

# The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Greek and Latin Word Studies

Edwin W. Fay

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 1 / Issue 01 / April 1907, pp 13 - 30

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800004912, Published online: 11 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009838800004912](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800004912)

### How to cite this article:

Edwin W. Fay (1907). Greek and Latin Word Studies. The Classical Quarterly, 1, pp 13-30  
doi:10.1017/S0009838800004912

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

## GREEK AND LATIN WORD STUDIES.

### (I) LATIN *landica*, *culpa*; GREEK κόλπος.

CICERO, in his letters (*Fam.* 9, 22), writes the following sentence (§ 2): *memini in senatu disertum consularem ita eloqui: 'hanc culpam maiorem an illam dicam?' potuit obscenius? 'non' inquis; 'non enim ita sensit.'* Wherein does the coarseness lie? Critics (cf. Tyrrell in his edition of the letters) find in (*il*)*lam dicam* a word '*landicam*,' which they define by 'clitoris.' But possibly *culpam* is, whether by equivoque or by definition, the offending word (cf. Shuckburgh's translation, 3, p. 295, where, after characterizing the interpretation just mentioned as far-fetched, he suggests an equivoque between *culpam* and *culleus*).

With Shuckburgh's characterization of '*landica*' as far-fetched I am fain to agree, for reasons to be presently set forth; but here turn for a moment to the consideration of *landica* [which first occurs in literature in the *Priapea*, 78. 5, with a long penult, though Walde writes it *landīca*].<sup>1</sup> Its next absolutely unquestionable occurrence is in (the African?) Muscio's old (5-6 century A.D.) Latin version of the *Sorani Gynaecia* (edited by Rose in the Teubner Texts), where *landica* occurs twice (12a, p. 8; and xxv. p. 106), in the undoubted sense of 'clitoris.' But as early as the siege of Perusia we find the word, partly restored, to be sure, on a glans Perusina, with the following inscription: *fulmen PET[o] | [la]NDICAM | FVLVIAE* (see *Eph. Epig.* vi. p. 55).<sup>2</sup> This restoration may be adjudged certain, an answer from a soldier of Octavianus without the walls to the other ribald glans Perusina shot from within the walls against the Octavians, viz. *pet[e] | CVLVM | OCTAVIA* (see Willmann's *Exem. Inscr. Lat.* ii. p. 239; or Cagnat, *Épigr. Lat.*<sup>2</sup> p. 313).

Further, *landica* is also found in three glosses (Goetz, *Corpus*, iii. 351, 53; 453, 71; 475, 7, the first being in a list of coarse words), with the definition *ἔσχαράδιον*, corrected by Georges to *ἔσχαράδιον*.

Forcellini-Corradini cites, from an old edition (*Epist. Sorani ad Cleopatr.* inter op. Petronii edit. Antonid., p. 81), the first Muscio-Soranus passage noted above; but further adds: *aliis recentis Barbariae nomen videtur, . . . foculum, ferramentum nempe, cui tamquam crati . . . Sed poterat alicui etiam landie Gallorum et Italorum landra <cf. Du Cange Landra Italis meretrix> in mentem venire.*

<sup>1</sup> The passages in square brackets belong to a revision of the MS. made in the late autumn, whereas the first copy was sent in the spring.

<sup>2</sup> For this reference I am indebted to Professor Minton Warren.

Du Cange also treats the word, from whom I cite as follows: *Landica* ἔσχαράδιον Thuribulum in supplemento antiquarii. Exponerem canterius focarius. . . In Valesianis p. 93, laudatur Glossar. Gr. Lat., ubi ἔσχαρά γυναικεία . . . (Adde ex *Castigat. in utrumque Glossar. Leg. ἔσχαρά γυναικεία, Vulc<anius> alibi ἔσχαρά* exponitur craticula. . .)

A fair inference, in view of the facts of usage cited, seems to be that *landica* in the sense 'clitoris' was good classical Latin, but that in late times a word *landica* meaning 'craticula, thuribulum' (=gridiron, censor) had come into use.

For *landica* 'clitoris' I have the following suggestion to offer: it stands for \*(g)*landica* and is a diminutive to *glans* (stem *glandi-*): that is to say \*(g)*landica* (sc. *clitoridis*, whence by synecdoche *landica* = *clitoris*) is a diminutive to *glans* (sc. *penis*), after the pattern of a pair like *postis/postica*.<sup>1</sup> The loss of the *g-* may be ascribed to the dissimilative effect of the following syllable *-ca* (cf. *lacte* for \**glacte*), or be accounted dialectal: cf. Span. *lande* 'glans,' *landre* 'glandular swelling,'<sup>2</sup> a group in which most other Romance tongues retain the *g-* of *glans*. Some uncertainty remains, however, for *landica*, defined by 'pars celata,' may be regarded as a cognate of *λανθάνει* 'hides' (: Lat. *latet*); or if defined by something like German 'rute,' *landica* may belong with the following lemma of Du Cange: *london*, vox gallica, Fustis brevior et crassior qui canibus ad collum appenditur ne excurrant. [Possibly *lanista* 'fencing-master' is derived from the base *land-*, whence dialectally *lann-*, and *lan(n)lsta* by the 'law of mamilla.' The suffix is that of citharista, sicinnista, petaurista, danista. The Greek suffix *ιστης* would seem to have had a considerable productivity on Italian territory, as it still lives actively in English. Or *lanista* is an extension of *lanius* 'butcher' with suffix as indicated.]

The second interpretation by 'craticula' (gridiron) may be defended as follows: either by comparing ἔσχαρίον 'pan-of-coals, brazier' (or 'cradle for launching ships'); or by adducing Celtic \**lannā* or \**landā* (see Stokes, in Fick's *Woert.* ii. p. 239), the base of Ir. *lann* .i. gréidil no roistín, and of Old Cornish *lann*, glossed by 'sartago' (=roasting-pan).

But are we not, after all, to fix on *culpam* as the obscene word in the passage? How shall we define it? A little later, Vergil (*Aen.* 4, 19, 172),—and the locution is general enough,—makes Dido use *culpa* specifically of her unchastity, and her temptation thereto. But *culpa* 'unchastity' would seem hardly to satisfy the requirements of this passage, where, in order, *anus*, *penis*, *cunnius* (inferred from *cum nos*) immediately precede and *liberis dare operam*, Κόννος (i.e. *cunnius*), *bini* (i.e. βίνοι), and *mentula* immediately follow our sentence. Some meaning like *pudenda* (*muliebria*) seems to me natural for *culpa* here.

<sup>1</sup> For *ī* see Otto in *I.F.* 15. 35 sq.

<sup>2</sup> In view of this meaning, comparing the gloss glandiolae quae circa collum et in inguinibus nasci solent χοιράδες, it may be that we should correct the gloss from *landica* ἔσχαράδιον to (g)*landicis* χοιράσιν.

But, on the other hand, a scholiast to Aristophanes explained the plural of ἔσχαρά by τὰ χεῖλη τῶν γυναικείων αἰδοίων (see Liddell and Scott, *Lex. s.v.*, vi).

