

Dr. Postgate, for example, would not have made himself responsible for the statement that *spatium* = *στάδιον* (even though Curtius says so), that *θέλω ἵνα* is not earlier than the apocryphal Gospels (there are half a dozen instances in the New Testament), that *invitare* is from *invitus* and its proper meaning 'to do violence,' that *felis* meant originally 'female' or *erudire* 'to hew a branch of a tree into shape,' that *truncus* 'mutilated' came from *truncare*, and this again from *truncus* 'a tree-stem,' that in Pompeian electoral inscriptions *facite* means 'unite' not 'vote for,' that *splendidus* comes from *σπλήν*, or that *senatus* is understood with the title *princeps*. It is an awkward choice of an illustration to write 'when the Latins began to say *impruntatum habeo*, "I have borrowed," they inaugurated a mechanism whose richness impressed their imagination: 'of course the mechanism was 'inaugurated' (if one must use so unfortunate a phrase) centuries before *impruntare* was ever coined, if indeed it ever existed. These criticisms, to which others might be added, are not intended to detract from the substantial value of M. Bréal's book, but simply to indicate that the publisher might have done well to secure a scholar like Professor Postgate, not only to introduce the book, but also to revise and edit it.

The essay is divided into three parts: 'The Intellectual Laws of Language,' 'How the Meaning of Words is determined,' and 'How Syntax is formed.' Under these several heads M. Bréal lays down a number of laws, but he is careful to explain that these are not blind and uniform: they are psychological, and tentative, sometimes

logically carried out, more frequently representing 'furtive' attempts at the expression of thought. The most novel of these discussed in the first part is one to which the author gives the name of 'irradiation': it has elsewhere been called 'adaptation.' M. Bréal's point is that a form, e.g. a suffix, accidentally combined with a definite force in one word, is supposed to convey that force of itself, and so is employed for that purpose in other cases. For instance *-sco* has no inchoative force inherent in it, as we see from *pasco*, or *nosco* [the latter example seems dubious], but as it is actually found connected with it in *adolesco*, *senesco*, it comes to acquire it in cases like *pallesco*. A more doubtful suggestion is that *esurio* etc. are of the *i*-conjugation, because they have modelled themselves on *sitio*. The chapter on Analogy treats this prolific source of change in language as a means rather than a cause, and acutely indicates some of its own causes. The chapters on restriction and expansion of meaning are full of interesting but sometimes dubious matter. Is it probable or historically proved that *adulterare* in its wider sense was earlier than, and gave rise to *adulter* in its specific sense. The history of *gain* and *regain* might have been traced a little further with profit; and similarly with *accabler*. There are some excellent remarks on articulated groups. But it is impossible to notice all the points touched on in the twenty-six chapters of this comparatively brief essay. It is perhaps sufficient to say that it will be found everywhere interesting and often original and stimulating.

A. S. WILKINS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

HORACE, *CARM.* I. 9. 1 AND I. 2. 14.

MR. Sargeant's remarks on Hor. *Carm.* I. 9 and I. 2. 14 on p. 428 of the last volume of the *Classical Review* prompt a brief note. It is probably unnecessary to assign a definite place as the scene of I. 9, though some commentators on Horace (Nauck, for example) have gone altogether too far in representing the difficulty of seeing Soracte from Rome. But for those who take Rome, or its vicinity, to be the scene

of the poem, a greater difficulty of interpretation arises from the fact that Soracte is not by any means a prominent or characteristic feature in the bounding landscape of the capital. The Alban hills, or the Sabine, are much more impressive. Why did not the poet cite them instead of Soracte?

Some satisfaction may be given these critics, however, from the result of a recent winter residence in Rome when especial

attention was given to such climatic and topographical observations as might tend to the better understanding of the Roman writers. No snow fell in the city during the winter, though the air was often chill enough to stimulate the enjoyment of high-piled logs, and of beverages even more thrilling than the sour wine of Sabinum. Again and again the slopes of Monte Cavo were white with snow, while the more distant summits of the Sabine hills kept on their frozen nightcaps for weeks at a time. But not once did I see Soracte snow-crowned, though I looked for such a phenomenon under apparently favourable circumstances many a time. The question finally came to me whether Horace did not mean that when not merely Sabine and Alban hills, but *even* Soracte, stood deep in snow, the wintry weather was severe indeed.

With regard to I. 2. 14, I am not quite sure what Mr. Sargeant means by his remark that 'the course of a flood high enough to have threatened the temple of Vesta must have *traversed* [italics mine] higher ground than the Trastevere;' but at just about the time when his article was published (on the first of December) the Forum was standing six feet deep in the Tiber-water. I have myself seen the Tiber more than once back up the ancient sewer-system to within a very few feet of the Temple of Vesta. And this is all in spite of the modern engineering operations that by deepening and widening the bed of the Tiber, and by the construction of the magnificent new embankments, have done much

to make Father Tiber content to rest in his proper quarters. The ordinary Forum floods of classical days may well have been quite as striking as the extraordinary ones of the year just closing; and the poet may be pardoned even if he did not give a technically correct discussion of the cause of the phenomena, and did ascribe to the jealous river-god an impiousness of deadly purpose against the safety of the deity who symbolized the very existence of the Roman community such as could not be allowed to stand as part of the arraignment before a modern court of law.

Mr. Page was of course much confused about his topography, but he may well be justified in believing *litus Etruscum* to be the right river-bank, and for more and other reasons than I have specified here. But it is to be hoped that the American School in Rome, and the newly-founded British School, may do something to quicken the study of elementary Roman topography among English-speaking students of the classics, so that we shall not encounter such statements as Mr. Sargeant has properly noticed, nor such as that made on p. 412 of the same number of the *Classical Review*, where an American student quotes the well-known *lex Julia municipalis*, but spoils the interpretation based upon it by attributing to the *Porta Flaminia* an existence a century and a half before the construction of the wall through which it opened.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT.

Dec. 15, 1900.

PHARSALIA NOSTRA.¹

Hinc iugulis, hinc ferro bella geruntur.—
vii 533.

ON Lucan i 463 '*bellis* arcere Caycos [oppositi] I gave my reasons for accepting Bentley's *Belgis*. 'But it should be added' says Mr Heitland 'that he proposed to rewrite lines 460-72 in an astounding manner.' Why should it be added? Because Mr Heitland cannot afford to rely upon the merits of his case, and must import this foreign matter to create prejudice. The rightness or wrongness of *Belgis* has no dependence on anything else that Bentley ever did; but because he

annoys us very much by his bad conjectures, therefore we will refuse his good conjectures, for revenge is sweet. I avoided this irrelevancy; so it is said that I 'do not always manage to state the case fairly.' Then Mr Heitland, who shrinks from the conjectural emendation of Lucan, proceeds to the conjectural emendation of me; though I have not been dead nearly so long, nor do nine centuries of transcription intervene between my autograph and last December's *Classical Review*. To show that the Romans had no wish to restrain the Chauci from war, but only from war on Roman subjects, I adduced Tac. Germ. 33, where the Romans are seen exulting in the

¹ See pp. 78-80 and vol. xiv p. 468.
NO. CXXX. VOL. XV.