

The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Brugmann's *Shout Comparative Grammar* Brugmann's *Short Comparative Grammar*. Parts 2 and 3. 7s. and 4s.: the whole (three parts) 18s. (bound 21s.). 8vo. Pp. xxviii, 777. Karl J. Trübner : Strassburg, 1904.

R. S. Conway

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 08 / November 1904, pp 412 - 414

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990772, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990772

How to cite this article:

R. S. Conway (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 412-414 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990772

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

may often not include it. The definite concept may simply be, *mittat eos*, accompanied by a less clearly conceived idea which might express itself, let us say, by a gesture towards certain persons who are ready (*parati sunt*).

The reader looks in vain through this paper for a solution of many troublesome problems of long standing. For instance, he is not told what classes of subjunctives attract, what connectives are involved, what is considered a close dependence, whether the dependence must be upon the verb or upon any part of the governing clause. Such questions can be answered, if not by definite negation or affirmation, at least with statistics illustrating general tendencies.

Finally, in giving the orthodox explanations that this construction is merely one phase of indirect discourse, and, again, that it is a part of the general phenomenon

that reveals itself in assimilation of consonants, M. Antoine betrays an incomplete theory of its origin. These considerations do have their place in the explanation of the construction, but they do not of themselves alone afford an adequate explanation. The habit of mechanical attraction is a product in which several constructions are factors, and that of indirect discourse is by no means the most important one (see the reviewer's *Attraction of Mood in Early Latin*, Chicago, 1904). In fact, M. Antoine's arguments are often weakened by his employment of illustrations that involve indirect discourse, rather than attraction of mood in the proper sense of the term. Some of these are Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 1, 1; *Div.* 1, 57; Caes. *B. G.* 1, 34, 4, on p. 32; and several of the illustrations on pages 33-5.

TENNEY FRANK.

The University of Chicago.

BRUGMANN'S *SHORT COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR*.

BRUGMANN'S *Short Comparative Grammar*.

Parts 2 and 3. 7s. and 4s.: the whole (three parts) 18s. (bound 21s.). 8vo. Pp. xxviii, 777. Karl J. Trübner: Strassburg, 1904.

A CORDIAL welcome will be given to the completion of this delightful book. In moderate compass and with wonderful lucidity it sets before us the best fruit of a lifetime spent in discovery. Those who have attempted, in any department, to keep pace with the progress of Philology will feel, perhaps, the keenest gratitude to the veteran author. But the classical scholar who has made no special study of this subject and finds himself often in need of safe guidance in linguistic matters will be hardly less thankful. The book makes it possible to arrive quickly at the facts in kindred languages which bear on any important question of Greek, Latin, or German Grammar; for if they are not all given in the text, they are easily accessible from the references to the *Grundriss* and other books,—references few and carefully chosen.

But though the book is thus a guide to Philological literature in general and the *Grundriss* in particular, it is also something much better. This *Short Grammar* is the latest and most perfect presentation of

Brugmann's teaching as a whole. There can be no doubt that the time had come for such an ingathering of the harvest. The period of destruction, of fierce and combative enquiry, which began in 1879 with Brugmann's discovery of the Sonant Nasals, and Johannes Schmidt's of I.-Eu. *e* and *o*, may be said to have ended with the publication of the second edition of the Phonology (Vol. I) of the *Grundriss* in 1897. It has been succeeded, not by stagnation but by 'eine gewisse Ruhe' (p. iv), a certain degree of general agreement on the main lines of the subject. For example, we may venture to feel assured that no serious change will ever need to be made in the general scheme of Ablaut laid down in the first part of this *Short Grammar* (pp. 138-150), though it is eminently suggestive and certain to lead to fresh discoveries in detail. A tone of calm, reflective, exposition pervades the book, and makes it, in truth, as notable a contribution to literature as it is to science.