It is possible, but I think, in view of the fact that no gloss nor other like authority records such a sense, not probable, that *culpa* may have come by this meaning by legitimate metaphor from its primary meaning. In *Am. Jr. Phil.* 24, 73, I derived *culpa* from the same root as *sculpat* 'cuts, graves, scratches,' and defined it as 'scratch, blemish, fault.' I then supported the definition merely by Lat. *nota* 'cut, mark, blemish.' But there are plenty of other parallels available: Eng. *crack* and Germ. *gebrechen*; *macula* 'spot, blemish, fault': *macit* 'beats, hacks, cuts' (cf. *micat* 'brandishes, darts, flashes,' decomposite to *dimicat* 'fights'); Skr. *chidrām* (:√*chid-* 'scindit') (1) 'hole, slit; (2) defect, flaw, blemish; (3) weakness, foible.' Similarly we might define *culpa* by (1) 'hole, slit, gash (Cic. *Fam.* 9, 22?); (2) defect, flaw, blemish, fault (passim); (3) weakness, foible' (Vergil, *Aen.* 4, 19). If the etymological sense of 'hole, slit, gash' be taken as a point of departure we may justify the definition of *culpa* by 'cunnus' by noting the same development for Germ. *schlitz* (=slit), as defined in Grimm's *Woert.*, s.v., 5. Nearly the same metaphor occurs in bonun sensum when Mrs. Stowe uses gash for 'mouth' (see the *Oxford Dict.*, s.v.).<sup>1</sup>

But in a context where Cicero mentions several Latin words that were counted obscene because they echoed the obscene words of Greek one may wonder if here also the whole point is not made on the fact that *culpam*, particularly if pronounced in the older form *colpam*, suggested Gr. κόλπος in its sense of 'womb, uterus.'<sup>2</sup> In view of all its senses, we are certainly justified in defining κόλπος by 'hollow,' i.e. cut out, and grouping it with the cognates of **kelp-**<sup>3</sup> (see Uhlenbeck, *ai. Woert.* s.v. *kálpate*), among them *culpa*.

But κόλπος has also been connected with Goth. *hwilftri* 'coffin,' base **kwelp-** (see, e.g., Prellwitz, *Gr. Woert.* s.v.; and Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, § 21, 9, who queries the relation). This cognation is semantically possible, but not semantically compelling. It raises the phonetic question of the Greek (and Latin) treatment of proethnic **kw**, to the consideration of which I now address myself.

## (2) DO GREEK κ-, LATIN v- REPRESENT **kw**-?

Literature: Wiedemann, *I.F.*, 1, 255 sq. (dated 1891, published 1892); Joh. Schmidt, *K.Z.* 32, 405 sq. (dated 1891, published 1892); Hoffmann, *B.B.* 18, 287 (1892); Solmsen, *K.Z.* 33, 294 sq. (dated 1892, published 1895); Zupitza, *Die germanischen Gutturale*, Berlin, 1896 (not accessible to me).

Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, § 341, § 633; *Kurze V. Gr.* § 157, 3; § 158, 3; *Griech. Gr.*<sup>3</sup> § 21, 9; Stolz, *Lat. Gram.* § 46, *Anm.* 1; Sommer, *Lat. Gram.* p. 227.

Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 299; Hirt, *Griech. Gram.* § 199; § 221, *Anm.* 2; *B.B.* 24, 288; [*I.F.* 17, 388]; Thumb, *I.F.* 11, 24.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the equivoque in Thos. Heywood's *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*, ii. 2, *init.*: . . . whom should we meet just in the nick . . . :: Just in the nick, man! :: In the highway I meant, sir.

<sup>2</sup> Much more explicit is the following: τὸ δὲ γυναικίον αἰδοῖον καὶ κόλπος ἀνδρῶσται γυναικίος (Rose's *Soranus*, § 16, p. 181). In modern medical

terminology *colpo-* is very common in the sense of 'vaginal.'

<sup>3</sup> Semantically comparable are Germ. *scheide*, Lat. *vulva* (cf. *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 52, fn. 3); also Lat. *vāgina*, if it belongs with (F)ἄγνοι: 'breaks'; see also Skeat, *Concise Etym. Dict.* s.v. *Sheath*.

The question asked in my title is answered in the affirmative by nearly all the authorities cited. Lindsay exhibits some reserve, and so, possibly, does Stolz (?), but Hirt and Thumb feel difficulties on the side of physiological phonetics, in that **kw** and **k̄w** yield different products both in Latin and in Greek. They teach, therefore, that *v* is the Latin, and  $\pi\pi$  the Greek product of both, while  $\kappa$ -, in the words that follow, comes from a proethnic doublet *k/k̄w*. I feel with Hirt that  $\pi(\pi)$  is what we have the right to expect in Greek, and I have no doubt at all that as *qu* is the normal Latin product of **kw**,<sup>1</sup> so we should expect the same product from **kw**.

Everybody knows that the phonetic laws one propounds depend on the etymologies one accepts, and in the present condition of linguistic science we do not accept etymologies whose recognition entails the acceptance of conflicting phonetic laws. The law now under discussion depends ultimately, as Joh. Schmidt clearly recognized, on a single etymology. This I propose now to examine.

i. Gr. *καπνός*: Lat. *vapor*: Lith. *kvāpas*.

Wiedemann defines *kvāpas* by 'duft, geruch, atem, hauch' (: *kvēpti* 'duften, hauchen'); Stowasser defines Lat. *vapor* by 'dampf, dunst, brodem'; and Menge defines *καπνός* by 'rauch, dampf, dunst'; and the words seem admirably adapted, at first glance, to furnish material for phonetic deductions. On the other hand, the words have different suffixes, and their definitions comprise eight different words, of varying semantic histories, to which we may add, for a ninth, *καπνός* 'schmauch.' It may then be that we have three different words, with accidental rhyme in *-ap-*, not cognate, but possibly affinate, as I believe Lat. *capit* and *rapit* to be; cf. also the rhyming pair Skr. *k̄pmis* and Lat. *vermis*; Skr. *aṣru* 'tear': Gr. *δάκρυ*: Lat. *lacruma*, parallel to the verbs *aṣnāti* 'eats' (bites), *δάκνει* 'bites,' *lacerat* 'bites, tears': no matter if *lacruma* is for *dacruma* (but this form used by Livius Andronicus may be Greekish), yet the popular etymology is true to the original semantic concept (Petr. *B.B.* 25, 150, entirely separates *lacrima* and *dacruma*); Germ. *schmauch* and *rauch* also constitute a rhyming pair. Rhyming synonyms, in so far as they constitute an association group, must be esteemed, if not cognate, at least something that we may designate as affinate.

Assuming for the sake of argument that *kvāpas*, *καπνός*, and *vapor* are not cognate, I turn to the suggestion of other possible explanations for the Greek and Latin words.

The first example for *καπνός* cited by Liddell and Scott is from Pindar, *κνισάντι*<sup>2</sup> *καπνῶ*. As in the Latin phrase 'religione obstrictos' we may gather from 'obstrictos' a clue to the etymological sense of 'religione,' so *κνισάντι* may show us how to account for *καπνός*. We may render *κνισάντι καπνῶ* by 'nidoroso fumo,' *nidor* and *κνίσα* having the etymological sense of 'quod

<sup>1</sup> See below, No. 2, x, end.

<sup>2</sup> Christ reads *κνισέεντι*.

rodit' (see Prellwitz [and Walde] in their lexica, and Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup> § 15, 5). The metaphor is common: cf., e.g., recens extinctum lumen ubi acri | nidore offendit nares (Lucretius) and lacrimosus fumus (Horace).

With κνῖσα belongs κόνις 'dust': for the relation of meaning cf. Eng. *dust* 'κόνις': Germ. *dunst* 'κνῖσα, καπνός.' If accordingly we define καπνός as 'the stinging, irritating,' there are two bases—of ultimate identity—to which it may be referred, viz.: (1) **s)kap-/s)kabh-**, attested by Lith. *kapoti* 'hacken, hauen,' *skabius* 'sharp, acer': Gr. κάπετος 'pit, hole,' σκάπτει 'digs, cuts' (see Prellwitz, *l.c.*, *s.vv.*), Lith. *skapoti* 'shaves, slices,' Lat. *scapulae* ('shoulder-blades'); recall the neolithic use of the shoulder-blades for digging). Ultimately the root was **s)kěp-/s)kōp-**: cf. Gr. σκώπτει 'carpit,' κοπίς 'knife,' ἕσκέπαρνον 'axe': Skr. *cipitás* 'abgestumpft, platt' (?).

