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](#)

Buck's Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System Carl Darling Buck.
— *The Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System. (Preprint from
Volume I. of the University of Chicago Studies in
Classical Philology, pp. 124–187.)* Chicago. 1895.

Hanns Oertel

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 09 / December 1895, pp 460 - 461

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202722, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202722

How to cite this article:

Hanns Oertel (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 460-461 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202722

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

P. 281. It can hardly be doubted that πλεῦμων is an older form for the lung than πνεῦμων. The Greeks like the English named the lungs from their lightness, not their function. § 267, 2. Delete the illustration of οσω, which is an obvious slip. P. 294. Is it not more likely that the shifting of χ-κ, etc., in the Ionic dialect arose from the weakening of the aspiration in the one consonant than from its strengthening in the other? At § 361 πατήρ from Thasos might be mentioned as well as πατήρ, there being thus a parallel to φρήρη as well as to φρατρία. § 367. Why should it pass belief that the Ionians borrowed a Doric word concerning the sea? The view that people never borrow words for things with which they are familiar is erroneous. If accepted for the English language it would lead to some very strange results. P. 311. It is not clear what are the great difficulties in the way of connecting κοινός with Lat. *com-* (not *con-*). P. 315. The reminiscence of Homeric style even in the popular poetry might be paralleled by the continuance in English of such rhymes as *love* and *move* long after the words had become far separated (except dialectically) in pronunciation. P. 465 n. 2. The explanation of the η augment in ἡβουλόμεν etc., as from a preposition in ἐβέλω, ἡβέλω (lost except in imperfect), is extremely doubtful. This seems one of the numerous cases in recent philology which sin against the rule *causae praeter necessitatem non multiplicandae*. P. 519. The statement regarding aorists does not appear easily reconcilable with the view that the stems of the future and of the -s- aorist are identical.

I have observed the following misprints

which it may be worth while to correct. P. 19 § 14, 297 for 295. P. 21 n. Ὅη for Ὅη. P. 149 εἰςταῖ for -οῖ. P. 188, last line but one, 286 for 287. P. 203 *dācati* for *dācati*. P. 204 Σπενύχλαρος. P. 229 οῦς from ὄος. Add out of *ου(σ)ος § 266. P. 304. For root *pāi* read *pōi*. P. 341 (in table) *gen.* *γαμᾶς for *γαFῆας. P. 386 n. 1 φυλακος wants accent (on first). P. 447, last line but two of § 563, ἀσατῶ? P. 468 n. line 4 ἀγγέλω for ἀγγέλλω. P. 507, last line, read γεγένηται. § 615 line 4 read δεδόκηται. At p. 559 some words such as 'In the prose writers' are wanting at the beginning of the second paragraph.

The style of the book at the beginning is crabbed and full of Germanisms, but improves as it goes on. On p. 306 there is a very curious mixed metaphor. Is it too great a demand to ask Professor Smyth in his other volumes to drop such an ugly hybrid as *prosaist*? Herodotus' feelings towards the person who described him so might be imagined as belonging to the order of things which he thought it well on the present occasion not to mention.

Having thus discharged the duties of the *advocatus diaboli* I can in conclusion only thank the author for his excellent book and wish for the early appearance of another volume on some other of the Greek dialects which have not yet been treated. At present, with Meister's and Hoffmann's work still fresh, we can afford to wait for Aeolic. Will not Mr. Smyth give us Doric or the North-West dialects which he has already treated so well in brief in the *American Journal of Philology*?

P. GILES.

BUCK'S OSCAN-UMBRIAN VERB-SYSTEM.

CARL DARLING BUCK.—*The Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System*. (Preprint from Volume I. of the University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, pp. 124-187.) Chicago. 1895.

INVESTIGATION of the Italic dialects is of recent date and comparatively few scholars have so far worked in this new and attractive field. But if progress, for these reasons, has been slow, it has, on the other hand, been steady and singularly free from empty and valueless contributions. If there have been not many *ναρθοκοφόροι* those who did

engage in the work were βάρχοι, and a new treatise has always marked a decided step in advance.

