

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. VI.

JUNE 10, 1853.

No. 136.

THOMAS WATTS, Esq., in the Chair.

The following paper was read—

“Miscellaneous Remarks on some Latin Words.” By Professor Key.

Although etymology is the foundation upon which all dictionaries should be constructed, yet it must be admitted that in not a few instances damage has been done by allowing a spurious derivation to affect the meaning assigned to words. Thus the sub. *armentum*, in a lexicon of considerable repute, has for the first meaning assigned to it ‘cattle for ploughing,’ with the appended note that it is ‘contracted from *arimentum* from *aro*.’ The form of the noun ‘*arimentum*’ seems to imply that the writer supposed a verb ‘*arere*’ of the third conjugation to have preceded the ordinary verb *arare*. To such a supposition we offer no objection, as it would be in harmony with the admitted examples of *lavare* and *lavere*, *sonare* and *sonere*, *cubare* and *cumbere*; and of course the loss of the *i* in the alleged *arimentum*, is a more probable doctrine than the loss of a long vowel from *aramentum*. We are aware that the derivation from the verb signifying ‘to plough’ has the authority of Varro, and we are also ready to admit that such derivation is more satisfactory than that found in Servius and Festus, which deduces it from *arma*, on the ground that as horses are immediately serviceable in war, so oxen supply material for making shields; more satisfactory we say, because the termination *mentum* implies a derivation from a verb. The objection which leads us to reject the view of Varro, is that the word *armentum* is never found in connexion with the idea of ploughing. Forcellini is right when he says, ‘*Proprie dicitur de grege equorum et boum qui simul aluntur*.’ Why then should we hesitate to deduce the word from this very verb *alere*, and regard *armenta* as a corruption, no very violent one, of *alimenta*? The fact that the language already possesses this sub. *alimentum* in a different sense is no impediment, as it is far from being a rare occurrence for duplicate or even triplicate varieties of the same word to coexist. Thus our own tongue has in the three substantives *bag*, *bay*, and *bow*, words with marked differences of meaning and yet one in origin. So again the transitive verbs *subrigere* and *porrigere* are by formation identical with the intransitive verbs *surgere* and *pergere*. Similarly *θαρσος* and *θρασος* are held to be only dialectic varieties of the same word, and at one time appear to have had no distinction of meaning, though there finally grew up a difference of usage which confined the former to a eulogistic, the latter to a dyslogistic sense. We have passed over the interchange of the two liquids in *alimenta* and *armenta* as

scarcely deserving notice; but it may be as well to observe that *αιρω* and *αλο* are probably equivalent forms; nor is the longer form *αιρωω*, *i. e.* the crude form *αιρ-*, sufficient to overturn this doctrine, for the Greek language abounds in verbs which prefix a vowel foreign to the root. Besides, the Latin itself in *arduus*, 'lofty, steep,' is a derivative from *alere* possessed of the desired liquid. To prevent misconception we add, that the first signification we would assign to *al-* is 'raise' or 'rear,' in the mere physical sense; a second, 'raise' or 'rear,' as we say raise or rear cattle, vegetables, &c., *i. e.* cause them to grow.