A second metaphor from which καπνός may have derived its meaning is exhibited in *Il.* 1,317, cited as the first example in Leo Meyer's *Griech. Etym.*:

κνῖση δ' οὐρανὸν ἴκεν ἐλισσομένη περὶ καπνῶ;

Curtius, 8, 7 has evolutus e tuguriis fumus, just as in modern metaphor smoke is that which 'eddies, curls, wreathes, makes rings': cf. καπνός ἀποθρόσκων (*Odyssey*). For this conception we may adduce Skr. *capalás* 'beweglich, schwankend, unstaet' (of the wind in native lexica), *cāpas* 'bow,' for which Uhlenbeck, *ai. Woert.*, *s.vv.*, writes a root **kěp-** 'sich kruemmen.' With this group we associate Lat. *capilli* 'hair,' recalling that Catullus (61, 79) names the flame (or the smoke ?) of the torch its hair. We must then assume for *capilli* a like semantic history to that of one of our English words for hair, viz., 'locks' (see Skeat, *Concise Etym. Dict.*, *s.v.*). The base *καμπ-* 'to bend,' cognate with **kěp-**, is of frequent use in Greek: cf. Prellwitz, *s.vv.* *κάμπη, καμπή*. Individually, I do not doubt that the base **kěp-** 'to bend, crook' derives from **s)kěp-** 'to cut,' by a metaphor easy to understand from 'cut, hollow, sloping, rolling': cf. the semantic note in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 378, and especially note Gr. *κουρά* 'capillus.'

Nor are the possibilities yet exhausted: Skr. *kṣár* 'night' is at least a possible cognate of Gr. *σκέπας* 'roof, cover' (cf. Prellwitz, *s.v.*), and from a base **s)kěp-** 'to cover' καπνός 'smoke' (i.e. a pall of smoke) might come, as well as *kṣár* 'night' (a pall of darkness: cf. *Aen.* 12, 592, caelum subtexere fumo). The base **s)kěp-** 'to cover' may again be but a special development from **s)kěp-** 'to cut' (see *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 185, 19). Thus in three ways, semantically plausible, we have seen how a phonetically justified καπνός may have a source not necessarily identical with Lith. *kvāpas*.

On the other hand, Homeric ἀπὸ . . . ἐκάπυσσεν (*Il.* 22, 467), with its German definition of 'aushauchte,' will be cited as semantic proof positive of the cognation καπνός: *kvāpas*. But here Lang, Leaf, and Myres render by 'gasped' (forth her spirit), which is a very different metaphor: German 'ausstossen' would be etymologically appropriate for this context. For the precise sense of *gasp*, I cite from

the *Oxford Dictionary*: 'The root *gap* (see *gape*, v.), whence Ger. Dial. *gapsen* "to gape for breath," belongs to a different vowel series, but the sense of "opening" is apparently common to both.' Also note that O. Norse *geip̄sa*, cognate with *gas̄p*, means 'to yawn.' It is reasonable then to define *καπύειν* by 'to gasp, gape, yawn,' and ascribe it to the base **s)kēp-** 'to split' (*καπύειν* denominative to \**κάπυς* 'a split, crack, a gape, yawn': cf. Hescychian *κάπυς· πνεῦμα*); *κάφος* (*Etym. Mag.*) 'breath,' if worthy of credence, would seem to vindicate the variation **skap-/skaph-**: cf. also Homeric *κεκαφήοτα θυμόν* 'having gasped out his spirit.' In this connection we may note Germ. *klaffen* 'to bark, yelp, gape, yawn, split open.' These definitions, in reversed order, 'to split, yawn,' etc., are found in Lat. *hiscit*, *hiat*: **ghē(y)-** (cf. Prellwitz, *l.c.*, *s.v.* *χάσκω*, but, for the definition, *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 203, 398). To this root, also, belongs Lat. *an-helare* 'to gasp,' with a true and not an 'inorganic' *h-*. In view of *hālare*, it may be well to derive from \**hāslare*: cf., with a different vocalism, Skr. *hāsati* 'laughs,' but also, of a flower, 'opens.' For further semantic illustration note Eng. *barks*, which may mean, in the last analysis, 'breaks' (see the *Century* and *Oxford Dictionaries*, *s.v.*).

If we are right in defining *καπύει* strictly by 'gasps,' then in Hescychian *κάπος· ψυχή, πνεῦμα* [*<ἄπος>καὶ ὁ φοίνικος φλοιός, ἐν ᾧ κέκρυπται ὁ καρπός. καὶ ἡ πρώτη ἔκφυσις. (τινὲς δὲ τὸ ἐλάχιστον. οὐκ εὖ—*these definitions 'bark, husk,' look in the direction of **s)kēp-** 'to cut'], *πνεῦμα* will admit of the interpretation 'gasp' (see L. and Sc., *s.v.*), while *ψυχή* may mean quasi *θυμός* (cf. Lat. *fumus*).

It is time to turn to Lat. *vapor* and search for its possible cognates. Its most immediate homonym, say, is (1) Avestan *vafra-* 'snow.' For the meaning cf. Germ. *duft* 'vapor': O.H.G. *tuft* 'frost': not without importance is (lexical) Sanskrit *vapras* \*'dust.' In Sanskrit there are two roots *vap-*, of which one means 'to shear,' but this sense I take to be specialized from an earlier sense of 'to pierce, split, cut.' Derivatives of this root are *vāpus* 'forma, corpus' (see *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 175), *vāpus* 'formosus, mirus'; *vapras* \*'dust, κόνις' (= fragments from cutting or breaking); *vāpī* 'trench (for water)'. In Avestan *vī-vap-* 'disicere: to destroy, lay waste,' we have a different specialization of meaning.<sup>1</sup> With this root we may join *vapor*, either specifically as suggested for *vapras*, or generally as 'the acrid, sharp' (? cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 5, 683, *lentosque carinus | est vapor*).<sup>2</sup> Further European cognates may be found in Gr. *ἡπίολος* 'a moth destructive of the honeycombs' (Lat. *vappo* moth; for the semantic problem cf. Kluge's *Woert. s.v. made*). Here also Lat. *vepris* 'briar, thorn' (?).

(2) But Skr. has a second *vāpati* 'strews, scatters, throws,' twice construed in *R. V.* with the object *mih-* 'mist'; its ptc. *uptās* means 'covered': cf. *abhi-vapati* 'covers' and *anu-vapate* 'zerstieben macht' (= causes to fly into dust). There is no difficulty in maintaining a direct connection between Lat. *vapor* 'mist' and the usage and definition of  $2\sqrt{vap-}$  as just cited: *vapor* is 'that which covers'; cf. Skr.

<sup>1</sup> I deprecate too great refinement of definition in words that have reached us after nobody knows how many centuries of unrecorded colloquial usage: for an instance in point we may take Fr. *couper* from

\**colopare* 'to box on the jaw,' but how generalized and then how specialized in definition.

<sup>2</sup> In Lucretius *vapor*=heat.

*vap̄ā* 'caul' (caul from Fr. *cale* 'a little cap'; but cf. *δέτρον* 'caul,' as explained in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 172, which allows of the connection of *vap̄ā* with  $1\sqrt{vap-}$ ).

(3) There is yet another homonymous group with which we may connect *vapor*: O.E. *wafian* 'to wave with the hand, to wonder at (cf. Skr. *vāpus* 'mirus'), to waver in mind,' with its adj. *wæfre* 'waving, restless': cf. O. Norse *vafra*, *vafra* 'to waver,' Bavarian *wabern* 'to sway to and fro,' O. Norse *vafa*. That *vapor* may belong to this group seems to me as clear as to Wharton in his *Etyma Latina*.<sup>1</sup> Here also Gr. *ῥπίαλος* 'shaking chill, ague': cf. *ῥπίολος* 'moth' (= flutterer?).

