

IV.—ON THE DERIVATION OF SON, NURUS,  
ANUS, UXOR, WIFE, ΠΑΣ, OMNIS, SOLUS,  
EVERY, ALL, 'ΟΛΟΣ. By PROF. T. HEWITT KEY.

THE most steadfast believer in the oneness of the several languages of the so-called Indo-European family must come across many words which have the appearance of being isolated or peculiar to a single member; and again, what really involves the same difficulty, in the tables of cognate terms which are adduced in proof of such affinity, there is at times seen an awkward gap which calls for explanation. Thus in the series of words which belong to relationship by blood or marriage, as *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *sister*, etc., the Latin column is left vacant as regards the term which should correspond to the Greek *θυγάτηρ*, E. *daughter*. It was to supply this defect that some time back I suggested *filia* as really entitled to the place, grounding the claim chiefly on the evidence of two letter-changes, that of *θ* with *f*, as seen in *θυγά*, *θυμός*, *θηρ*, compared with *fora* (acc. pl. *foras*, dat. pl. *foris*, called adverbs), *fumus*, *fera*, and that of *γ* (softened to a *y*) with an *l* mouillé, as in *μoyis* compared with *μολis*. Thus the more essential part, viz. *θυγά* of *θυγάτηρ*, is substantially identical with *filia*, viz. *thi-ya* with *fi-ya*. This argument was confirmed by the information I received from a friend, that in modern Greek a shorter form *θυγο*- (n. *θυγος*) was a term in habitual use for 'a daughter.' I further identified *θυγ* of these two nouns with the Latin *sugo*, so that the original meaning should be 'suckling;' and this view, I am told, was put forward by Lassen, who preferred it to the translation of 'milk-maid,' as favoured by the majority of Sanskritists. Moreover, if I am right in thus identifying *filia* with *θυγάτηρ*, it will at once follow that the office of 'milk-maid,' which is not without meaning as a suitable expression for a daughter, loses its special fitness for a son, and yet it is impossible to separate *filia* from *filius*. On the other hand the term 'suckling' is applicable to both, and has the additional advantage that it is available for the infant who is not yet qualified to take a part in the work of the dairy.

But here arises another question. The Teutonic languages have for their ordinary representation of *filius* a word very unlike it in shape, Go. *sunus*, Germ. *sohn*, E. *son*; and here the Skr. is in thorough agreement with them, having a word identical with the Gothic, viz. *sunus*. Can this be brought into connection with *filius*, as our other term *daughter* with *filia*? I venture to answer in the affirmative. A Greek *θ* may well be regarded as interchangeable with an *s*. Indeed this convertibility has already been assumed in the identification of *θυγ* of *θυγατερ*- with the Latin *sug-o*. So *θαλ* of *θαλασσα* is habitually regarded as one with *sal* of Latin; *θορ* of *θρωσκω* is no doubt an equivalent of *sal* in the Latin *sal-io* 'leap,' and of *sor* in the noun *sors* (*sorti*-) 'that which leaps from the urn in casting lots;' and *θνα-ειν* with its very special meaning is of course the same with the Lat. *suba-re*. Even within the limits of the Greek vocabulary grammarians place the Laconian *σειος*, *Ασανα*, *σaw*, by the side of the Attic forms *θειος*, *Αθηνη*, *θaw* (as *θησθαι*). I would also identify *θαπ* of *θαπτω* with *sep* of *sepelio*; *θεσ* of *τιθημι*, *θεσμος*, with *ser* of *sero*; and *θε* of the noun *θε-a*, whence *θεαομαι* with our own *see*, G. *seh-en*, and consequently with *σεκ* of the Gr. *σ(ε)κ-επτω*, and *sec* of the Lat. *s(e)c-io* 'know;' as well as *sep* of the Lat. *s(e)p-ecto*. It is therefore no violent assumption that the Go. *sunus* may have grown out of an older *suknus*, from a verb = our *suck*, the *n* being a dim. suffix, corresponding to that of *suckling*. Lastly, let me observe that boys and girls are more likely to have obtained their names from some relation to the mother, when the tie of paternity was less cared for.

