

A REJOINDER TO MR. LLOYD-JAMES
ON THE MAKING OF LATIN.

LET me thank¹ Mr. Lloyd-James for pointing out one serious mistake in the definition of a consonant which I noted for correction directly the book appeared. But otherwise the differences between us seem to me almost wholly a matter of wording. Save on a trivial point he quotes no authorities for his statements, and it would therefore be enough here to say, what is true, that in no one of the points which he raises is his wording commended by the results of my own study. Since, however, such *ripostes* take nobody any further, I add below my reasons, more briefly than I could wish for courtesy's sake, but humbly obeying the Editors.

The source of Mr. James' complaint lies in the difference between what I set out to do and what he would have liked. Besides complaining generally of the limits of the Phonetic sections he asks that I should transcribe passages of Latin into a modern 'Phonetic Alphabet.' He holds that students should not be allowed to approach the history of Latin without first having mastered the phonetics of English and one of the competing systems of phonetic notation. Viator enumerates twenty-two different schemes for classifying the vowels alone which have been put forward by twenty different authors between 1803 and 1908.

No one could hold more strongly than I do that students of language should know that they are talking about sounds, not written symbols, and should have some idea how those sounds were produced; but to say that no knowledge of the history of Latin is possible without the same kind of phonetic precision which is desirable in the study of a modern language, is a view which would be rejected by all the great scholars whose work in the last half-century has built up the fabric of philological knowledge. The *Transcriptionsmiserè* also should be kept in its proper place, not thrust upon beginners.

Hence Mr. Lloyd-James everywhere quarrels with my phonetic descriptions, as being incomplete. I dismiss the vowels in twelve lines, adding: 'This is, of course, only a very rough description. In nearly all languages there are a great many intermediate positions giving rise to special kinds of vowels.'

Viator (*Elemente der Phonetik des Deutschen Eng. u. Französ.*, Ed. 6, 1915) gives them 163 octavo pages, mostly of small print. The question whether I have succeeded in selecting the most certain points involves no general principle. One matter, however, concerns the Classical Association, and is typical of Mr. Lloyd-James' attitude. He falls foul of the

scheme of Latin Pronunciation issued by that Association (after the report of a specialist Committee) and adopted by the Board of Education, and wishes it replaced by more precise phonetic descriptions.

This scheme has been a document of importance in all English schools; it had a practical not merely a scientific purpose; and none of its statements are erroneous, except from the point of view of minute phonetic precision. The gulf which there is between Mr. James' attitude and that of the Association is well shown by his remark on the sound of *e* in Latin. This the scheme describes as being like English *ey* in *prey*, or French *é* as in *bié*. Mr. Lloyd-James observes that 'the English and French sounds have nothing in common.'

The descriptions given of the Latin sound were meant as approximations, not identical; but they indicate what we know of the Latin sound closely enough for practical purposes. But what of Mr. Lloyd-James' own statement? Is that quite a model of precision? Does he mean to deny that both the English and French sounds are formed with unimpeded voice? To deny that both are formed with the lips unrounded? To deny that the positions taken by the tongue in both are intermediate between the positions taken in forming the *a* of English *father* and the *i* of English *machine* respectively, but different from both these? All this, in Mr. Lloyd-James' view, is 'nothing.' A more reasonable estimate would be that these three statements cover nine-tenths of the relevant facts. As to the remaining tenth, I shall be happy to learn more from any phonetician who can teach me, whenever I engage in the study of French sounds for their own sake.

I add a few notes on matters of detail:

(1) On some points Mr. James seems to have missed what the book does contain. All that he says about sonants will be found explicitly stated in §§ 30 and 34.

(2) Mr. James rejects my definition of a vowel as 'a sound produced by the voice passing through the mouth while the tongue and lips are held in some particular position'; and he adds: 'according to this definition *l* is a vowel and the diphthong *ou* is not.' Certainly it is not. The definition of a vowel must distinguish it from a diphthong. Nor does my definition include *l* as I described it (formed by some 'vibration' of the sides of the tongue); that, however, would be the effect of Mr. Lloyd-James' two definitions. In the description he gives above of *l*, where is there anything about 'audible friction,' the absence of which he regards as marking a vowel? According to Mr. James sonant *l* is simply a vowel.

(3) As to consonant *l*, Mr. Lloyd-James' definition is in conflict with Viator's (p. 253), who calls *l* a kind of fricative in which a 'very loose narrowing' is enough; adding that stronger narrowing and clear friction appear when it is voiceless.

I depart from Viator by substituting for 'a fricative with a very loose narrowing' the phrase 'formed by vibration of the tongue' in order to describe what I seem to hear in many languages—for instance, in Welsh, Italian,

¹ The Editors rightly deprecate any comments from me on Mr. Campbell's generous review of the book; but they allow me to say that I believe the misprints, with two errors which he pointed out, are now all corrected in a list of *Errata*, and that this will be sent post free to any previous purchaser of the book who applies to the publisher.

and sometimes in English. No doubt Vietor's description is safer. Nevertheless there is a difference of kind between the rough hissing of real fricatives like *f* and *s* and the more musical sound of the liquids; 'vibration' seems a convenient term to represent this; but I will gladly adopt a better when anyone can suggest it.