That sense No. 1 'to cut, strike' and sense No. 2 'to strew, cover' may be common to one and the same root is a point I have elsewhere tried to establish (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 185, 19; 189, 26). Sense No. 3 'to shake, vibrate' is also combinable with the others. I take the ultimate base for all three senses to have been ( $w\check{e}(y)$ - 'to split' > <splice,' extended as set down in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 194, 36; 202, 51; for the sense 'to vibrate' see *ib.* 378, 55. Further cf. Lat. *fumus* 'smoke' (: Skr. *dhūnōti* 'shakes'; see *ib.* 377, 53) with *vapor* 'mist' from a base meaning 'to shake.'

No cogent phonetic reason will hinder us from connecting *vāpulat*, with the curious passive meaning 'is beaten,' with *vapor*. True, the *a* of *vapor* represents *ə*; and if *vepris* properly belongs with it, the base is to be written  $w\check{e}p-$ ; but a secondarily lengthened  $\bar{a}$  (from  $\acute{a}$ ) not infrequently intrudes into an  $\bar{e}/\bar{o}$  series. Still the semantic correlation of *vapulat* and *vapor* is not easy. But in English we have a curious parallel metaphor in the verb 'to smoke,' which occurs in Shakespeare in the sense of 'to beat, thrash' (cf. *King John*, ii. 1, 139), and in the neuter sense 'to be beaten, punished' (*Tit. Andronicus*, iv. 2, 111). Nor does this metaphor arise, it would seem, from 'burning at the stake,' but rather from 'beating the dust out of an object.' So the verb 'to dust,' not only in Early English, but now, has the sense 'to thrash.'<sup>2</sup>

Three Plautine contexts gain in point when this sense is applied to their interpretation:

*Aul.* 3, 3, 9 (457) coctum ego, non uapulatum dudum conductus fui,  
'I was hired to boil, not to smoke.'

*Ps.* 1, 1, 15 (13) sub Veneris regno uapulo, non sub Iovis,  
'I smoke beneath Love's tyranny, not Jove's.'

*St.* 5, 5, 10 (751) uapulat peculium, actum est,  
'My money smokes (cf. dissipatur); 'tis gone.'

(The possible equivoque in *peculium* may be noted in passing.)

<sup>1</sup> [So also Danielson and Johannson as cited by Walde.]

<sup>2</sup> I cite the following authorities for the words: *Cent. Dict.*, s.v. smoke, 7. 'To suffer as from overwork or hard treatment; be punished. . . . 8. to emit dust, as when beaten; . . . trans. 6. to raise

dust from by beating; "dust"; *Oxford Dictionary*, s.v. dust, v. 1. '7 a) trans. to beat, thrash; b) intrans. to strike, beat' (citations for each use from 1612): 'cf. dust v. 2' <much earlier, of same sense, but of untraced origin>.



To recapitulate here : If *καπνός* means

(1) 'the sharp, biting, stinging' it may be cognate with

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Lith. <i>kapóti</i> 'hacken, hauen'    | <i>skabús</i> 'sharp'       |
| O.B. <i>kopati</i> 'digs, rows'        | <i>σκάπτει</i> 'digs, cuts' |
| Lat. <i>scapulae</i> 'shoulder-blades' | <i>κάπετος</i> 'pit, hole'; |

(2) 'the wreathing, curling' it may belong with

|  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Skr. <i>capalás</i> 'shifting, unsteady'; 'wind' (native lexica) |                                      |
| Skr. <i>cāpas</i> 'bow'  | Lat. <i>capilli</i> 'locks of hair'; |

(3) 'that which covers' it may belong with

|                          |                              |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Skr. <i>kṣáp</i> 'night' | <i>σκέπας</i> 'cover, roof.' |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|

The common root of all three groups may be written as **s)kěp- s)kěbh-**, with the normal vowel grades, and the definition 'to cut, slice.'

Following a similar arrangement for *vapor*, we have a table as follows :

|   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| (1) Skr. <i>vápati</i> 'shears'   | Av. <i>vī-vap-</i> 'disicere'        |
| Skr. <i>vapras*</i> 'dust'  | Av. <i>vafra-</i> 'snow'             |
| Lat. <i>vepris</i> 'briar'  | { <i>vap̄ro</i> 'moth'               |
|   | { <i>ἡπίολος</i>                     |
| (2) ('that which shakes, quivers'; cf. Skr. <i>dhūnóti</i> 'shakes': Lat. <i>fumus</i> ). |                                      |
| O.E. <i>wafian</i> 'to beckon, wonder at'   | wæfre 'waving, restless'             |
| Skr. <i>vápus</i> 'mirus'   | Bavar. 'wabern' 'to sway about'      |
| <i>ἡπίαλος</i> 'shaking chill, ague,' cf.   | { <i>ἡπίολος</i> 'moth' }            |
|   | { <i>vap̄ro</i> } (= the flutterer?) |
| (3) Skr. <i>vápati</i> 'strews, covers'   | <i>vap̄ā</i> 'caul.'                 |

The common base here is **wěp-**, and its derivatives admit of the same definitions for it as for **s)kěp-**.

If we thus find cognates for *καπνός* and *vapor*, what are we to do with Lith. *kvāpas*? Instead of writing a common base **kwəp-**, of which *kap-* and *vap* are, respectively, simplifications in which now *-f-* and now *k-* have been lost, I suggest that it is no less reasonable to divine in **kwəp-** a proethnic syncretic product of **s)kəp-** and **wəp**. This syncretic base is, I realize, no less (and no more) 'glottogonic' than Hirt's phonetics, whereby **kw-** and **k-** were varying initial groups; but it has this to commend it, viz.: that there was a something special to tempt to the syncretism, to wit, a synonymous base **k̄wes-**, attested by Skr. *çvāsiti* 'breathes, gasps, sighs.' What are we to say of the pair **k̄wes-** and **kwəp-**? They fall, in my opinion, into the group of 'determinative' phenomena of which a particularly transparent example is furnished by three bases for 'trembles,' viz.: **tres-** (in Skr. *trāsati*, Gr. *τρέει*), **trep-** (in Lat. *trepidus*, O.B. *trepētī*), **trem-** (in Lat. *tremīt*, Gr. *τρέμει*)—all cognate with Skr. *taralás* 'trembling' (cf. Brugmann, *Kurze V. Gr.* § 367). The variation between **k̄w-** and **kw** gives a special complexion to this case: is it that **kw** was palatalized in the syllable **k̄wes-**, but left a plain guttural in **kwəp-**, or conversely that **k̄w-** was depalatalized by the labial sequence

in **k̄wep-**? But still another base adds to the complications, to wit, the base **k̄wās-/kās-** of Germ. *husten* (see Kluge, *s.v.*): Skr. *kāsate* 'coughs,' cognate with English *whoezes* (O.E. *hwēsan*).

Instead of having a proethnic contamination before us, it may be that we should recognize only a Balto-Slavic one. The *k-* of *kvāpas*, alongside of Lat. *vapor*, may be 'inorganic,' due to some contamination starting from the base of which O.B. *kaditi* 'räuchern' may be taken as the representative.

ii. Lat. *invitus, invitare*.

The next group on which this phonetic law is based is O. Pruss. *quāits* 'voluntas,' Lith *kvė'czū* 'invito,' Gr. *κοῖται γυναικῶν ἐπιθυμῖαι* (cf. *κίσσα*, same sense, somewhat specialized, quasi 'whim'): Lat. *invitus* 'unwilling,' *invitat* 'invites,' Skr. *kétas* 'desire.' The cognations here asserted are most uncertain. If *invitus* means 'unwilling,' why not put it with Skr. *vēti* 'seeks' (ptc. *vītās*): Gr. *Flētai* (cf. Lat. *vis* 'thou wilt': Skr. *vēsi*, an etymology of considerable vogue)? But *invitus* may rather mean 'coactus' (cf. *libens quam coactus*, Tacitus, *Ann.* 14, 61, 6), or 'loth' (so Wharton, in his *Etyma Latina*). I believe *invitus* to be a compound, and to mean something like Germ. 'angebunden,' Eng. 'constrained,' while *invitat* means 'constrains, urges, presses, urgently invites' [as for example in Plautus, *Trin.* 27,

*invitus, ni id me invitet ut faciam fides*

'under constraint, unless honour constrained me so to do';

*Rud.* 590,

*si invitare nos paulisper pergeret*

*ibidem obdormissemus*

'had he gone on constraining us a little longer, there we'd have had our final sleep'].