It was but natural that this inquiry should suggest another. The tables of terms of affinity include the *socer* and the *socrus*. Then how is it that *gener* and *nurus*, *γαμβρος* and *νυος*, are so unlike to each other? I call to mind, however, that not a few words which eventually commenced with an *n*, had in earlier times a preceding *g*, as *nosco*, *nascor*, *nitor*, all deduced from older forms, *gnosco*, *gnascor*, *gnitor*, and these again may be proved to have been corrupted from yet fuller forms, *gon-osc-o*, *gen-asc-or*, *gen-it-or*, or rather *genicitor* or *gon-uct-or*,

with an excrescent *t* from *γονν(κ)*. I therefore propose *gonurus* as the form which was cut down to *nurus*, and *gonurus* would stand to *gener* almost precisely as *soc(u)rus* to *socer*, or *ἐκύρα* to *ἐκύρος*. On the same principle *νυος* would have been preceded by a *γονυος*, or rather *γονυος* or *γονυπος*, and so nearer to *γαμβρος*, which is distinctly formed from *γαμ* of *γαμεω*, the *β* of *γαμβρος* being excrescent, precisely as the *d* of the Fr. *gendre* is an outgrowth from the *n*. The sibilant which appears in the Sanskrit *snuṣa*, A.Sax. *snóru*, etc., constitutes no grave difficulty, as sibilants so often supersede gutturals. Thus the Gothic *snutra*, A.Sax. *snotor* or *snoter*, is probably of the same stock with its equivalent in meaning *knowing* and the Lat. *gnosco*. Nay, the form *snuṣa* is in itself a witness that *nurus* is in some way a decapitated word.

I have long contended that the second and fourth declensions, that is, those in *o* and *u*, owe their suffixes to a corruption from *oc* and *uc*. Thus the four Latin words I have just been dealing with would have been *soceroe*, *socuruc*, *generoc*, and *gonuruc*. In the same way I am tempted to treat *senex* 'an old man,' and *anus* 'an old woman,' as kindred words, having for their crude forms *sén-ec* and *sán-uc*, the original sibilant having been lost for *anus*.

Yet another question is here started. Has the Eatin *uzor* no representation in the kindred languages? Can it possibly have any relation to our own term *wife*? Once more I venture upon an answer in the affirmative, after a careful consideration of the etymology of *uzor*. The Romans themselves find a somewhat strange derivation for the word. Thus Servius (Aen. 4, 459) says that a bride, before crossing the threshold of the husband's house, dressed the door-posts with fillets of wool, 'propter auspiciū castitatis,' and smeared them with oil (oleo ungerent, unde *uxores* dictae sunt quasi *unxores* . .). Donatus gives the same explanation, adding however yet another, that the bride with her own hands anointed the bridegroom himself on his coming out of his bath, and his authority for this assertion seems limited to a line of Ennius: *Exin Tarquiniū bona femina lauit et unxit*. Such etymologies are in keeping with the habits of Roman gram-

marians, but find little favour now-a-days. My own course is always to follow linguistic analogies. Now I have long noticed that a Latin word in which a *u* is followed by two consonants is generally the result of a compression from a disyllabic form, which had an original *o* in place of the *u*, and a *u* between the said consonants. Thus *ung-* of *unguis* (*onuguis*) corresponds to *ον-υχ* of *ονυξ*, and so is akin to the Germ. *nag-el*, our *nail*; *urg* of *urgeo* (*orug-eo*) to *ορυχ* of *ορυσσω*; *umbra* implies an older *on-ub-era*, and so is connected with *nub-o*, *nubes*, *νεφέλη*, *nebula*, and Germ. *nebel*; *umbo* and *umbilicus* grew out of *onubo*, *onubilicus*, and so are akin not merely to *ομφαλος*, i.e. *ονυφαλος*, but also to G. *nabel*, E. *navel*; and *turba* for *toruba* has for its analogue the Gr. *θορυβος*, so that *tor* or *ter*, in the sense of 'turning' and 'stirring,' is the root. Hence I ask whether *uxor* may not stand for *oc-us-or*; and then as such a form is not traceable in Latin, I look for a Greek equivalent, remembering that a Latin *c* implies a Greek *π*. The Homeric verb *σπ-υω* 'wed,' 'marry,' at once presents itself to my mind with a thoroughly suitable meaning, and the difficulty in the non-appearance of *σ* in this verb disappears, when I call to mind that the Greek mouth habitually dropped a sibilant, when it would have stood between vowels. Thus *μουσαων* is a corruption from *μουσασ-ων*, *μαχεομαι* from *μαχεσομαι*, *γενεος* from *γενεσος*, *νυος* from *νυσος*=Lat. *nurus*; and this is especially the case with verbs in *υω*, witness *ανυω*,<sup>1</sup> which is shown to have once had a *σ* by the derivatives *ανυσ-ιμος*, *ανυσ-τος*, *ανυστικος*. Moreover the *ι* of *σπυιω*, virtually a *y* (as in *ύ-ιος*), may well be the representative of a lost consonant, especially as it only occurs when flanked on either side by vowels. I regard then *uxor* as standing for *ocus-or*, of which *oc* alone is the root, as *σπ* is of *σπυιω*. But this *σπ* may well be one with our term *wife*, for the *f*<sup>2</sup> obeys the law of Rask (Grimm); and a word which begins with an *o* has commonly

<sup>1</sup> The form *ανυτω* or *άνυτω* has a *τ*, which is interchangeable with *σ*, and the fuller *ανυσσ-ω* points to a theme *αν-υχ*, of which the first syllable alone belongs to the root, so as to justify the assumption that *σπ* alone is radical in *σπυιω*.