Another instance of a familiar word where a mere change from one liquid to another has tended to obscure the origin, is seen in the substantive *annus*. It is generally admitted that this word denoted simply a circle, and that it was immediately related to the diminutival *annulus* and *annellus*, 'a ring'; also to the noun *anus* = *podex*, inasmuch as a single nasal is found in the word *annulus* itself. But the origin of *annus* is still a problem for solution. We find in a dictionary published within the last few years, what is probably taken from Dr. Freund's work,—“kindred with *AN* = *ἀμφί*,” &c. The writer probably means the particle *am*, and if so, his view is established by the Oscan form of *annus*, viz. *amnus* (see Mommsen's *Unteritalische Dialecte*, where the word repeatedly occurs as the equivalent of *annus*). The Latin inseparable preposition is of course familiar in the compound *am-icio*. But in several verbs to which it attaches itself there has been, as we have elsewhere noticed, a natural but undue tendency to give to the prefix something more than it can justly claim. Thus *ambire*, *amburere*, *ambedere*, should probably be divided immediately after the liquid, so as to give the *b* to the stem of the verb. But when we deduce *annus* through *amnus* from the stem *am*, we are disposed to consider the latter as an obsolete verb, rather than as an ignoble particle, and standing to *ama-*, the essential part of *amare*, precisely as *son-* of the above-mentioned *sonere* to *sona-* of the more familiar *sonare*. If our view be correct, the first signification of *amare* will be 'to embrace,' a physical idea from which readily flows the ordinary meaning of the verb. It is true that the Latin verb *amare* is held to be represented by the Sanscrit *kam-*, 'love'; but this is perfectly consistent with all that has been said, and even the Latin language seems to present the same root with an initial guttural, if we may believe the interpretation which Servius gives to *hamus* in Virgil:—*Loricam consertam hamis auroque tralicem*, *Aen. iii. 467*, “*i. e. catenis vel circulis*.” Be this as it may, the appearance of an *m* in the Oscan *amnus* accounts for the variety in the form of *solemnis*, *solennis*.

The same stem *am* is seen in the substantive *ames*, *amitis*, 'the fowler's pole,' a word that stands without etymological remark in the dictionaries. In Mr. Rich's work the precise character and use of the tool is explained, and the origin of the word becomes then one of easy discovery, if we follow the simple and safe rule of placing it by the side of words which possess a similar ending, such as *pedes*, *eques*, *comes*, *ales*. Our dictionaries are commonly satisfied with a

half-performance of their etymological duties. Thus we are told that *equus*, *pedes* and *ales* are respectively from the substantives *equus*, *pes* and *ala*, while of the second element which enters into them not one word is said. Fortunately the deficiency is supplied under *comes*, which is justly deduced from *eo*, 'I go,' though it would be more precise to say that *it* in *com-it-* is only a fuller form of the *i* seen in *i-re*, as is also the case in *it-er*, *ex-it-ium*, *in-it-ium*, &c. Thus *ames* is an adjective and might be translated by 'going round,' with some such word as *pertica* understood. In the working of the clap-net, the action of the *ames* is exactly what the word denotes; it *revolves*, and carrying the net with it, deposits it on the surprised birds.

Alec or *Halec*.—This word is probably nothing more than the southern equivalent for what is written in French *hareng*, our *herring*. On the interchange of the two liquids in question we have already had occasion to speak, and as the herring is a fish belonging to the northern seas of Europe, we have an explanation of the fact that it was known to the Romans only in the form of a pickled fish, or fish-pickle.

Adulari.—The current doctrines about this word are various. We will give them as summarily noticed in Dr. Andrews's lexicon: "Acc. to Fest. p. 18, this word is formed by metathesis fr. *adludo*, to play with one, to wag the tail, as orig. used of dogs: Kärcher compares with it, etymologically, the Germ. *wedeln* and the Eng. *wheelde*, Beier, Lael. 25, 91, *ululo*, to howl. Doederl. deriv. is most correct, Syn. 2, 175, fr. *aula*, the court-yard where the dog stands guard, serves or waits: thus *adulor* is, as it were, *ad aliquem aulor*."

The connexion with the Germ. *wedeln*, Eng. *wheelde*, is upset, to say nothing of other matters, by the mere quantity of the *u* in *adulor*, for the suffix *el* of German words is represented in Latin by *ül* with a short *u*: *tafel*, *tabula*; *wandeln*, *ambulare*. But a more satisfactory explanation of the Latin verb will present itself, if we keep steadily in view what the usage of the classical writers, as well as the direct testimony of ancient commentators, places before us, that the word was originally applied to dogs wagging their tail at a favourite master. Such a meaning well agrees with the reflective form of the verb, as expressing an act of the animal upon its own body, and also with the ordinary power of the preposition *ad*. All we have to look for is the tail, and this we find in the three letters *ula*. Here again the interchange between the liquids *r* and *l* must be called in aid, and as the Greek equivalent for a *ū* is *ov*, we have before us the word *ovpa*, 'a tail.' But it will not be satisfactory unless we also find the word within the Latin domain. Now the word *cauda* has in Varro the form *coda*, just as *caudex*, *caulis*, *Claudius*, *plaudo*, also take the forms of *codex*, *colis*, *Clodius*, *plodo*. In modern Spanish we find duplicate forms as regards the second consonant, both *cola* and *coda*. But an initial *c* is far from being a stable letter. It is now commonly admitted that *ubi*, *unde*, *uter*, *umquam*, are later forms of *cubi*, *cunde*, *cuter*, *cumquam*, and so stand in immediate relation to the cases *cujus*, *cui*, &c. of the relative. In