In the glosses (see Goetz, ii. 424, 19) *invito* is defined by 'I urge on, impel.' As to Skr. *kétas*, it belongs, in my opinion, with the verb *cétati* 'observes, notes,' but also 'wishes, desires'; the notion of 'will' further appears in *cittām, cītis, cetas, cintā*. The vocalism is duplicated in Gr. *κοῖται, κίσσα* (of the cravings and longings of pregnant women); their meaning is also accordant with Lith. *kaitrā* 'fire-glow,' *kaitrūs* 'heating, heat-giving': Skr. *ketūs* 'light' (cf. also *cetūs* 'anxiety'), Goth. *heito* 'heat, fever' (note Eng. *heat* used specifically of the period of sexual desire of the female). On the semantic side the correlation of 'thought' (Skr. *cetas*) and 'will' (Skr. *kétas*) is attested by the pair Lat. *mens: μένος*. Beside the base **k̄ēy-t-** 'to think, purpose, desire' we have to note a root **k̄wēy-(s)-**, attested by Lat. *quaero, quaeso* (? from **k̄w̄ey-s-so**, or **k̄w̄ey-t-to**); cf. also *cura* from **k̄w̄ois-a**: Pael. *coisatens* 'curaverunt.' In O. Pruss. *quāits* 'voluntas' we seem to have to recognize a base **k̄wēy-t-** 'velle,' contaminated from the bases **k̄ēy-**, **k̄w̄ēy-s-** (? **k̄wēy-s-**), plus an infection from the synonymous base **wēy-** 'to seek, desire.'

iii. and iv. κάλπη 'trot'; κόλπος 'bosom, womb, bay, vale.'

Schmidt's Hesychius has the following entries κάλπη ἵππος βαδιστής, καὶ εἶδος δρόμου, καλπάζει ὄξυπόδης σακκάζει <ἀκρίζει?>, but also note σκαλαπάζει ῥέμβεται and σκαλαπάζειν ῥεμβωδῶς βαδίζειν [ὄξυποδεῖ Cyr., in Schmidt, *edit min.*, col. 802 fn.]. Here the σκ-forms agree in definition with O. Pruss. *po-quelbton* 'knieend' better than the κ-forms. But I find a simple and sufficient base for the Greek words in **s)kelp-** 'to cut,' whose synonym **s)kerp-** (cf. Uhlenbeck, *ai. Woert. s.v. khrānas*) exhibits in Lat. *carpit* (viam, iter) the sense of 'picks, pursues one's way.' Perhaps κάλπη means explicitly 'loose,' and as a form of race it actually seemed to involve the rider's dismounting; then its relation to **s)kelp-** 'to cut loose' is clear. For the development of the sense 'to run' from the sense 'to cut' I refer to *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 198.

The explanation of κόλπος from the same root **s)kelp-** has already been given above (No. 1, end).

v. Lat. *vannus*.

Fick's connection of *vannus* 'winnowing-fan,' *vannere* 'to winnow' with O.H.G. *hwennan* 'to winnow' has also been defended by the law that **kw-** yields Lat. *v*. Fick's first proposal, however, was to ascribe *vannus* to the root **wē-** 'to blow,' a connection most satisfactory on the semantic side, if we note that Lat. *ventilat* as well as Eng. *winnows* (cf. Skeat, *l.c., s.v.*) both mean explicitly 'to cleanse grain by getting it blown by the wind' (see also Uhlenbeck, *ai. Woert. s.v. vāti*). The precise base from which *vannus* comes cannot be definitely made out; we may think of **wə-snos**, or, as it is an agricultural word, of **wəp-nos**, which would yield, in a vulgar pronunciation, *vannus*. As to the *-p-*, note the causative *vāpdyati*, with which O.E. *wafian* and its kin (see above, p. 19) may be grouped. The first *n* in *vannus* may also be identical with the *n* of *ventus* 'wind.' On *vannus* see also Kluge, *s.v. Wanne*, and Uhlenbeck, *got. Woert. s.v. diswinthan*.

vi. Gr. κτήματα: πάματα.

[In *I.F.* 17, 388, which had escaped my notice in the preparation of this article, Hirt again maintains his objections to the current doctrine touching the Greek and Latin treatment of **kw-**. We may safely pass over his insistence on the equation κτήματα = πάματα, as he sets up a base **kpwē-**, which has no immediate bearing on the problem under discussion. For my own part, I believe these words to have no more necessary connection with one another than Lat. *captum* with *raptum*. None of the examples cited in the handbooks to prove that **kþ-** yielded Latin *s-* seems to me to carry conviction, and in view of ἄρκος and ἀρκίλος I cannot think that the equation ἄρκος = *ursus* 'bear' proves **-kþ-** for this group. It may well be that *-τος* and *-sus* are different suffixes. I am inclined provisionally to suggest that κτήματα 'possessions' belongs with Lat. *tenet* 'holds, possesses.']

vii. Latin *vitrum* 'glass.'

[Hirt apparently has a much stronger etymology in the equation *vitrum* 'glass': Skr. *çvitás* 'white,' 'was Pedersen, *K.Z.* 36, 306, eine durchaus tadellose Etymologie

nennt.' But I fancy that any explanation of *vitrum* 'glass' that does not also account for *vitrum* 'woad' will in the long run fail to satisfy. That these words are identical seems to me as certain as to Schrader (*Reallexikon*, s.v. Waid) and Stowasser (*Latin Lexicon*). I think chiefly of the dull ordinary bluish glass I have seen at Pompeii, but we may also think of the splendid blue of the Portland and Naples vases. Though the name of the woad seems better established than almost any other plant name in the European languages, a blue glass-like mineral may have been the first source of a body-paint, subsequently replaced by the woad plant, which took the name. The Greek name for woad, *ἰσάρις*, has a suffix found in names of minerals, e.g. Graeco-Latin *aspisatis*, *limoniatis*, *hydatis*, as well as in names of plants, e.g. *batis*, *clybatis*, *bucconiatis*, *clematis*. In early German the plant is named *waisda*, Gothic *wizdila* (see Schrader, *l.c.*). For the Greek and Germanic names a base **widh-/wě(y)-dh-** suggests itself, for the Latin **wi-d-**. This brings us to the definition 'splitting,' and to the base of Latin 'di-vidit.' The woad plant is described as many branching, 'quod se dividit.' If a mineral is to be sought, one would think of azurite in some of its low grades, the source of the paint known as mountain blue, and a material used by the Egyptians in making glass (cf. Blümner, *Technologie*, 4, 502). The mineral, whether by its fractures, or as ground up for paint, also lends itself to the definition 'quod dividitur.' These are vague definitions, but no more so than when we explain *δρῦς* 'arbor' as 'quod finditur' or the vine *κληματίς* as 'quod frangitur' (cf. Skeat, *l.c.*, s.v. *clematis*), though here our definition is helped by the intermediate stage, *κληματίς* 'brush-wood.' Also note the Sanskrit plant names *vidāris* 'Hedysarum' (named for its splitting pods?), and *vidālas* 'Bauhinia variegata' (used in dyeing and tanning). Gothic *wizdila* even looks like a compound, \**widh-tela* 'dividens-ramos' (? - *tela* ultimately: Lat. *talea* 'shoot, cutting') or 'dividens-acies' (? ultimately: Skr. *talam* 'surface'), a not unfit designation of a crystalline mineral. All of this we may dismiss as speculation, but we are still left with the unquestionable esidium *vitrum* '(blue) glass' = *vitrum* '(blue) woad,' with primitive **w-**.]