<sup>2</sup> That a Greek *π*, a Lat. *c* (*q*), and an E. *f* should correspond, as in *oc-uxor*, *σπ-υω* and *wife*, has its parallel in *πεντε*, *quinque* and *five* (Go. *fimf*), in *πικυρε* *quatuor* and *four* (Go. *fidvor*), in *πι-π(ε)τ-ω*, *cado* and *fall*.

lost a digamma. The root  $\acute{o}\rho$  of  $\acute{o}\rho\alpha\omega$  is our *ware* of *beware*, *os* (*ossis*) appears in Span. as *hueso*, *ovum* as *huevo*, *opera* as *huebra*, the town *Osc*a as *Huesca*, the Greek  $\sigma\eta\eta$  'a hole,' as *hueco*,  $\sigma\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$  as *huerfano*; the Dan. *ord*, *orm*, are with us *word* and *worm*, in which words an *o* is written but an *e* pronounced. I go one step further and would ask whether our *wom-an* may not be akin, in the first syllable, to the Greek  $\sigma\eta$ ; and here I have in view what will appear in the sequel, viz. that the Greek often has a  $\pi$  where kindred languages exhibit an *m*. At any rate I know of no other satisfactory origin for the word *wom-an*; and what I have said no way disconnects *wom-an* from the G. *weib*, for of course our *wife* and the G. *weib* are one. But the suffix *or* of *uxor* claims some notice. I believe this suffix, as that of *sor-or* also, to be substantially one with the *er* of *pater*, *mater*, *frater*, i.e. a diminutival suffix of affection, and the variation in the vowel to be due to the law of vowel-assimilation. It has been objected to this explanation of *uxor* that it would have applied equally had it signified 'a husband.' This is true, but the same may be said of *coniux*. In fact, as the Latin language had already a word signifying husband in *uir*, it was but natural that the term *uxor* should be limited to its existing sense. So much for terms of relationship.

Two other words, which at first sight appear to be isolated, are the Greek  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  and the Latin *omnis*, and I take them together because of their identity in meaning. To begin with the Greek noun, it is commonly assumed that  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$  is a compound of  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ , the first vowel representing somehow or other the particle  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha$ ; and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\omicron\nu\varsigma$  is quoted as a parallel case. But I have long entertained the conviction that a large number of forms in language are the result of decapitation, and this suggests the question whether  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  may not have been cut down from  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ . Nor am I here stopped by the fact, to which I give a ready assent, that in practice  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  is a more emphatic word than  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ; for I hold that, when there are two forms of the same word, the fuller word is naturally preferred if emphasis be desirable. It is in this way that, although I hold  $\lambda\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\lambda\iota\theta\alpha\varsigma$  to be in origin the

same word, the two old themes being *λιθοκ* and *λιθακ*, in which the difference of vowel marks only a difference of dialect, yet the form *λιθαξ*, having preserved its guttural, was naturally preferred in those cases where the diminutival suffix was to have a distinct meaning. So with us, 'even he' is more emphatic as regards the adverb than 'een he,' 'seven nights' than *sennight*.'

In evidence of the law of decapitation I might quote almost every Greek, Latin, and English word that begins with *l*, *n*, or *r*, and some that begin with an *m*. But to limit the field, and so show that I am not making an undue selection, I will take first some of the prepositions, and then a few of the more familiar adjectives, for the more familiar be the use of a word, the more probable is it that it has suffered some truncation. In the region then of prepositions I may point to *re* or rather *rec* (*reci-procus*, *recu-perare*), which has grown out of an older *er-ec*, and so is a derivative from *er*, which still survives in German with all the meanings of the Latin *re*. *Post* I have shown to be a corrupted form from a theoretic *op-os*, a comparative of *ob*, and thus one with our *after*, as *ob* is one with our *aft*, so that the word is also brought into connection with the Greek *οπισω*, *οπισθεν*, as also with the nouns *οπαδος* and *οπρων* 'attendant,' while the *t* of *post*, *aft* and *after*, and the *θ* of *οπισθεν*, are all excrescent consonants, growing out of that consonant which precedes them; and I draw attention to this the more that *ἀπαντες* and *παντες* also owe their *τ* to a similar influence, and hence the numerous compounds which dispense with the *τ*, as *παναθηναια*, *παναθλιος*, etc. Again, the Latin *per* and *παρ* of the Greek *παρά* (when not signifying presence) I hold to be corruptions from *super* and *ὑπερ*,—in other words, that they are in form decapitated comparatives of *sub* and of *ὑπ*. Similarly our prep. *to*, following Grimm's suggestion, I believe to have grown out of a fuller *ato*, so that the more primitive form is *at*. Our *neath*, O.Norse *nid*, Skr. *ni*, are in my view deduced from a form like the Greek *ενι*, of which *εν* alone is radical, corresponding to the Lat. *in*, with the meaning *down* as seen in the comp. *εν-εροι* ' (the gods) below,' and the superl. *imus* (i.e.

