick's rule it seems to crumble away upon closer examination. Of his 14 names in *-ίνης* *-ίνας*, I can find no single instance where the ι is certainly long, while there are two where it is short. These are *Μυρίνης* (cf. *Μυρίνος*, *Μυρίνη*) in poet. ap. Ath. 32b, 132d, and *Σμυκρίνης* in Menander's *Aspis*. Of course *Μυρίνης*, as the name of a wine, and adjectival, may not be evidence for real proper names. *Σμυκρίνης* rests upon an emendation of Bentley's (MS. *σμυκρήν ἥ*), but if the form with Σ was used at all by the Comic poets (see the strong evidence in