#### viii. Latin *canis*.

[Instead of deriving *canis* from *k̂w-nis* with Hirt, I think we must rather set up a paradigm \**cu(v)ō*, gen. \**cunīs*, shifted to *canis* under the influence of *catulus* 'young animal, puppy' (see Walde, s.v.), and perhaps influenced by *canit* quasi 'yelps,' with meaning, as in *κλάζει* 'shrieks' (of birds), 'barks' (of dogs), 'twangs' (of arrows), 'shouts, sings' (of men).]

#### ix. Latin *cāseus*.

The equation of *caseus* 'cheese' with O.B. *kvasū* 'fermentum' may be correct, but no valid inference, I think, can be drawn from it for the treatment of **kw-**. It does not demand discussion at this time when I am seeking to establish two negative conclusions, (1) that there is no good evidence to prove that **kw-** yields Greek *κ*, Lat. *v-*; (2) and no good evidence for **k̂w-** yielding Lat. *v-*; but I suspect that Plautine *casat* = *quassat* gives us a right to regard *cāseus* as dialectic for

\**quaseus*. I have small doubt that *cāseus* (older form *cāseum*, neuter) is derived from \**lac quassum*, with suffix like the suffix of *cereus* or *farreus*. A semantic parallel in Skr. *ghanás* 'compact,' *ghanīkaroti* 'curdles.' In Germany the cheesemaker calls his curds at a certain stage "Bruch." Also note Greek γάλα σχιστόν 'curds.' Or was cheese *cibus q(u)aseus* 'the crumbling food'; or 'the rotten food' (cf. the gloss *quassum σαθρόν*)?

I do not minimize the difficulty of *-ās-* for *-āss-*, but \**quāsus* is not more perplexing than *cāsus* 'fallen,' not adequately explained by the assumption found in Sommer's *Gram.* p. 642; or if explained, just as *strūctus* is modelled on *frūctus*, so *quā(s)sus* 'shaken' may have been affected by *cāsus* 'fallen,' for a time at least.]

x. Latin *ut, ubi, uter*.

[I do not feel, as many scholars seem to have felt, constrained to derive this group from the interrogative-relative stem *k<sup>w</sup>u-*, and I entirely reject the position that the Latin product of *k<sup>w</sup>u-* was *u-*, as phonetic laws deduced from one example are rarely convincing. Long ago I brought *ut* into correlation with Skr. *utá* 'itaque' (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 15, 417 fn. 2), of demonstrative origin (see Brugmann, *Denom.* p. 100). Greek *ὄς*, plainly of denominative origin, has developed almost every sense of *ut*, save the full interrogative usage. The derivation of a relative from a demonstrative is also attested by German *der*. From the self-same demonstrative stem, it may be assumed, comes *ubi*, a very convenient match, with its initial vowel, for its correlative *ibi*; from the same stem also *u-ter* (see Brugmann, *l.c.* 107).

In the rivalry between the demonstrative-relatives *ut* and *ubi* and the interrogative-relatives \**k<sup>w</sup>ut-s* (cf. Osc. *pous, puz* 'ut') and \**k<sup>w</sup>ubei* (cf. Umbr. *pufe*) 'ubi' the forms without *qu-* 'prevailed.' That false divisions like *nec-ubi* and *alic-ubi* lent a helping hand to this result is also not improbable.

The phonetic laws which I hold for *k<sup>w</sup>-* and *kw-* result from the following etymologies:

(1) *k<sup>w</sup>* is exhibited by Skr. *çvasiti*: Lat. *queritur*.

(2) *kw* is exhibited by O. Pruss. *quāits* 'voluntas,' Lat. *quaerit* 'vult,' Gr.-παραματα 'quaesita' (cf. Collitz, *B.B.* 18, 213).

I find the base of *queritur* also in English *whines*, *k<sup>w</sup>ě(y)*<sup>-1</sup>, with a parallel *k<sup>w</sup>es-*, and a variant *k<sup>w</sup>ōy-s* in Pael. *coisatens* 'curans.']

(3) *negumate*.

Some seven or eight years ago I completed a MS. reviewing the evidence for Lat. *av* from *ow*, a small part of which was published in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 20, 90 sq. (1899), in a review of Horton-Smith's essay on The Law of Thurneysen and Havet. I dealt further with the subject in *Studies in Honour of B. L.*

<sup>2</sup> A highly interesting form is Lat. *quirītat* doublet, with reduced vocalism, of *quaesitus*) closer 'whines,' closer in meaning to *queritur*, but in voice, to *quaerit*.  
vocalism, and formation (\**quirītus* being a rhotacised

*Gildersleeve*, 189–203. An unpublished portion of the earlier MS. seems to me now worth imparting in its original form, as follows:

'In the course of his essay Mr. Horton-Smith allows himself to accept the current explanations of Lat. *autumat* 'affirms' and Gr. *ὀίεται* 'deems' as denominatives to *owi-s* 'bird.' On the semantic side I have all the scepticism of Kretschmer (*K.Z.* 31, 455), with whom I do not agree when he derives *ὀίεται* and Lat. *ōmen*, *osmen* from \**ōvi-s*. I see no reason why Varro's derivation of *omen* from *os* 'mouth' is not correct. As for *ὀίεται* 'deems,' *ὀίω* 'I ween,' why not explain them as intensives to Skr. *véti*, defined by Boehtlingk by 'verlangend aufsucht, herbeikommt—appetit, gern annimmt'? In Lat. *opinor* (from \**opvinor*) 'I ween' we have the precise semantic counterpart of *ὀίω*. In general it is to be noted that English *weens* is a cognate of *wins*, and there is no reason why *ὀίω* may not be cognate with Skr. *véti* 'seeks to win.' In formation \**ἴοιεται* is rather like *ἄισσει* from \**ἴαιθυει*, though *ἴοι-* seems to have given *ὀ-* as against the *ἄικ* of the other word. On the *o*-colour of the reduplicating diphthong, I refer to what I have said above on *κωκίει*.<sup>1</sup>

'The only *R.V.* example of *vevīyate*, referred by Boehtlingk to a fifth root *vī-*, is found in *vér na vevīyate matīh* 'birdlike flutters my heart' (10, 33, 2d); while *ānevīran* (in *T.S.*) means 'trepidant.' It is curious how the *R.V.* passage is echoed, as it were, in the *θυμὸς ὀίστατο* 'cor trepidat' (*ὀίστατο κατὰ θυμόν*) of the *Odyssey*. The signification of *vevīyate*, *ὀίεται* lets them be connected with the root *wē-* 'blows, pants,' to which *wī-* (cf. Homeric *ἄiei*, *ἄισθει* 'gasps, breathes') would be a possible by-form, the root being *wē(y)-* or, dissyllabic, *awē(y)-*.

'The comparison of *autumat* with *ὀίεται* seems to me very far from probability: *auceps* I understand, and *augurium*, if made a compound of *avi-s* 'bird,' plus a cognate of *garrit* 'chatters,' whence *augur* on the pattern of *aucupium*: *auceps*, *auspicium*: *auspex*. But *autumat* is more difficult. That it gets its suffix from *aestimat* 'rates' is perfectly possible, but where does *aestimat* get its suffix? I suggest from \**aes-tomos* 'money-inspector,' \**tomos* being cognate with Gr. *τέμνει* 'cuts' and *ταμίας* 'steward.' But \**autumus* 'bird-inspector' is not so plausible as \**aestumus* 'treasurer.' I suggest therefore that *autumat* is simply a denominative to *autem* in its early affirmative sense of 'well, well now.' In O.H.G. the verb *avaron* 'to repeat' is similarly allied to *abur*, *avar* 'but, again' (so Kluge, *Woert.*). In Sanskrit *katháyati* 'relates, tells' we have the same type of denominative formation (: *kathám* how?); cf. Lat. *iterat* 'repeats': *iterum* 'again.' Has any one noted that *negumate* in Marcius Vates (before the end of the second Punic war) owes its *-umat* to its antonym *autumat*? As for *negat*, it seems to be a denominative to Lat. *neg-* (from \**nege*: Skr. *nahí*=*ego*: Skr. *ahám*).'