*inimus*) 'lowest.' The Russian *na* 'up' has lost a vowel, which is preserved in the Greek *av-a* 'up.' Lastly, the Latin *de* 'down' has its fuller form in *inde* 'down' (as in the phrase *inde ab initio*, and the adv. *sub-inde* 'ever and anon,' more strictly 'up and down,' like our 'off and on'), and so a derivative from *in* 'down.' So much for prepositions. For adjectives I take *little* standing for *elickle* (cf. for letter) change of *t* and *c* *brittle* for the old *brickle* from *break*, and for the initial vowel the Swed. *elak* 'wretched,' and the Gr. *ελαχς*). Our adj. *bad* is no doubt one with *mal* of *malus*; but *malus* must have come from a fuller *amalus*, as is shown by the old Prov., Cat., Span., and Port. *avol* 'bad,' and also by our Eng. equivalent *evil*, G. *übel*. Again, *bonus* is shown to have superseded an older *obonus*, first by its superlative *optumus*, which would be a natural contraction from a form *obotumus* for *obonumus*; and perhaps by the Ital. *ebbene*, the two words *obono-* and *ebbene*, standing to each other much as the Greek *οροφο-ς* to the vb. *ερεφ-ω*, and *οροβ-ος* to *ερεβ-ιθος*. Then *αγαθος* and *αμεινων*, as compared with the Germ. *gut*, E. *good*, and L. *melior*, have no doubt retained in the *a* what is part of the original root.

But in the assumed degradation of *ἀπαν* to *παν* there must have been an intermediate step when a non-asperated *απαν* existed. Let us next ask what form, under the laws of letterchange which holds between the Greek and Latin languages, such a word would take in the latter. Now it will be found on examination that a Greek *π* in the neighbourhood of *ν* is apt to pass into the nasalized labial, viz. *m*; nor is this to be wondered at. On physiological grounds such a change was to be expected. The passage from the larynx into the nasal chamber is under the control of the so-called *velum palati*, by which this passage is closed or left open at man's pleasure, though he is unconscious of the mode in which such pleasure is carried into action. During the utterance of the sounds *b d g, p t k* the *velum* is closed; but the moment it is opened, these sounds pass respectively into *m n ng*, by the last of which is meant what is heard in the *ng* of *ring*. When a person is suffering from a catarrh, the parts of the soft palate

are at times so swollen that it is no longer in the power of the muscles to open the passage, and accordingly, when one so suffering wishes to ask, say a sister Minny, to favour the company with some vocal music, his attempt to express the wish leads to something like, 'Cub, Biddie, sig us a sog.' One of our members, Dr. Weymouth, has drawn special attention to the important part which the *velum palati* plays in articulate speech, and he suggests a little experiment by which it may be readily seen whether speech is produced by a passage of the air through the nose or through the mouth. Let a person, says he, place a piece of dry glass horizontally between the nose and lips, then when the mutes are pronounced he will find that it is the lower surface which is covered with steam. On the other hand, it is the upper surface which is so covered in the utterance of the nasal *m n* and *ng*. Let me add, that in the case of that congenital defect of the palate, which has its outward mark in the hare-lip, the power of closing the nasal passage by the velum is lost, and the sufferer of necessity speaks through his nose and so is unable to articulate the mutes.

Applying this to the present case, it was no way strange that the opening of the velum, which is requisite for the production of the coming *n*, should be anticipated, and so change the *p* to an *m*. It is in this way that the noun ὕπνος takes in Latin the form *somnus*. Similarly the Greek δαπανη, I was about to say, is, save the feminine suffix, one with the Latin *damnum*. But here I find an estoppel, in a note given in a recent edition of Terence by one of our most esteemed members: The word "*damnum*," he says, has nothing at all to do with δαπανη, and the spelling *dampnum* has no claim to authenticity. This last assertion I cannot but consider to be too unqualified. At any rate Ritschl (proll. 103), speaking of this very word *dampnum*, among others, says that the appearance of this *p* is not due to the barbaric influence of a later age of the language; for he adds that the farther a MS. recedes from the barbaric period, the more frequent is the appearance of a *p* in such forms. Still it must at once be admitted, on the evidence of inscriptions, that in the oldest period *damnum* was habitually written without a *p*, this word