The most important changes in the parts we are now concerned with are the complete re-writing of the Morphology and the new sketch of Comparative Syntax. In the former the rather dreary chapter of Noun-formation is abridged and enlivened by treating the meaning and usage of the forms side by side with their development, and by

classifying them according to meaning. This has also the advantage of saving some repetition in the Syntax, and of enabling the student as he goes along to clothe the skeletons of Noun-stems, Tense-stems, Case-suffixes and the like, all in short that are included under the new and very convenient term 'formans' (plur. 'formantia'), with the flesh and blood of some human significance. The advantage of the combination will be felt by every one who has worked through the Second Volume of the *Grundriss* with its necessary but almost Mathematical abstractions, the affection for which apart from their meaning, 'cometh of evil' (*ist vom Übel*) as Brugmann himself quaintly observes (p. viii). English readers will probably be glad to find, in this connexion, that the long and unconvincing explanation of compounds like ἀρχέκακος (Eng. 'tell-tale,' 'catch-penny'), as containing in origin no Verbal but merely Nominal elements, has now been withdrawn and the group left to speak for its separate self (p. 299).

Perhaps the most important and interesting of the particular points of new teaching, is what may, I think, be called the final solution of the puzzle of Gender. That complicated disease of language, as we now see, sprang from three separate germs, which are, in the order of their discovery,

1. The original use of the *-ā* and *-ī* (alias *-iē*) formantia;

2. The original meaning of the 'Neuter' ending *-om* (Gr. *-ov*, Lat. *-um*);

3. The development of the meaning of female sex in a large number of the *-ā* and *-ī* formata, and in the corresponding pronoun-stems (*ō, ī*).

The credit of the first must be divided between Brugmann (*Grundriss* ii. s. vv.) and Johannes Schmidt (*Die Pluralbildung der Indogermanischen Neutra*); the mutual confirmation which their independent theories supplied was, I believe, first pointed out in a note in this *Review* (1890). Brugmann showed that the Collective, Abstractive sense [ἀπορή 'ploughings, tilth' beside ἀπορός 'ploughed'; *esca* 'things eaten, food' beside **escus* 'eating,' or 'eatable' (seen in the compound *u(e)-escus*); πνυρή 'prudence' beside πνυρός; *noxia* (subst.) beside *noxius*, etc.] of these two suffixes was older than any reference to sex; and Schmidt that the Neuter Plural constructed with a Singular Verb in Greek and other languages was derived from the Collective use of these same two suffixes which were afterwards converted into ordinary Plurals. The

cogency of the second point was first made clear, I believe, by the Principal of the University of San Francisco, better known as Professor Ide Wheeler (*Journal of Germ. Philol.* 2. 528), who pointed to the real significance of the 'Accusative' *-m* (in Pronouns *-d*) namely that the thing it denoted was represented as merely passive; and hence inferred that though we find this *-m* applied to words denoting creatures or persons elsewhere conceived as Agents (and then marked by the 'Nominative' *-s*), its earliest use was to mark off a totally distinct set of things which were conceived as never capable of Action, stocks, stones, and all the other 'Neuters.' He further pointed out the powerful influence of the Pronouns (especially that which in Greek is *ὁ, ἡ, τό*) in forcing every Noun into one or other category. There remained the puzzling question, How did the mere Collective *-ā* clothe itself, so to speak, in petticoats? To this it was really no answer to say, as Brugmann used to do (and still does as an alternative), 'Because *ἡγνᾶ* "wife" (Gr. *γυνή*, Boeot. *βανά*) happened to end with an *-ā*.' That only pushes the question a very slight stage further back, and leaves us wondering that this very form, this mother of all Feminines, should have masked its feminine shape by adding a quite sexless *-uk* (*γυνυ-uk*) in one of the few languages in which it survived at all. But the new explanation which Brugmann now puts forward as an alternative (p. 361) is to my mind certain,—nor does it exclude the earlier, if that has found supporters; for in the development of meanings, the more influences to the same end the better. Why did, say, *υἷλqā* or *υἷλqī* (Lat. or Volsc. *lupa*, Sanskr. *vṛkī*) which to start with certainly meant 'the wolfery,' 'the pack' come to mean 'the she-wolf'? Because of the contrast between **υἷλqos* 'the wolf (par excellence)' and his mate and cubs which together were called **υἷλqī*. In the case of an animal like a stag with several does or a primitive chieftain, the Collective in contrast to the (Masculine) Singular would denote his wives more often than his children, and finally, if he had one wife, it would denote her. There are close parallels to this supposed change of meaning in words like the Germ. *Huhn* 'hen' (orig. 'the poultry' in contrast to *Hahn* 'the cock'). Of the historical or sociological deductions that might be made from this Brugmann is silent, and no doubt it would be unsafe to make them too wide. Still it does seem clear that the change in

meaning must have gone along with a steady process of improvement in the status of women such as the Indo-European races, or the strongest of them, have alone carried through.