the north of Italy Etruria was as fond in ancient times of initial gutturals as Florence is now, while Rome and Naples preferred and still prefer softer sounds. Thus, for example, the pronoun *ille* or *olle* (to follow the guidance of Virgil's *olli*) began with a vowel, but the modern Italian, forced by fashion to give a preference to the language in favour at Florence, has been compelled to substitute *quello*. On these grounds we regard *ula* in *adulari* as but a corruption of an older form *cōla*, 'a tail,' and the equivalent of the Greek *οὐρα*.

The matter of the last argument in reference to the origin of *ubi*, *unde*, &c., brings to mind a prevalent error that still disfigures some, if not all, our best dictionaries. Of course if *ubi* (i. e. *cubi*) be a mere dative of the relative, as most scholars (lexicographers excepted) admit, then *alicubi*, *alibi* and *aliubi* are but datives corresponding to the nominatives *aliquis*, *alis* (Lucr.), *alius*. So again Dr. Andrews's lexicon is not far from the truth when under *inde* it tells us that this particle is formed from the pronoun *is* with an adverbial ending. We have said that he is not far from the truth, for in fact there is strong reason for believing that the liquid *n* belongs to the pronoun and not to the adverbial suffix. In a paper on the Pronouns, read some years ago before the Society, reasons were assigned at length for the doctrine that the pronouns of the third person ended in *n*. To what was then said we will add an argument drawn from the Greek language. The adverb *ενθεν*, 'thence,' contains in its last three letters a well-known suffix which can lay no claim to the preceding liquid. Comp. *οὐρανο-θεν*, *εμε-θεν*, &c. The pronominal stem we contended had for its original form *κεν*, which was readily subject to the loss of the initial guttural. Thus *ενθεν* is only an archaic genitive of the pronoun, signifying from this. But as *οπισθεν* also takes the form *οπισθε*, so *ενθεν* might well lose its final liquid; and as the Latin language commonly substitutes a medial consonant in place of a Greek aspirated consonant*, *inde* is the very form which might be expected to correspond to the Greek *ενθεν*. In the same way we hold *un-de*, *aliun-de*, *alicun-de*, to be correctly divided, when *de* alone is treated as the suffix denoting *from*. But this is not material for the present argument. If *unde* (i. e. *cunde*) be only an archaic genitive of the relative, and *inde* of *is*, so *aliunde*, *alicunde*, are archaic genitives of *alius* and *aliquis*. It is now more than twenty years ago that the writer urged similar arguments in a review of an early edition of Zumpt's Latin Grammar, but he still finds in what are deemed some of our best lexicons such explanations as: "alibi [alius-ibi], alicubi [aliquo-ubi], alicunde [aliquo-unde], aliubi [alius-ubi], aliunde [alius-unde]." A similar error, exposed on the same occasion, is still repeated from year to year in this form: "istic (also written isthic) [iste-hic]." Surely the writer of this, on a little reflection, will perceive that *ille* and *iste*, like *num* (now) and *tum* (then), may take the demonstrative suffix *ce* or *c*, so as to make *illic*, *istic*, *nunc*, and *tunc*, without dragging in the whole of the pronoun *hic*, especially as the non-admission of such a suffix as

* As in *ungui-* by the side of *οὐυχ-*, *nebula νεφελη*, *umbilico- ομφαλο-*.

ce or *c* leaves him in an awkward position when he endeavours to analyse *hic* itself.