and derivatives from it occurring no less than sixteen times; and against such evidence it is idle to oppose the authority of the Manuscripts DEG of Merkel's *Fasti* (1, 60 and 367; 2, 520 and 833; 4, 321 and 708; 5, 311 and 314; 6, 189 and 446), though in themselves respectable witnesses, or that of the Manuscripts C and D of Plautus (Trin. 219, 314, 585; Bac. 67, 117, 1103; Pseud. 415, 440, 1132; Men. 133; Merc. 237, 784); or of Ritschl himself, who in the *Trinummus* gave a preference in his text to the forms with *p*, though in the later plays he rejected it. But, after all, this dispute has in fact no bearing on the present question, for the  $\pi$  of  $\delta\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\eta$  has its real representative in the *m* of *damnum* or *dampnum*, while the *p* is but an outgrowth from the *m*, precisely as in *sumpsi*, *sumptus*, two words for which Ritschl claims the *p* as essential, 'necessarium,' whatever that may mean. But to the identification of *damnum* with  $\delta\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\eta$  the same critic opposes a rival derivation: "*damnum*=*damenum*,  $\delta\dot{\iota}\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu$  (cf. *alumnus*, *Vertumnus*), 'what is paid as a fine,' hence 'loss.'" So too Ritschl (Opusc. 2, 709) treats with no little contempt all other derivations, that from  $\delta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$  included, as "*thörichte Träumereien und unmethodische Spielereien*." But I am strongly inclined to think that, if we are to deal at all in such hard words, his own etymology must fall under the category so defined by him. In the first place, the assumed  $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\dot{\iota}\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu$  could not mean 'a gift,' to express which a perfect participle is necessary; and here I find myself in agreement with the writer from whom my first quotation proceeds. I refer to a note on line 545 of the *Andria*: "*dabam* 'offered,' i.e. was ready (willing) to give her; impf. de conatu.  $\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu\nu$  in Greek frequently has the same meaning." Moreover, the two words quoted in support of the doctrine, viz. *alumnus* and *Vertumnus*, collapse on the first pressure, for here imperfect participles are justly employed, *alumnus* meaning 'one who is being reared,' and *Vertumnus* the God who is 'constantly changing his form.'

Secondly, the leap from a 'gift' to a 'fine or loss' is too broad for me to venture over. Ritschl refers to the German use of *gift* for 'poison;' but here we have still a gift, though of an

unpleasant nature. And such euphemisms are common in language. Our own term *poison*,<sup>1</sup> in an etymological point of view, is but a drink (*potio*); and when our police reports speak of a man being drugged in a public house, a common phrase is that something was 'given' him in his beer. But *damnum* is the reverse of a gift, something taken away. Ritschl supports his argument by what he deems parallel cases of nouns derived, he says, from participles, as *certamen*, *nomen*, *regimen*, etc., which he holds to represent theoretic participles *certaminus*, *nominus*, *regiminus*, and so on. But he seems here to have forgotten that the suffix—I should say the double suffix—*am-en*, *im-en*, has for its Greek equivalent *ομ-ατ* as *ου-ομ-ατ*-, of which *en* and *ατ* are found by themselves in *ungu-en-* and *τερ-ατ*-, *κερ-ατ*-. Under these circumstances I have no hesitation in adhering to the doctrine that *damnum* and *δαμνη* are of one stock; and the more so when I find that the Latin language sees no stranger in the root *dap*, having of the same family probably *dap-es* and certainly *dap-silis* and *dāpinare*, which I venture to write with a short vowel *i*, corresponding to the short *a* of *δαμνη*, in spite of the authority of Forcellini. The line which he quotes from the *Captivi* of Plautus (4, 2, 116), *Aeternúm tibi dāpínábo cibum si uera autumas*—has already in the first three words enough to establish the fact that *dupinabo*, like *δαμνη*, has the first two syllables short, but *cibum* has been with reason altered by Fleckeisen to *victum*.

The Latin *amnis* invites attention as having the same combination *mn*; and suggests a search for *am* in a corresponding Greek noun. The suggestion is further recommended by the Latin *aqua*, the *q* of which might well have an equivalent *π* in Greek. But if the search in this quarter be without result, we find what is sought in the Skr. *ap* 'water;' and the same law of letter-change which is good for Greek holds for Sanskrit, as shown in Skr. *lap* = *loqui*. Further, that the word *amnis* is a genuine member of the Indo-Euro-

<sup>1</sup> So *dose* (δωσις) has a similar use, as in 'Little Dorrit': "I'll give you such a dose."

pean family is confirmed by the equivalent form *Avon*, so familiar in the geography of our own island.