<sup>1</sup> 'The *o*-colour of this reduplication in Greek is to be seen in *πορ-φύρει*, *ποιφύσσει*, *ποιπίει*, *ποππύζει*, *δαίδυξ*, *γογγύζει*, *κόκκυ*, *κοικύλλει*, *κωκίει*, *μορμύρει*.'

Since the above was written some one else (Stowasser, to the best of my recollection) has printed the same explanation for *autumo*, and I lay no claim to priority. I was convinced afresh of its truth during the last term, when I chanced, after a long interval, to be reading Terence again with a class. Any Latinist might, by turning to the examples given in Lewis and Short, s.v. *autem*, ii. B. 7, convince himself, I should think, how nearly *autem* approaches a verb of saying.<sup>1</sup>

I no longer think we can pin our faith to any etymology in which Lat. *op-* is the reduction of *obv-*, for reasons set forth in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 25, 180: and accordingly withdraw the derivation of *opinor* from *\*opinor*. Instead, I think we are to proceed from *\*ob-pīnor*: *\*pīnor* is from the base **pēy-/pōw** 'caedere' and is cognate with *puto* on the one hand and with *πινυτός* 'clever' on the other (cf. *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 188). The last word on *πινυτός* makes it a compound of *\*πι-+\*νυτος* (see Brugmann in *I.F.* 19, 213). Also in my opinion it is a compound, of the tautological sort, *πι-* and *-νυ-* each being reductions of bases meaning 'to pierce, penetrate,' with the development of meaning so transparent in *κρίνει*. Note the affixed nasal flexion of *πινυτός* and *opinor*.

A word in passing on the development of the deverbatives and prepositions: take for example Lat. *dēcidit* 'cuts off'; it contains, I suggest, two bases, viz., **dēy-/dō(w)-** (see *Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 178, fn.) 'to cut' and the base of *caedere*. As a preposition, e.g., in *undeviginti*, *dē* may be conceived as a suffixless imperative, and *undeviginti* interpreted as 'twenty, cut (off) one.'<sup>2</sup>

#### (4) LAT. *secespita*.

i. Paulus-Festus, p. 500 (de Ponor), *Secespitam alii securim, alii dolabram, alii cultellum esse putant*.

In favour of the definition by 'cultellum' I would cite the only literary use of the word known to me: *inter pontifices sacrificanti simul pro secespita plumbeum cultrum subiciendum curavit* (Suetonius, *Tiberius* 25).

The illustrations of the *secespita* in the dictionaries are now dagger-like (see e.g. Rich or Harper), and now, if we may judge by the object taken for a *secespita*-case, more like a cleaver with rounded end (see Guhl and Koner, p. 121). In

<sup>1</sup> It is of great interest at this point to read § 1678 of Lane's *Latin Grammar*: *autem* is often used in questions, as *metuo credere*: *credere autem?* Pl. Ps. 304, I am afraid to trust: *trust do you say?*

<sup>2</sup> The article on *negumate* stands as it was written in the spring of 1906. It was already in the hands of the editor before Walde's *Etymological Lexicon* was forwarded to me by my Leipzig bookdealer. I now see that the explanation of *negumate* has been anticipated by Stolz, and the derivation of *opinor* from *\*opinor*—which I no longer hold—was suggested by Meillet in *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 9, 55 sq., prior to the time (1899) I wrote the review quoted

above. It proves to be Zimmermann and not Stowasser who has anticipated me in the publication only of the derivation of *autumo* from *autem*: *suum cuique; qui primus palam dederit palmam habeto; but the coincidences have their interest, and if Walde, s.v. pingo, speaking of the two lines of meaning exhibited by that group, writes 'wahrscheinlicher sind beide Bedeutungsentwicklungen nach Hirt (brieflich) auf der Anwendung der Wz. zur Bezeichnung des Tätowierens begründet,' he might have quoted from me (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 21, 198) 'pingit . . with a formal meaning of "paints," developed from a vernacular "pricks, tattoos."']*

Smith's *Dictionary* a hatchet-like object on a coin of the Sulpician gens is called a *secespita*, but, in its later abridgement by Cornish, *secespita* is the name given to a knife (cultrum), while the hatchet-like object is called a securis. In his *Religion der Roemer* Aust renders *secespita* now by 'opfermesser' (p. 184), and now by 'beil' (p. 210).

ii. Festus and Paulus, pp. 522-523: *Secespita cultrum ferreum, oblongum, manubrio eburneo, solido, vincto ad capulum argento auroque fixum, clavis aeneis, aere Cyprio.* This passage, if I mistake not the meaning of oblongum, seems to make for an implement of the shape pictured by Guhl and Koner.

iii. Paulus-Festus, *l.c.*: *secivum libum est, quod secespita secatur.* The use of *secespita* in this passage has not been heretofore taken account of in the study of the meaning, I believe. The sacrificial cakes called liba were, it is presumed, flat and round. Did they get their shape from being trimmed with a *secespita*, or were slices (*seciva*) of the entire libum cut with the *secespita*? The fragmentary lemma does not tell us. The passage is important, however, as it adds a limitation to the usual statement that the *secespita* was employed in cutting open a larger victim.

iv. Pott (*Etym. Forsch.* 3, 326) found the suffix of *secespita* as great a riddle as the suffix of *hospita*, *sospes*, *caespes*. But *hospita* is now cleared up, doubtless to everybody's satisfaction, and I have myself suggested (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 26, 184) that *-spet-* in *sospes*, *caespes* is rather the last member of a compound than a true suffix, and meant something like 'pluckt, pulled off: a twig.' Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.*) hazards no individual opinion as to *secespita*.

v. I venture the following suggestion: *secespita* is a feminine derivative of an adj. \**sece-caespes* 'cutting-turf,—shoots' (cf. Paulus-Festus, p. 31, *caespes* . . . *frutex recisus et truncus*). I am, however, unable to find any mention that the *secespita* was ever used for the cutting of turf or twigs; but a heavy knife of the shape pictured by Guhl and Koner would be ideally adapted to cutting shrubs and shoots, and as a turf-cutter much more suitable than the dagger type. The primitive (as well as subsequent rustic) use of turf for altars would account for the priests having to employ a *secespita* in the first instance, and a substitute knife, whether of the same or a different general shape, and otherwise employed, might well take over the old name.

vi. More minutely as to form: \**sece-cespita* would be a Latin instance of the type of compound with impv. 1st member (cf. Delbrueck, *Grundriss*, 5, § 70), of which I have found other Latin examples in *cle-mens* and *vehe-mens* (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 24, 71). The reduction to *secespita* was either by haplology (*sé[ce]cspita*), or resulted from a chain of development as follows: \**sécecespita* > \**séccespita* > \**se(c)céspita* > *secéspita*.

vii. In *secespita* we must assume dialectic *æ* for *ae*, as in the Spoletium



inscription, also of sacral character, where we find *cedere* for *caedere* (Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 35, 627).

viii. *cespitat* 'cadiť, offendiť': This late Latin word (cf. Du Cange, *s.v.*) seems to have meant 'stumbles, falls on the turf'; quasi 'turfs.' For the sense cf. Eng. *grounds* (trans. and intrans.) = 'runs on the ground.'

(5) LAT. *hostire*, *hostia*.

Schrader in his *Realexikon*, p. 270, challenges Leist's induction that the correlation of Lat. *hostis* 'stranger' and Germ. *gast* 'guest' proves a primitive institution of guest-friendship; and he asserts that in the Latin word *hostis* friendly feeling for the stranger was never connoted. He argues that *hospes* (out of \**hosti-pets* 'stranger-protector') was secondarily formed to connote the friendly feeling for an enemy; so ξένος 'guest-or-host' is subsequent to ξένος 'enemy,' in spite of the fact that, in its literary emergence, ξένος 'enemy' is long subsequent to ξένος 'guest-or-host.'

