

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1905.

## THE SPELLING AND PRINTING OF LATIN TEXTS.

THE document which we print below at the request of the Committee who have drawn it up for circulation among members of the Classical Association of England and Wales and teachers interested in the subject, though its importance is primarily pedagogical, is not devoid of interest to the wider circle to which this *Review* appeals.

The proposal to mark the quantity of the long vowels consistently is but carrying out the principle which underlies the various expedients employed in Latin inscriptions for removing an ambiguity in the imperfect transcription of living speech. The apex, the doubling of the vowel and the use of the tall I are each of them a recognition of the paramount importance of the quantity to the pronunciation of the ancient Latin language.

The choice between a double and a single symbol for the twin sounds of the pair *i* and *u* is a somewhat different and certainly more disputable matter. The fact that there is no classical or even decent mediaeval authority for the discrimination in writing between the vowel and the consonantal sounds of the two letters is too well known to need more than the briefest of statements. It is however singular that the two letters have been differently treated. While a single symbol is now the rule in the case of *i*, even in Germany where *j* would be phonetically unobjectionable, the caprice of fashion or fortune has maintained the severance of *u* and *v*; but maintained it inconsistently. And thus it has come about that the ancient semi-vowel of the Romans is sometimes written *v* and pronounced as

NO. CLXVI. VOL. XIX.

*v* ('*vee*'), and sometimes written *u* and pronounced as *w* — a really remarkable combination of misspelling and mispronunciation.

There seems to be good ground for believing with the Committee that the writing of *u* for both vowel and consonant is gaining ground, though slowly. The most significant proof is that of its use in more than one recent text published in the Oxford series of texts, which has hitherto shown a steady conservatism in the matter.

'The Committee appointed to consider the spelling and printing of Latin texts desire to have the opinion of teachers upon the questions raised under the following heads. Answers to be useful should be based on actual experience, not on theoretical grounds.

I.—*The marking of the long vowels in Latin texts intended for the use of beginners.*

American editors, as a rule, mark long vowels consistently in grammars, texts and vocabularies. English editors do not, as a rule, mark them in texts nor consistently in grammars and vocabularies.

1. Have you in your teaching used—

(a) texts in which the quantity of the long vowels is consistently marked,

or (b) texts in which it is marked occasionally or not at all?

If you have used both kinds, which do you prefer and why?

2. Do you think it would be helpful

either (a) to the teacher,

or (b) to the learner,

H

if the long vowels were consistently marked in Latin texts intended for beginners (say in the first two years)?

II.—*The writing of the consonants or semi vowels i (j) and u (v).*

[It is assumed that the pronunciation of the consonant or semi-vowel corresponding to 'i' (= English *ee*) was roughly *y* and that corresponding to 'u' (= English *oo*) was roughly *w*.]

### I (J).

The prevailing practice both in England and America is to use one symbol 'i' for both the sounds, thus following the Classical practice. But in a few elementary school books 'j' is used for the consonantal sound and in others an italic *i*.

1. Does your experience show that any inconvenience results from the employment of one symbol for both sounds?
2. Do you wish to see 'j' restored for use in school books?
- or 3. Would you prefer to see an italic *i* or the like (*e.g.* *j*) employed instead?

### U (V).

I.—In a certain number of books intended for the more advanced students, and in two or three intended for the less advanced, 'u' is used for both vowel and consonant; and there are signs that this practice, which is in accordance with that of the ancient Romans, is on the increase.

II. In the majority of books 'v' is written for the semi-vowel.

\* *But* after *q*, after *g*, and sometimes after *s* 'u' is written.

Thus quis, exstinguo, consuesco.

In these cases Madvig wrote 'v': qvis, extingvo, consvesco.

The distinction between vowel and consonant may be given by other means.

It has been proposed to use for it—

- (a) an italic *u*.
- (b) the symbol *u* (Professor V. Spiers in his elementary work on French etymology).
- (c) a new symbol.

The Committee would be glad if you will give from your own experience answers to the following questions.

[To facilitate the expression of opinion on the questions examples of all the pos-

sible combinations in which u consonant can occur are appended.

I.—When closing a word or syllable or preceding a consonant in the same syllable, 'u' is always the vowel: u-nu-s, ful-gu-er.

[So always after two consonants, unless the second is *q*, *g*, or *s*: *e.g.* noctua.]

II.—Before a vowel in the same syllable 'u' is always a consonant: uerbum.

[So always after a preceding long vowel: am-ā-ūi.]

III.—After a vowel followed by a single consonant (*l*, *r*, or *n*) 'u' may be either a vowel or a consonant: silua, soluo, uolui, larua, genua.

In verse the scansion almost invariably determines a doubtful case.

In such words as uīuō, ūuidus, the addition of the marks of long quantity decides the pronunciation.]

1. Have you used texts in which one symbol only (u) is employed?

If so, have you found that this spelling is productive of serious or of only passing inconvenience?