The Lat. *scamnum*, by the side of *scabellum*, exhibits a similar interchange of a labial nasal before *n* with a labial mute; and those who connect these words with the verb *scando* are probably right, if we may regard *scando* itself as standing for *scambo* (cf. *lumbi*, Germ. *lende*, γαμβρος, Fr. *gendre*), or rather *sclambo*, and so akin to our *climb* and Gk. κλιμαξ.

But in the Greek language also a mute labial is apt to give place to a liquid labial when a *ν* follows. Thus from the root ὕφ of ὕφαινω 'weave' are deduced ὕμην 'a membrane,' and ὕμνος, which no doubt had for its original meaning a textile fabric, before it attained its later secondary meaning; and indeed ὕφαινω itself was readily used in poetry for weaving of words; while the same metaphor, I am told, is in favour with Arabian poets. Similarly, from the vb. σεβομαι is deduced an adj. σεμ-νος, and by the side of ερεβ-ος we find ερεμ-νος. The noun αμνος 'a lamb' by its form naturally attracts my attention; and it bears a remarkable similarity to the Lat. *agnus* of like power. Now as *cygnus* was the form which the Romans adopted for the Gr. κυκνος, one might have expected a form ακνος in the latter language. But the swan and the lamb are inhabitants of the country, and so might well have a name of specially rustic form. It is in this way I would account for the anomaly that the Gr. λυκος and Latin *lupus* have inverted the law of letter-change which commonly subsists between the two languages, a Greek π usually corresponding to a Lat. *k*, as ἐπομαι and *sequor*. It seems therefore that the so-called Ionic dialect with its *k*'s had an especial connection with the country dialect around Athens; and in the same way the rustic language in the neighbourhood of Rome had some affinity with the Oscan. On this theory a form απνος might have been expected within the walls of Athens, had it not been for the influence of the liquid; and so perhaps arose the variety αμνος.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have to thank a gentleman who was present at the reading of the paper for the suggestion that the Swedish vocabulary would supply evidence of the same

So much for the first consonant of *απαν-* and *omni-*. I next take in hand the vowel or vowels ; and have to notice the Latin habit of having an *o* where allied tongues have an *a*. This change in the case of Greek and Latin words was the more to be expected, as the Æolic dialect already felt the tendency, changing the prep. *ava*, the adv. *ανω*, the noun *στρατος* to *ον*, *ονω*, *στροφος* ; and the Æolic dialect is precisely that dialect of the Greek tongue with which the Latin has the closest affinity. Accordingly *δαμα-ειν* appears in Latin as *doma-re*. It was upon this principle that I was long ago led to identify the Latin *om-itto* with the Greek *av-ιημι* ; not that I wish to tear *omitto* altogether from *mitto* and its compounds, for I hold *mit* of *mitto* to be substantially one with *it* of *iter* and *i* of *ire*, while on the other hand I would also connect the *ι* of *ειμι* 'I go' with the *ι* of *ιημι* 'I let go.' Again, the belief in this connection between *av-ιημι* and *omitto* confirmed me in the further belief of the identity of the root syllables of *av-ερ-* and *hom-on*, the more as both these nouns have a claim to an initial digamma, this letter belonging to *av-ηρ* on the authority of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and the Ital. *uomo* justifying a similar assertion in behalf of *homo* ; while the German also, according to Grimm, in one of its dialects once wrote *wan sagt*, where the ordinary phrase is *man sagt* ; and we again, imitating the habit, still pronounce a *w* in our *one says*.

Again, *θαρς* is one with the Lat. *fortis* ; *δακ*, the essential syllable of *διδασκω*, appears as *doc* in *doceo* ; *μαλ* of the Gk. *μαλακος* and *μαλασσω* appears to have signified 'beat,' and so 'by beating make soft,' but in the Latin words of this stock we find for the most part an *o*, as in *molere*, *mulcare*, i.e. *molicare* or *molucare*, *mordere*, *mola*, *mortarium*, and *mollis*, which Niebuhr unduly connects with *mobilis* and *moveo*.

Many years ago I ventured upon the bold doctrine, and

tendency of a labial mute to pass into an *m* before an *n*, as *hæven* is in Swed. *hamn*. Accordingly I find our adv. *even* appearing in that language as *jamn*, our verbs *to leave* and *to rise*, as *lenna* and *remna*, and with these I must include *somna* 'to sleep' by the side of *söfva* 'to put to sleep,' for this Swedish *somna* is no loan-word from the Latin. Let me further add from our own island the Latin *Damnonii* by the side of our *Devon*.