The further deduction is made that the primitive Indo-Europeans were only hostile-minded to strangers.

As to the last point, if the etymological correlation of ξένος and *hostis* were as certain<sup>1</sup> as is their identity of meaning and ritual significance, I should feel a disposition to reject Schrader's conclusion on the sole basis of those words. The testimony of the Romans themselves seems to me to controvert the view that *hostis* 'enemy' was prior to *hostis* 'guest' (in *hospes* 'guest-lord,' has the compound, as not infrequently, an earlier sense than the simplex?); cf. Varro, *L.L.* 5, 3: multa verba aliud nunc ostendunt aliud ante significabant, ut *hostis*; nam tum eo verbo dicebant peregrinum *qui suis legibus uteretur*, nunc dicunt eum quem tum dicebant perduellem (cf. also Cicero, *Off.* 1, 12, 37, Paulus-Festus, p. 73, 370). Further, as *hospes* 'ξένο-δόκος,' the friendly significance of which is self-evident, subsequently acquired the senses of (2) 'guest' and (3) 'stranger,' why not reckon with the possibility that *hostis* meant (1) \*'guest-or-host-,'<sup>2</sup> (2) 'stranger,' (3) 'enemy,'—(2) and (3) being, by the Roman testimony cited, actual definitions in their historic order of usage.

The verb *hostit*, *redhostit* 'requisites,' which Festus (*ll. c.*) defines by 'aequat,' seems to me to furnish the clearest sort of attestation for (1) 'guest-or-host.' The guest-gift was an exchange of objects of equal worth (cf. R. M. Meyer, cited in Schrader, *op. cit.* p. 272), and *hostire* means in our modern phrase 'to give one as

<sup>1</sup> [I shall shortly publish in *Modern Language Notes* an explanation of the phonetic relations of *hostis* and ξένος. Not until this occurred to me did I think that the equation of ξ- with h-s in these words was any proof of their identity, but if we start with a preposition-adverb *eghos* 'extra' (Brugmann writes *eghs*, *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup> § 79, 5, but the *gh* seems due to the now discarded belief that O. B. *izi* belonged here), then *hostis* is from \*(e)ghos-stis 'extra-stans'

(on the suffix *-stis* see *Class. Rev.* xx, 255, 6) and ξένος from \*(e)gh(o)s-*enwos* 'extra-inhabitans' (*-enwos* from *en* 'in' + *wos*: the root *wes* 'to dwell'). This explanation requires some readjustment of the following numerical arrangement of the senses of *hostis*.]

<sup>2</sup> Servius in his note on *Aen.* 4, 424, states, and I doubt not correctly, that *hostis* was by some interpreted as 'guest' (= 'hospes').

good as he sends.' Note the following interesting context in Plautus (*Asin.* 371 sq.):

pugno malam si tibi percussero, . . . caueto ne succenseas. . . : patitor tu item, quom ego te referiam, . . . quin promitto, inquam, hostire contra ut merueris.

Here *hostire* means 'to give you blow for blow,' if we interpret, as we ought, in the light of vs. 172:

par pari datum hostimentumst, opera pro pecunia.

A further instance in the Hectoris Lutris of Ennius (Ribbeck, *Scaen. Rom. Poes.*<sup>3</sup> I, 39, 149):

quae (sc. convicia) mea comminus machaera atque hasta hostibit manu.

It was from contexts like these that the definition of *hostire* by 'ferire' was derived: cf. Festus (p. 73) *hostia dicta est ab eo, quod est hostire ferire.*

It remains to draw the corollary that *hostia* was originally the animal sacrificed at the reception of a stranger-guest (Latinè, *cena hospitalis, adventicia*): cf. for the custom *Il.* 6, 174, ἐννήμαρ ξέλνισσε καὶ ἐννέα βοῦς ἰέρευσεν.

In the Vedic ritual, also, the killing of a cow (often only a ceremonial killing) was of the utmost importance in the ceremony of the reception of a guest (cf. the references in the index to Oldenberg's translation of the *Gṛhya-Sūtras*, Sacred Books of the East, 30, 306). The usage of ξέλνισσε in this passage and its easy correlation (ritual and semantic) with *hostire* as explained above, as well as the sense given to *hostia*, seem to me to prove that the institution of guest-friendship may well antedate the separate establishment of the Greek and Roman civilizations.

[Because of *hostus*, which he defines by 'Niessnutzen, . . . Ertrag,' Walde defines *hostire* as 'vergelten . . . also eintragen,' and refers it to the root *ghas* 'to eat.'

That the meaning is 'yield' is clear, for Varro explains (*R.R.* I, 24, 3), *hostum* vocant quod ex uno facto olei reficitur: factum dicunt quod uno tempore conficiunt, which points to 'pressum, quod premitur' rather than to 'Niessnutzen,' if I divine what that means. Why Walde, of all scholars, should want to define *hostus* by what amounts to 'quod editur' I cannot see, for he has contributed no little material from which to extract a base **ghē(y)-s** 'ferire,' though he stops short of firmly drawing the ultimate inference from his material (see *K.Z.* 34, 488 sq.). No, *hostus* is 'quod feritur,' unless with them of old time it is 'quod hauritur,' and if 'quod feritur' seems vague it is very easy to note Eng. *strike* 'the yield of a single drawing off from a sugar kettle' (see *Cent. Dict.*, s.v. *strike*, n. 9); and if this oversea example is not persuasive enough, Swiss *ankenschlag, schmalzschlag* 'so viel butter als man auf einmal macht' (Grimm's *Woert.*, s.v. *schlag*, v, 9 b) ought to be. That beside **ghē(y)-s** a doublet **ghō(w)-s** is to be recognized seems to me clear (cf. Thurneysen's definition of *hauritur* in *K.Z.* 28, 158), and *hostus* may

well be rustic for *haustus*. Here belongs *dehōrit* 'skims off,' as well as *hostorium* 'strickle, strike.'<sup>1</sup>

If *hostorium* 'strickle' were earlier of record I should be more inclined to accept the glossic definition of *hostire* by 'aequare,' but at any rate it seems that *hostit* 'ferit, aequat,' whether as suggested above from *hostis* 'guest-friend,' or from some lost word meaning 'strickle,' or the like, is a denominative of secondary development in Latin. Like *hostit* 'aequat' we may explain *dehorit* 'skims off' as implying the use of a strickle.

The assumption of a base *ǵhě(y)-s-* 'ferire' enables us also to account for the Latin compound verb *suggillat* 'beats' (from \**ǵhis-lā* in composition), and for glossic *harit* 'ferit,' as also for *harena* 'sand'='quod frangitur,' *hīlum* 'bit, particle.']

EDWIN W. FAY.

Austin, Texas.

<sup>1</sup> I find myself completely nonplussed by Walde's entry under *hostorium*, 'streichholz (spät): volksetymologische Umgestaltung von *ustorium* (: *uro*), wie *ustulare* "als Opfer darbringen und verbrennen" später nach *hostia* zu *hostilare* gemacht wurde (Keller,

*Volksetym.* 44).' So far as Priscian and the glosses tell us, the *hostorium* was a 'strickle' (= 'streichholz'), but Walde's explanation suits a 'friction match' (= 'zündhölzchen, streichholz').

Without discussing the probability of Professor Fay's ingenious combinations for *culpa* (*supra* p. 14) it may be pointed out that it would be a strange freak of chance if *illam dicam* in Cicero *l.c.* did not point to *landicam*. †

Upon the etymology of *uitrum* 'glass' (p. 22) it may be observed that the short *i* is not accounted for. The quantity of the *i* in *uitrum* 'woad' is unknown.

ED. C. Q.