2. Are you of opinion that two symbols should be used in elementary books?

3. If so, are you of opinion that one of these should be used always for the vowel sound and the other used always for the consonantal sound?

4. Which of the four proposed representatives—

(a) *v*, (b) *u*,

(c) *u*, (d) some new symbol,

would you prefer as a representative of the consonantal sound?

[5. For those who answer *No* to (3).

How do you propose to deal with the three classes of cases given above and marked with an asterisk?]

In order to complete your answers will you kindly state if you are in favour or not in favour of the pronunciation of

i semi-vowel as *y*?

u ,, ,, *w*?

*Signature and Description.*

Answers to the above queries may be sent to *Professor J. P. Postgate*, 54 *Bateman Street*, Cambridge, from whom also copies of this circular can be obtained.

## SPELLING OF PROPER LATIN NAMES.

The Committee of the Classical Association of England and Wales<sup>1</sup> would be glad of further information as to the correct spelling of the proper names in the following list. It may be sent to Prof. J. P. Postgate, address as above.

<sup>1</sup> See *Classical Review* for February 1905, pp. 6, 7.

Balearis  
Bedriacum  
Caphareus  
Casandra  
Delmatae, etc.  
Egeria (Aegeria)  
Gnidus  
Gnosos

Parnasus  
Philyrides  
Phraates  
Rhipaei  
Semiramis  
Talasio  
Veseuus

ON EURIPIDES *ALCESTIS* 119–121: 130 f.

- Θεῶν δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάραυς  
120 οὐκ ἔχω ἐπὶ τίνα  
μηλοθύταν πορευθῶ.  
120 ἔχω 'πί L  
130 νῦν δὲ τίν' ἔτι βίου  
ἐλπίδα προσδέχομαι.  
130 τίν' ἔτι βίου B  
τίν' ἐπὶ βίου α τίνα βίου LP

The above shows the reading of the manuscripts, but all editors read with Musgrave *προσδέχομαι* in v. 131 as the metre and sense require; but there is no such general agreement as to the other changes needed in order to complete the responson and remove the difficulties of interpretation. In 119 f. objection has been felt to the repetition of ἐπὶ in different senses. Hence Monk reads δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάραν (δέ γ' ἐσχάραν Reiske): Weil and Wecklein-Bauer change ἐπὶ in 120 to ἔτι, but Wecklein in his revision of Prinz's *Alcestis* retains the preposition. Earle and Hayley adopt the proposal of Hartung, save that the former reads the improbable *μηλόθυτον* with Reiske and Nauck. Hayley's text is therefore:

- Θεῶν δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάραν  
120 οὐκέτ' ἔχω τίνα  
μηλοθύταν πορευθῶ.  
130 νῦν δὲ βίου τίν' ἔτ'  
ἐλπίδα προσδέχομαι;

In this way the responson is secured and the interpretation is made simple, but the changes are too violent to be probable.

I propose to adopt the reading of L in v. 120, ἔχω 'πί, and to insert ἔτι after οὐκ, thus:

- Θεῶν δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάραυς  
οὐκέτ' ἔχω 'πί τίνα  
μηλοθύταν πορευθῶ.

The particle ἔτι could easily be omitted by a careless copyist, and while the use of the preposition with two distinct meanings may seem harsh it can be easily paralleled, e.g.—

*Od.* 24. 80–82

ἀμφ' αὐτοῖσι δ' ἔπειτα μέγαν καὶ ἀμύμονα  
τύμβον  
χεύαμεν Ἀργείων ἱερὸς στρατὸς αἰχμητῶν  
ἀκτῇ ἐπι προύχουσῃ, ἐπὶ πλατεῖ Ἑλλησπόντῳ,

*Aristoph. Equit.* 402 f.

ὦ περὶ πάντ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τε πράγμασι  
δωροδόκοισιν ἐπ' ἀνθεσιν ἴζων.

*Aesch. P.V.* 120–123

τὸν Διὸς ἐχθρόν, τὸν πᾶσι θεοῖς  
δι' ἀπεχθείας ἐλθόνθ' ὅποσοι  
τὴν Διὸς αὐλὴν εἰσοιχνέουσιν  
διὰ τὴν λίαν φιλόττητα βροτῶν.

*Soph. Ai.* 581 f.

οὐ πρὸς ἱατροῦ σοφοῦ  
θρηνεῖν ἐπωδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πῆματι.

*Thuc.* vi. 50. 4

ἐπὶ Συρακούσας ἔπλεον ἐπὶ κέρως.

Cf. also *Eurip. I.T.* 44 f.; 1289–1291; *Soph. Trach.* 330 f.; *Phil.* 1017 f.; *O.C.* 899 f.

I should then interpret v. 119 ff. as follows—'At the altars of the gods there is no longer any priest whom I may approach.'

With this reading of vv. 120 f. no change beyond Musgrave's emendation need be made in vv. 130 f. That a tribrach in v. 130 corresponds to the cyclic dactyl in v. 120 is no serious objection. The hiatus also at the end of v. 130 may be readily paralleled, e.g.: