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](#)

Osthoff's *Suppletivwesen D. Indogermanischen Sprachen Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Erweiterte akademische Rede von Hermann Osthoff. Heidelberg, 1900. 4M.

P. Giles

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 05 / June 1901, pp 278 - 279

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030444, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030444

How to cite this article:

P. Giles (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 278-279 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030444

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

or coast road, because the Cenis is 'more easterly and therefore nearer Italy'; and for the same reason the Great St. Bernard (which he takes to be Hasdrubal's pass) is placed before the Little St. Bernard. A difficulty, no doubt, there is; but I still believe that it is met by the solution which I proposed in the *Classical Review*. However that may be, no one can approve the desperate expedient which is here proposed.

Professor Osiander deserves all credit for the industry and research of his treatise;

and it is all the more to be regretted that he leaves the controversy just where he found it. The impossibility of the Little St. Bernard was already demonstrated by arguments which needed no repetition. The Cenis route would have a fair case if it were not for the passage of the Druentia, and he certainly has not got rid of that difficulty. He has neither strengthened the case of the Cenis, nor weakened that of the Genève.

G. E. MARINDIN.

OSTHOFF'S SUPPLETIVWESSEN D. INDOGERMANISCHEN SPRACHEN.

Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erweiterte akademische Rede von HERMANN OSTHOFF. Heidelberg, 1900. 4 M.

In this University address, delivered in a shorter form on the occasion of the birthday festival of the Grand Duke of Baden by Professor Osthoff in his capacity as Pro-rector of the University of Heidelberg, a very interesting problem is discussed, and one which lends itself, comparatively speaking, to popular treatment. It is in short an attempt to answer the question 'why do we say *am, was, been*, making one verb out of three, or again *good, better, best; bad, worse, worst* with the comparative and superlative from a stem different from that of the positive?'

The pamphlet of 95 pages falls into three parts. In the first, extending to page 40, the problem is propounded in all the varieties of form which it takes; in pages 41 to 52 will be found the solution; the remaining pages are occupied by references to the literature of the subject and by the index.

The problem itself is subdivided under five heads, according as it appears (1) in the verb, (2) in the formation of feminine words, (3) in the adjective, (4) in the numerals, (5) in the pronoun. In each and all of these there appear examples not a few where one or more alien stems have become part and parcel of a series of forms with which originally they had no connexion. In all cases it is noticeable that the words thus treated belong to the commonest elements of the language, and are those which are most frequently in use. In the verb system it is just the verbs expressing the most common actions which fall into this category; verbs of eating: *ἔδω* and *ἐσθίω*,

ἔδομαι but *ἔφαγον*; verbs of giving and bringing: *φέρω*, *fero*, but in Greek *οἶσω*, *ἤνεγκα*, etc., in Latin *tuli*; verbs of going and coming: *ἔρχομαι* but *ἐλεύσομαι* and *ἦλθον*, *go* but *went*; *τρέχω* but *ἔδραμον*; verbs of saying and speaking: *ἔρῳ*, *ἔρηκα* but *εἶπον*; verbs of hitting: *ferio*¹ but *percussi*; verbs of seeing: *ὄράω* but, on the one hand, *ὄψομαι* and *ὄπωπα*, on the other, *εἶδον*, etc.

In the feminine formations it is remarkable that in the nearest relationships the feminine is rarely a derivative from the masculine form: *father, mother; husband, wife; son, daughter*. Only in Latin where the old words are lost do we find *filius* and *filia* from the same stem. More distant relationships like *grandson, grand-daughter* are expressed by forms from the same stem: *nepos, neptis*, for father-in-law, mother-in-law: *ἐκυρός, socer; ἐκυρά, socrus*. Yet son-in-law and daughter-in-law: *γαμβρός, gener; νύος, nurus* are from different stems. In the naming of the lower animals also the most familiar have names from different stems for the masculine and feminine forms: *horse, mare; bull, cow; boar, sow*, etc. Of wild quadrupeds only the deer, *hart* and *hind* are so distinguished in Old High German.