I still adhere to it, that as the Latin *bellum* 'war' superseded an older *duellum*, as we know historically, so this *duellum* had co-existed with an old *guellum* or *guerrum*, virtually one with the Ital. *guerra*, which, as a Tuscan word, has preserved the guttural, while the softer dialects of more Southern Italy had already in classical times preferred first a *d* and then a *b*. On similar grounds I held that *bonus* through *duonus* had originated in a theoretic *guonus*, and so was of the same stock with our *good*, the change of the *n* with *d* having its precise parallel in *food* by the side of the Latin *penus* and *penum* of like meaning, and *mood* (as used of the mind) by the side of *mens* and *μενος*. I have since satisfied myself that, as I have already stated, *bonus* is a decapitated word, standing for *obon-us*. I now identify this *obon-* with the Gk. *αγαθ-*, standing for *αγαυ*. If this be true, we have again a pair of *o*'s in Latin corresponding to a pair of *a*'s in Greek.

But the love of Latin for an *o* in place of an *a* is also well seen in a comparison of Latin words with those of the Teutonic family, for example in the German, as *collum hals*, *corilus hasel*, *folles balgen*, *hom-o mann*, *hostis gast*, *longus lang*, *nox nacht*, *molere mal-men*, *ob aft*, *oc* of *oculus*, and *ach* of *acht achten*, *odium hass*, *rogare fragen*, *rota rad*, *sop* of *sopor* and *schlaf*. On the whole then I conclude that a form *απav* not only might, but ought to have for its Latin analogue *omon*, or *omn*, as seen in *omnis*.

I have so far said nothing on the ultimate origin of the two words; and here I am bound not to neglect as hitherto the asperate of *ἀπav*, which no doubt represents an earlier *σ*, at least in some dialect, possibly a *κ* in another. On the other hand, I discard from view the syllable *av*, which can only be a suffix of secondary power like the *αλ* of *μεγαλη*, the *n* of *magnus*, the *ρ* of *μακρος*; all of which suffixes I hold to be substantially the same, with the meaning of diminution, although this meaning must soon have disappeared, when the simpler forms passed out of use. Looking then to the first syllable alone for the root, am I to give a preference to the *σav* of the Greek or to the *som* of the Latin, or to an

intermediate *sam*, which retains the vowel of the one, and the nasal labial of the other? I am disposed to award the preference to the last, *sam*, relying upon the feeling of those who would connect *άπας* with the Greek adv. *άμα*; but at the same holding that the *άπ* of the former is identical with the *άμ* of the latter. The Latin of course has the same root in *sim-plex* = *άπλους*, in *simul*, or, as Plautus wrote the word, *sem-ul* or *sem-ol*, in the adv. *sem-el*, in *semper*, in *sing-uli*, in *sin-cerus*, in *sim-itu*. Nor need we be surprised at the substitution of a weak vowel, *i* or *e*, in these words. In *sem-el* and *semper* the law of 'umlaut' affords a sufficient explanation; and indeed the *ul* of *simul* and *singuli* must have been preceded by a form *el*, as in *Siculi* from *Σικελοι*, *oculus* from *ocelus*, witness *ocellus*. Further the *a* reappears in the Fr. *sangler* from *singularis* (sc. *aper*). The connection of ideas between 'one' and a 'whole'<sup>1</sup> seems to me too evident to call for illustration, but we have it shown in the Latin *una* 'together,' in our own *union*; while the German *zusammen* 'together,' *sammeln* 'to collect,' exhibit the notion of a whole in words which proceed from the very root before us. So, too, the Latin adv. *semper*, with its meaning 'always.' The Greek adverb *άπαξ*,<sup>2</sup> Pott, it is said, derives from *ά* = *αμα* and *παγ* of *πηγνυμι*; but I cannot see how any one can fail to see that it is a compression of *άπ-ακ-ις*, which bears comparison with *δυ-ακ-ις*, *τρι-ακ-ις*, *πολλ-ακ-ις*, in which the *ις* is the same suffix that appears in *δις* (for *δυις*), *τρις*, the Lat. *bis* (for *duis*), our own *twice*, *thrice*, and with some corruption in *on-ce*. Nay, the Latin *semel* itself has probably superseded an older *semel-is*, much as *facul*, *vigil*, stand for *facilis*, *vigilis*, and *ter quater* for *ter-is quater-is*, for the liquids *r* and *l* seem to have a strange power of destroying a following sibilant. The *ακ* of *απ-ακ-ις*, *δυ-ακ-ις*, etc., I hold to be diminutival, just as I hold *el* of *semel* to have the same power. But this explanation of *άπ-αξ* again leaves *άπ* (= *sam*) for the root.

<sup>1</sup> The Latin *as* (*assis*) is habitually used with the notion of 'a whole,' heres *ex asse*; and yet it is the origin of the French *as* in *l'as de pique*, our *ace* of spades. Nay, this Latin noun *as* is but the analogue of the Greek *ονος*, the 'one' on dice, just as *as* of the sb. *as-inus* represents *ον* of the Greek *ονος* of like meaning. Thus the Latin *as* is identical with our numeral *one*.

<sup>2</sup> *Απλους* is probably for *άπ-πλους*.

But the Latin and Greek languages have each of them yet another adjective of like power, viz. *sōlus* and *ὅλος*, which, but for the difference of quantity in the vowel, one would at once be ready to identify. If really identical, we must give precedence to the Latin word, if only because the passage from long to short vowels is more in accordance with the habit of language than the converse. This adj. *solus* is another example of the close union between the ideas of 'one' and 'all.' In its ordinary sense of 'alone' it already unites the two ideas, for the very word by which we so translate it, like the Germ. *all-ein*, combines in itself the two English adjectives *all* and *one*. But the word carries with it more distinctly the notion of 'all and every' in the compounds *sollicitus* (or *solicitus*) 'all roused,' *sollers* 'of universal skill, *sollemnis* 'annual; and *sollus* itself is given by Festus as an equivalent in the Oscan dialect for the Latin *totus*. But the long vowel of *sōlus* claims an especial attention; and I first ask the Latin *sōl* 'sun' whether it can assist me. This word is of course of the same stock with the Greek *ἥλιος*; but lexicographers are satisfied with the vague remark that *sol*, *ἥλιος*, our *sun*, are but varieties of the Skr. *sūra*. The connection of all these words I admit, but I ask careful etymologists not to leave out of view the fuller forms—the Greek *ἡλιος* and the Gothic *sauil*, both of which must be more genuine than the contracted Skr. *sūra*; and seem to imply that the liquid, whether *l*, *n*, or *r*, is no part of the true root.

Thus instructed, I proceed to consider whether our adj. *sōlus* may not owe the length of its vowel to contraction; and when I call to mind that by the side of the Latin series *umesco*, *umor*, *umidus*, there stands a second series, *utesco*, *uvor*, *uvidus*, of all but the same meaning, the question naturally arises whether our root *sam* or *som* may not have given origin to an adj. *sātilus* or *sōvilus*, both of which would readily pass into *sōlus*. Of course in my theoretic *savilus* (a Greek would have written *σαφ-αλος*) all that follows the first three letters is of little value, and indeed corresponds in power to the *av* of *ἀπαν*, much as, to repeat the case, *αλ* of *μεγαλη* to *in* or '*n*' of *magnus*; and most probably the two suffixes were one, for

in diminutival words such interchange of *r*, *l*, and *n*, is common, as in G. *degen*, E. *dagger*; G. *stopfel*, E. *stopper*; G. *himmel*, E. *heaven*.

And this interchange of liquids in the suffix leads me to compare my theoretic *omoni*-, or rather *omonic*- (cf. *molliculus* by the side of *molli*-), with our English *every*, or, as old authors preferred to write, *everich*. Here the substitution of a *r* in place of *m* is what we have already seen to be a law between Latin and English, as *amnis* and *Avon*, *amalus* and *evil*. Again, the weak vowels of the English *every* also agree with what is seen in the comparison of the last pair just quoted.

Finally, let me place by the side of the Latin *sōlus* 'all' words whose connection with it needs little in confirmation, as the Welsh *holl* 'every one' (so Lat. *sal* 'salt' and *sen* of *senex* appear in Welsh as *hal* and *hen*), Eng. and G. *all*, Gk. *όλος*, which somewhat startles one by its short vowel, but such abbreviation was due probably to the busy life of Athens, where many words with a mere *o* have for their representatives in the other dialects forms with the diphthong *ou*; and indeed, in modern Greek, *ούλος*, written with a non-pronounced asperate, has outlived the Attic *όλος*. The Lat. *saltus* 'whole,' 'sound,' and the S. *sarwa* 'all,' have no doubt in their first syllable what is seen in *sol* of *solus*, but this must be the result of compression from a form like *savil*.

## V.—THE HISTORY OF THE "TH" IN ENGLISH.

By HENRY SWEET, Esq.

THE formation of the sound represented by *th* in English will be best understood from Mr. Bell's description in his "Visible Speech." "The 'front-mixed divided' consonant has its centre check at the *tip* of the tongue, and its apertures between the edges of the flattened point and the teeth or the upper gum;—the front of the tongue having considerable convexity within the arch of the palate." As I shall frequently have occasion to refer to the analogous lip-divided-