One other rather striking innovation is perhaps a matter of tone and style, but it seems to add depth to much of the teaching. In the first edition of the *Grundriss* the psychological aspect of linguistic growth was largely taken for granted, but Prof. Wundt's notable treatise (*Völkerpsychologie: Die Sprache*, 1900) has greatly influenced his colleague's thought, and in certain classes of changes, instead of the well-worn and rather barren denotations of the grammarian, we have the psychological process, of which they in fact consist, plainly stated;—for example in the description given (p. 678) of the causes which led to the growth and the elasticity of certain principles of the order of words in the Indo-European sentence. Instead of the practically meaningless phrase 'for emphasis,' it is refreshing to read of the greater or less prominence of this or that part in the total mental picture which the sentence represents; and it is certainly a gain to the teacher to think of the sentence—and as a Latinist I would add, of the paragraph—in this way. No doubt one is apt to run into rather long though true descriptions of familiar facts (e.g. of Assimilation on p. 697), but I have noticed no other passage in which the psychological phrasing is not more of a gain than a burden; except a beautiful definition of the sentence (quoted, p. 624, as the last of four, from some rising philosopher named Dittrich), which, like Brugmann, I cannot withhold from the reader; 'A sentence is a rhythmically complete unity of sound by which the hearer is invited to attempt a more or less complete apperceptive (relative) analysis of the state of meaning in the mind of the speaker, in such a way that the speaker may recognise the analysis as correct.¹' The definition applies well to itself, and no doubt to many other sentences constructed by its ingenious inventor. It must be a charming world where every

¹ "Ein Satz ist eine modulatorisch abgeschlossene Lautung, wodurch der Hörende veranlasst wird, eine vom Sprechenden als richtig anerkennbare relativ abgeschlossene apperceptive (beziehende) Gliederung eines Bedeutungsthatbestandes zu versuchen."

speaker, political or other, yearns to see a 'correct analysis' made of his 'state of meaning.' When I am next struggling with a bad book, I will take comfort and call it 'a paper unity whereby the reader is invited to analyse the author's state of meaning, if he can.'

In details there is a wealth of new and suggestive explanations which will greatly lighten the work of the Classical teacher,—for instance, of the use of Lat. *primum* (orig. a nominative, p. 449), of *tum* and *quom*; of Greek, Latin, and Gothic *an* (all originally meaning something like Germ. *doch wohl*, 'Yes, but it is,' or in questions, 'Yes, but is it?' p. 615); of *iva* (p. 667), of *ei*, of *nisi*, of *si*, of *-que* in *neque*, *absque*² (pp. 668, 670); and of the Prepositions (e.g. *κατά*, p. 479); indeed the whole of this brief and luminous chapter (pp. 462–480) is a masterpiece of lexicography. I notice in passing that the use of Lat. *sine*, which has never so strong a negative colour as the Eng. *without*, seems to separate it definitely from Gr. *ἀνευ*, Germ. *sonder(n)*, etc., and to make it better to count the word merely the Imperative of *sino* (like the Eng. phrases 'put aside,' 'leaving out') constructed with the Abl. through the influence of the older *sē(d)*. Nor is *apud* mentioned so far as I can find; its derivation (*apo* + *ad*) is surely obvious and gives an exact explanation of its use which the beginner often fails to grasp: 'away at (Cicero's house),' 'over yonder beside (the river bank),' 'far off among (the barbarians).'

I have found very few misprints: p. 637 l. 15 read *ἀκρό-πολις*; p. 639 l. 6 read *πάμ-παν*; p. 662 *footn.* l. 2 read *iniectio*; p. 711 col. 2 l. 13 read *Hilfsvokale*.

None of Brugmann's great predecessors has added such broad and rich territory to this domain of human knowledge; and yet no one of them lived to crown his own conquest with so happy a picture of its results. *Praesenti tibi maturos largimur honores.*

R. S. CONWAY.

MANCHESTER, August, 1904.

² Brugmann does not, I think, explain the meaning 'and.' But this use is equally derivable from the original meaning 'anyhow, certainly'; thence to 'indeed,' 'furthermore,' 'next,' 'and.' Cf. Osc. *inim* 'and' = Lat. *enim*.