In the adjectival comparison it is noticeable that, in most languages, adjectives (and adverbs) expressing *good, bad, little*, fall into this category; in the numerals specially *one, first; two, second* and so in other languages. In the personal pronouns there are different stems for singular and plural; in the demonstratives, stems in the nominative different from the oblique cases, *ὁ, ἡ: τόν, τήν*, and so in the personal pronouns *ego: me*, etc.

¹ This verb, however, as distinguished from *verbero* is aoristic by nature and is explained by Plutarch as equivalent to *πληξαι* (*Romulus* 16).

Full details for the whole of the Indo-Germanic languages are given in the first part of the address to illustrate these headings. The explanation offered is briefly this: that, where interest is close and personal, the human mind individualises each detail, where the interest is more remote, it classifies in series. Hence therefore there are separate and individual forms for the actions of most frequent occurrence, for the nearest relationships and so forth. That

the explanation supplies a *vera causa* seems undeniable; whether, however, the cause supplied is the only cause is perhaps more doubtful. Be this as it may, the author has given us a most interesting study of a large number of seemingly isolated peculiarities which the ordinary grammar is content to label as irregularities, and has shown us that here as elsewhere there is a unity in things which at first sight appear exceedingly diverse.

P. GILES.

GILES' COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

A Manual of Comparative Philology. By P. GILES, Reader in Comparative Philology in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition, Revised. Pp. xl., 619. Macmillan, 1901. 14s.

A HEARTY welcome will be given to the new edition of a book which has long since established its position as an interesting introduction to a difficult subject and a valuable instrument of higher education. The main lines of the first edition are preserved, notably the frequent use of changes and idioms in modern English and its dialects to illustrate similar developments in ancient languages. The appeal from the unknown to the familiar is always refreshing, and is doubly so here, since even the facts of the history of our own language, particularly in Syntax, are still extremely difficult to find. The result is that even the special student of English Philology will probably find more help in Mr. Giles' lucid sketch of the general principles of the subject than in any of the professed hand-books of English Grammar; while the classical student, who is apt to feel that he has come into a rather arid region when he begins Philology and turns his back upon the wealth of literary association that surrounds even the linguistic part of his Classical training, discovers that the range within which he may find such interest has not been narrowed, but greatly extended, by the light which the historical method throws upon the modern literature and the everyday speech of his own and other countries.

To write a text-book on a subject so full of controversies and pitfalls is a feat rather like building one's own house, which, it is said, is generally much better done the second time than the first. Mr. Giles is

to be congratulated both upon the conspicuous success of his first attempt, which, besides other testimony to its value, earned the somewhat rare honour of a German translation, and upon the admirable use he has made of the present opportunity for improvement. One feels in turning over the pages that one is under the guidance of a scholar whose method of stating his subject has the freshness and precision whose value can only be learnt by constant experience in teaching it; and in the six years that have passed since the first edition the author has, perhaps insensibly, discarded what has been felt as its only real weakness, the ultra-sceptical, almost contemptuous tone which then appeared in his discussion of the more intricate points. *Tout savoir est tout pardonner*; in other words, the longer one works at difficult problems, in this subject at least, the more hopeful one grows of their ultimate solution and the more patient meanwhile of half-successful attempts to grapple with them. It is not that the present edition draws the reader into a larger number of unsolved questions than the first: indeed Mr. Giles' success in avoiding matters which are unprofitable to a beginner is quite as striking as before. But where important questions not yet finally determined have to be mentioned, they are now presented in a thoroughly spirited and hopeful tone from which the student can draw nothing but encouragement. The volume is slightly increased in size, but the change is more apparent than real, and due mainly to the use of larger type. The actual additions, besides a brief and welcome appendix with the text of the fragmentary "Forum Inscription," are generally put into footnotes, which often present in a very