Abstemius.—A favourite derivation of this word is from a hypothetical substantive *temum*, whence it is said proceed *temulentus* and *temetum*; and further, we are sometimes told that *temum* is by metathesis from $\mu\epsilon\theta\nu$. This doctrine of metathesis is most fatal to the fair progress of etymological studies. One writer, for example, tells us that *vinco* is a metathetical variety of $\nu\iota\kappa\alpha\text{F}\omega$, another that *et* is the Greek $\tau\epsilon$ transposed, a third that *forma* is only a transformation of $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$, a fourth that *abdomen* is a corruption of *adipomen* from *adeps*; and it is to be regretted that the German scholar Bopp has too often encouraged such assumptions. But while we reject without hesitation the derivation of the supposed *temum*, we also doubt there being any connexion between *abstemius* and the word which is at the base of *temetum* and *temulentus*, and this partly because the termination *ius* seems rather to point to a verb, while we see no sufficient objection to the derivation from *abstinere*. The liquids *m* and *n* are frequently convertible, especially in this part of a root. Thus *mem-or* must be connected with the family of words derived from *men-*, as *mens*, *re-min-iscor*, *me-min-i*. Again, if we direct our thoughts to $\chi\theta\omicron\nu$ - of the Greek $\chi\theta\omega\nu$, and compare it with the similar combination of consonants in $\chi\theta\epsilon\varsigma$, we shall see reason for expecting the Latin correlative to begin with a simple *h*. Hence as *her-i*, *hes-ternus* are immediately related to $\chi\theta\epsilon\varsigma$, so $\chi\theta\omicron\nu$ - may be regarded as the analogue of *hūmo-*; and the little doubt that may linger in the mind disappears on seeing $\chi\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ by the side of *humi*.

The adjective *aequali*- we have long regarded as formed from *aevo-*, 'age,' and a suffix *li*, represented in our own language by the termination *ly*, i. e. *like*, for *manly* (Germ. *mannlich*) is well known to be only a corruption of *manlike*. Thus *aequalis* would signify 'of the same age,' and such is the sole meaning of the word in the writers who preceded Cicero, so that the subsequent use of the word with the mere meaning of equality, independently of age, ought not to outweigh its early signification. Our theory presupposes that *aevo*- had once a guttural consonant after the diphthong; and had any ancient works written in that Italian dialect which prevailed in Florence in ancient times come down to us, we should probably have found in them a dialectic variety, *aequum*, 'age.' Thus the Latin verb *vivere* must assuredly have had a guttural at one time, or the perfect would never have taken the form *virsi* (*viri*); of such guttural the French language has retained a trace in its participle *vecu*. So also have the Latin *vigeo* and *vigor*. Again, the Latin adjective *vivus* is represented in our northern tongue by *quick*, where two gutturals replace the lip-letters of *vivus*, and conversely our adjective *quick* in Lancashire has retaken the softer form *wick*. A parallel case is seen in the first element of *aequus*, 'level,' compared with the first element of our own *ev-en*. But *aeum* itself is perhaps to be deduced from the Latin verb *aug-eo*, for growth and age are often represented by a common term, by *grandis* for example, which in the Latin language generally expresses age quite as much as size;

and we know that young children are constantly assuming that the taller people are, the older they are. Then as to form, since the Greek wrote both *αἰξω* and *αἰξω*, we may assume that *aeg* might be an equivalent for *aug* of *augeo*, and so *aevo-* might be a legitimate child of such a verb. The Greek adjective *ἴλιξ* we would also claim as of similar formation with *aequalis*, only that the second half exhibits greater purity, having preserved the *k* of *like*; while on the other hand the first syllable has undergone violent compression, but not more than was to be expected in a Greek word, which commonly annihilates a *F* between vowels, and indeed has so dealt with *αιων*, which is acknowledged to be related to *aevum*. In claiming *ἴλιξ* and *ἴλικια*, we would not disturb *ἴλικος*, *τηλικος*, *πηλικος*, in their relation to each other and to the pronominal forms *ὁ*, *ἡ*, *το-* and *πο-*. Nay, as *aequalis* in the minds of the Romans got confounded with the derivatives of *aequus* and *aequare*, so also it is probable that a similar confusion found its way among the Greeks between *ἴλιξ* and *ἴλικος*, and hence perhaps arose the aspirate of the first word. Though this also admits of independent explanation, for the root of *augeo*, *αἰξανω*, *αἰξω*, seems identical with our own verb *wax*, Germ. *wachsen*, and so to have been once possessed of an initial digamma, which we know was often replaced by an aspirate.