(4) Mr. Lloyd-James says that the English words *way* and *low* 'do not end in semi-vowel sounds,' and gently suggests that I was deluded into that belief by their spelling. I chose these examples, because the spelling, for once, fairly represents the sound. These sounds are represented by Sweet (*Handbook*, p. 110) by the diphthongs *ei* and *ou*, also by Vietor (*Elem.*, pp. 94 and 109). Jespersen and True, in *Spoken English*, represent them by *e'* and *o''* (see Jespersen's discussion on pp. 144 and 153 of his *Lehrbuch der Phonetik* for more precise descriptions).

(5) There is no room in twelve pages of phonetic explanations to distinguish between a 'palatal plosive' and a 'slightly fronted velar'; nor do I know how to ascertain which description would best suit the ancient Latin sound of *c* and *g*.

(6) 'The initial sound of *shut* is not a palatal fricative, but an alveolar fricative.' There was no need to discuss the alveolar sounds as such, though I noticed the term as a more exact description of the English 'dentals.' About these fricatives I wrote that the current of air is rubbed 'between the tongue and some part of the palate; the commonest kind is that of English *sh* in *shut*.' I must submit that *sh* is certainly palatal in my own pronunciation; but even if it is alveolar in other speakers, it is formed 'at some part of the palate.'

(7) 'In the production of nasal consonants all the air, not part of it, passes through the nose.' If Mr. Lloyd-James uses the term nasal consonants, as I do, to include the full sounds of *m* and *n*, I have nothing to say but that in every case (save where they are immediately followed and so curtailed by a breathed plosive) some of the voice escapes through the mouth—*m* differs from *b* only in this, that while the voice is blocked by the lips some of it escapes through the nose; as soon as the block is removed, it escapes at the lips also. Vietor (p. 301) describes them as 'Explosives with nasal resonance.'

(8) 'The palatal nasal consonant does not occur in English.' I suppose that what I have called the palatal nasal in words like *king* would be called by Mr. James 'a slightly fronted velar nasal.'

(9) Mr. James is careful not to name the 'Phonetic Alphabet' which (he says) is used in certain schools. If it comes under my notice, I shall observe with interest whether it is or is not free from the appalling obscurities of Sweet's so-called Romic; nor can I find anywhere in Vietor's books a system of notation that is not open to grave objections. The slight extensions of the Latin alphabet devised by Sievers and Brugmann nowhere suggest a false meaning. No doubt they are inadequate for denoting the sounds of modern languages as precisely as phoneticians desire. It does not follow that

they are not good as far as they go; still less that they are not in place for the general description which is all that we can provide for languages no longer spoken. R. S. CONWAY.

'WORD-ORDER IN HORACE.'

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,

I have to thank Mr. Cookson for writing at such length on my 'Word-Order in Horace.' He has, obviously, struggled to be just in the face of 'the almost personal resentment which one feels in being confronted with a wholly new view on so familiar a book as the *Odes*.' I fear, too, that he has sometimes tempered the wind. But in fairness to the theory, for what it is worth, may I be allowed to defend myself against one or two criticisms? Mr. Cookson chooses the first six lines of the first Ode of Book I. to justify the verdict that my 'conclusions . . . are, to say the least of it, apt to do some violence to the natural meaning of a passage.'

I will take the criticisms in their order. On l. 1 I have called *regibus* emphatic, and have remarked that *regibus edite* would 'scan equally well.' Mr. Cookson denies the truth of this remark. But if Horace could end the last line of this Ode with *uertice*, why should he not end the first line with *edite*? In *Odes* I. 3, Horace concludes nine out of twenty Asclepiads with short open vowels, and nearly all these lines 'end a colon' (if I understand this phrase aright).

On l. 2, Mr. Cookson asks 'why not *dulce meum decus*?' I have answered that it was usual in Latin prose and poetry (as in Italian and French) to put the adjectives on either side of the noun. What more can I say? The order is conventional like 'bread and butter,' 'almonds and raisins.' As to the *nostros* of *Odes* III. 6, 10, Bentley's exact objection is not quite clear; Wickham thinks that he 'objected to the series of accusatives as prosaic.' In any case, the loneliness of *nostros, nostris, nostrorum* requires comment.

Next, speaking of *pulverem Olympicum* (l. 3), Mr. Cookson holds that on my principles *Olympicum* would be unemphatic. But what I have said in the first section of the *Prolegomena* is that 'when Horace departs from the normal order . . . he wishes to draw our attention to the abnormality and so to emphasise for us the point which he desires to make.' I have not said that a word in a normal position cannot be of interest; on the contrary, the essential meaning of a word may be such that it requires no change of position; and this seems to be true of *Olympicum* and of *nobilis* (l. 5).

The criticism about *feruidis* (l. 4) is perfectly just. One can only answer that certain orders became crystallised. Thus in the familiar hyperbaton *maximis efferat laudibus* (Cic. *De Amic.* 7, 24) it is, perhaps, impossible to tell whether any extra force is given to the adjective; the hyperbaton had become so conventional. The extension of this hyperbaton to participles, as in *uariis obsita floribus* (*Odes* I.