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](#)

Delbrück's die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen *Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen*. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Alterthumskunde. Von Berthold Delbrück. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1889. pp. 228. Mk. 8.

Benj. Ide Wheeler

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 04 / April 1890, pp 171 - 172
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190067, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190067

How to cite this article:

Benj. Ide Wheeler (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 171-172 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190067

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the prohibitive force, *Thou shalt not*, acquired by the Greek future with negatives from the Hebrew commandments (Ex. xx. 13-17). It should however have been more distinctly stated that the future also acquires an imperative force: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, Thou shalt love thy neighbour* (Matt.

xxii. 37, 39). The Hebraistic element is of value as differentiating the language of the N.T. from that of the Greek fathers, and fixing the date of its composition before the decay of Hebrew language and literature in the Christian church.

F. RENDALL.

DELBRÜCK'S DIE INDOGERMANISCHEN VERWANDTSCHAFTSNAMEN.

Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen.

Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Alterthumskunde. Von BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1889. pp. 228. Mk. 8.

THIS work is a most significant contribution of philology to anthropology. It deals with the history of the primitive family organization, and limits itself to an attempted reconstruction of the conditions existing in the *Aryan* family just prior to the so-called dispersion of the *Aryan* race.

The recent investigations into the rise and development of the institutions of the family, which have attracted so much attention, notably among students of historical ethics, have been exclusively in the hands of anthropologists pure and simple. Bachofen's *Mutterrecht* (1861), Mc Lennan's *Primitive Marriage* (1865), Lubbock's *Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man* (1870), Morgan's *System of Consanguinity* (1871) and Starcke's *Primitive Familie in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung* (1888), are perhaps the best known works of this kind. The method pursued by all these authors is in substance this: to note all the various conditions among *existing* peoples of the most various degrees of civilization, and to arrange these into a historical series, with sexual promiscuity as a presumptive starting-point for the whole. Little or no attention is paid to the possibility that among different races the family-system may have had a different history. The method has no claim to the title comparative, but may rather be denominated the *confusative*. It is what the linguistic method of Wilhelm von Humboldt was to that of Bopp. It may suggest and illustrate a possible sequence; it cannot demonstrate one. An admirable example on the other hand of the strict application of the *comparative* method to the study of primitive institutions we have in the recent book of Professor Leist on the primitive law of the *Aryan* clan (*Alt-arisches Jus Gentium*, 1889).

The most widely accepted result of the application of the anthropologist's *confusative* method is that which places between the hypothetic original stage of sexual promiscuity and the final stage of civilized monogamy a stage, among others, wherein kinship was recognized through females alone. That conditions have existed and do now exist corresponding to this stage is indubitable. That it may have existed as a stage prior to the essential monogamy which we find established among all the *Aryan* people at the dawn of their separate histories is possible, but it is not necessary. It must be proven and proven for the *Aryan* family by itself.

It is to settle this as well as other less disputed points that Delbrück approaches the whole subject. He essays to bring to bear upon it the whole strength of the material of language. He proceeds soberly and cautiously. He turns his back resolutely from the start upon all the fair *Aryan* idyls sung by Müller, Curtius, and Fick, upon all those 'own dear' *svasaras* leaning on the helpful arm of 'supporting' *bhrātaras*, or as dutiful *dhughtaras* carrying the milk-pail for 'protecting' *pataras* and 'wise-ordering' *mātaras*. Not so much the primitive etymology of the oldest names of relationship is sought, for this is always uncertain, being in the nature of the case essentially beyond the reach of the truly comparative method, as, first of all, the fact of their existence. Let us illustrate by one or two cases the value of such determination. The absence in primitive *Aryan* of a word like Latin *conjuges* to denote the husband and wife as a pair joins with many other considerations to indicate that 'the relation of the husband to the wife and that of the wife to the husband were to the ancient mind things so different that one never thought of denoting husband and wife by the use of one term.' The existence of a word for *widow* coupled with the absence of any word for *widower* is in the light of ancient Indian usage significant of that

primitive Aryan usage whereby the second marriage of the wife, but not that of the husband, was precluded. To the same conclusion point the probable existence of a word for *step-mother* (Gr. *μητρικά* and Armenian *mauru*) and the absence of any word for *step-father*.

It is furthermore demonstrated that only the wife, and not the husband, enjoyed the advantage of distinctive names for the brother-in-law (*δαίρ*, *levir*), the sister-in-law (*γαλώς*, *glos*) the father-in-law (*έκυρός*, *socer*) and even the mother-in law (*έκυρά*, *socrus*). The children had a distinctive name for the paternal uncle, but none for the maternal uncle as separate from that of the maternal grandfather. The relationships to the family of the wife are everywhere vague and remote; if recognized, they are summarized ('friends,' 'allies'), not distinguished. The theory of the 'Mutterrecht' finds no comfort. Even the pre-eminence given to the maternal uncle among the Hindoos is shown to be a matter of the later usage only, while in the older usage the paternal uncle is preferred in honour. No explanation is however offered of Tacitus's report that among the ancient Germans the *avunculus* ranked with the father in honour (*Germ.* ch. xx). Cer-

tainly this must have been a special and secondary development.

But of even more importance than this determination of the existence or non-existence of primitive terms is the determination, by comparison of terms present in the different languages, of the existence of primitive, discriminations between the different grades of relationship. Here Delbrück has exhibited much good judgment and much good learning, but to illustrate would carry us too far. We can barely add one chief result of the whole investigation which includes also an important chapter on the antiquities of the Hindoo family system. It proves that the primitive Aryan family was monogamous in the sense that one wife, as the mistress of the house and the priestess at the household altar, stood distinctly apart from the other wives or concubines. Fidelity was exacted of the wife, though not strictly of the husband. To the children the kinship through the father was much more important than that through the mother, but the relations to the mother-family were those of friendship rather than of hostility.

BENJ. IDE WHEELER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.
Ithaca, N. Y.

SOLTAU ON THE PUNIC WORDS IN PLAUTUS.

Zur Erklärung der in Punischer Sprachgehaltenen Reden des Karthaginiensers Hanno im 5. Akt der Komödie Poenulus von Plautus: von FRIEDRICH SOLTAU. Berlin 1889. Calvary. 1 Mk. 20.

ALTHOUGH the relics of the ancient language of Carthage are miserably scanty, and fresh finds of inscriptions, owing to their uniform character, rarely add much to our knowledge of it, scholars have for centuries felt practically certain of its affinities, of the general principles of its grammar, and of a considerable portion of its vocabulary. As a Carthaginian is introduced speaking his own language in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, it has been very generally agreed that that language must be Carthaginian (*i.e.* Phoenician), or none; and the most eminent Semitists have been at pains to restore and interpret the 'Punica' of Plautus. The result of their labours, as it appears in Schröder's *Phönizische Sprache* (1869), is on the whole

highly satisfactory, and bears all the marks of a true restoration. The words restored differ slightly from the MS. tradition; their meaning agrees very closely with the corresponding Latin texts; and they are for the most part familiar words, which occur either in other Phoenician documents, or in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. In the same year in which Schröder's book appeared, two other famous Semitists published monographs on the 'Punica' of Plautus, Ad. Neubauer in the *Journal of Philology*, and Jos. Derenbourg in the *Journal Asiatique*; and the former of these at least offers some felicitous suggestions with which Schröder's account may be supplemented. That there is still room for discovery in these texts on the lines of these scholars is perhaps agreed; but a new interpretation which sets aside all their labours must naturally be received with surprise and suspicion. Such however is the work of F. Soltau, the appearance of which in the *Berliner Studien* gives it a