Aestivus.—The carelessness of etymologists is distinctly exhibited when we find an adjective of this form deduced from the substantive *aestas*, the evident connexion of sense being allowed to cover all the iniquities of disregarding the two suffixes of the words. A fault not less serious to the cause of etymology occurs when the substantive *aestus* is deduced from the verb *aestuare*. Let such proceedings be contrasted with the analogical steps which are requisite. As *aestivus* has a suffix in common with *captivus*, *subditivus*, *stativus*, &c.; and these come through perfect participles *captus*, *subditus*, *status*, from verbs; so must *aestivus* come eventually from a verb containing the element *aes* or something like it. So again, as *nobilitas*, *caritas*, *bonitas*, are deduced from adjectives, *aestas* likewise points to an adjective *aesi-* or *aeso-*. Thirdly, *aestus* (*aestu-*), a masculine noun in *tu*, must be placed alongside of such words as *factu-*, *actu-*, *dictu-*, and we again infer the existence of some such verb as *aes-*. It is true that we do not at first find one, but *uro*, *us̄si*, *us̄tus*, contains in the syllable *us*, the consonant desired, and we know that wherever a root contained a long *ū*, the older language had a diphthong *oe*, as *coerare*, *comoenis*, *moenera*, *oeti*, *oenus*, for *curare*, *communis*, *munera*, *uti*, *unus*. Hence we must assume a form *oes-* in the sense of *burn*; whence indeed *oes-trum*, 'the gadfly,' and probably by a very slight interchange of *o* and *u*, *Vesta* and *Vesevus*, the goddess and mountain of fire. Then again, as *parcus*, *fidus*, *vivus*, are adjectives immediately formed from verbs, we may assume an adjective *aesus*, whence the substantive *aestas*. Thus we admit *aestas* and *aestivus* to be closely related words, but not that they stand to each other as mother and daughter. To what we have here said it may well be objected that a change between *ae* and *oe* is a hasty assumption, not easy to defend by precedents. Perhaps then we should look to the Greek

verb *αιθ-ω*, for the diphthong *αι* of the Greek would of course become *ae* with the Romans, and the *θ*, so unpronounceable to a Roman, might well take the form of the sibilant. Yet, in favouring this etymology, we do not mean that the Romans derived *aestas*, *aestus*, *aestivus*, from the Greek, but that these words were still of native growth, deduced from an obsolete verb *aes-*, the Latin analogue of *αιθ-*.

We have just assumed the existence of some words which are no longer found in the Latin language. The fear to make such assumptions has done much harm to etymology. But for it we should not find our lexicons dealing with a word like *adoption-* as a condensation of *adoption-*. The substantive *optio* and the frequentative *optare* alike point to a fossil verb (so to say) *opere*; and *adoptio*, as well as the adjective *adoptivus*, both bear evidence to the quondam existence of their parent *adopere*. In fact it should ever be borne in mind by the etymologist, that we possess after all but a fragment of the Latin language. When we look at all the existing Latin authors of classical repute as they appear in the simplicity of a Tauchnitz edition, apart from all commentary, we are at once struck with the smallness of an inheritance, which does not exceed thirty duodecimo volumes. This being so, let us put a case of a parallel nature. Suppose that thirty volumes be taken hap-hazard from the shelves of the British Museum, and all the words found therein be carefully arranged in an alphabetical index, what proportion would such index bear to the whole vocabulary of our language? Surely it would be no exaggeration to suppose that a good half of our native tongue would be absent from its pages.