In the line of Oscan and Umbrian phonology the three most important contributions were all made in the year 1892, when Bronisch and Buck gave their exhaustive discussion of the Oscan vowel-system and von Planta his careful and detailed survey of the whole field of Oscan and Umbrian phonetics. The general outlines thus being settled only minor points remain here open for discussion.

A systematic treatment and comprehen-

sive presentation of the scattered facts of Morphology and Syntax, similar to that given by von Planta for Phonology, we still lack, and the present work of Buck proposes to fill this want as far as the Oscan and Umbrian verb-system is concerned. He thus anticipates part of what we may expect in not too long a time from the pen of von Planta in the promised second volume of his *Grammar*. For the Latinist the gain is twofold. He will have the opinions of two specialists on controverted points when von Planta's second volume shall have appeared, and he will find the material in Buck's work grouped in such a manner that its arrangement may be more convenient for his immediate needs and purposes. For it may be expected from the disposition in the first volume that von Planta will follow Brugmann also in the arrangement of the morphological part, i.e. that he will start from the inferred Indo-European forms and trace their development within the individual language, a method which will force him to separate originally heterogeneous forms which the individual language has welded into one system (the Latin perfect is an extreme case) and which it treats as homogeneous. Buck's arrangement, on the other hand, is more that of Schleicher, which starts with the actual facts of the individual language and unravels them by the help of the light thrown on them by Indo-European philology.¹ 'It is,' he states, 'with more especial reference to possible readers among the Latinists that I give a synopsis of the Oscan-Umbrian Verb on the basis of the traditional system of conjugations and further attempt a general comparison of the Oscan-Umbrian verb-system with that of the Latin.'

With this aim in view he gives first a tabular view of the Oscan-Umbrian verbal paradigm in the traditional (Latin) arrangement (pp. 125-130). This is followed by a general comparison of the Oscan and Umbrian verb-system with that of the Latin (pp. 131-150). In this section lies the chief interest of the monograph for every Latinist. For the points of similarity of the two systems are numerous and outweigh by far the points of difference. Barring the absence of a pluperfect which may be accidental, the only real divergences

in the *categories* of the verb-system are confined to the *verbum infinitum*, where the Oscan lacks the gerund (but not the gerundive), the active perfect infinitive, the future infinitives, the passive present infinitive and the active future participle. From a *morphological* standpoint also the similarity is close. The modal system is the same except the perfect subjunctive (which in Latin is an Indo-European optative, while in Oscan-Umbrian it is a real subjunctive) and a few forms of the imperative. In tense-formation the *l*-, *nki*-, *f*- and *t*-perfects, a future which is morphologically equivalent to the Greek sigmatic future, i.e. the subjunctive of an original sigmatic aorist, the periphrastic future perfect based on the union of an active perfect participle with the subjunctive of the substantive verb, and the lack of the perfects in *vi* and the sigmatic aorist perfects (like *dixi*) are characteristic of the Oscan-Umbrian. Finally we find an almost complete agreement of the two systems in the *syntactical* employment of verb-forms. Buck has devoted pp. 137-150 to this interesting comparison.

The remaining thirty-seven pages are chiefly taken up with those 'contributions on points connected with the verbal system in Oscan and Umbrian' to which the author at first intended to confine himself. Among them are noteworthy his discussion of *seste* (p. 151) against Brugmann and Bréal, of the relation of *i* to *ii* (p. 158) against Bronisch, of Oscan *stait*, *stahint* (p. 160), the plausible explanation of the *p* in *hipid* and *hipust* as the result of a contamination of *habeo* and *capiō* (p. 165), the conjecture to fill the lacuna in Zvetaieff Osc. 4 = v. Planta 204 *patt* [*rafens*] (p. 174), the treatment of passive (pp. 177-182), and finally the attempt to establish an active perfect participle for the Oscan-Umbrian, a somewhat bold hypothesis which is offered tentatively only.

The presentation throughout is clear and concise and much more *übersichtlich* than that of Buck's *Vocalismus*; the judgment is calm and sound. The treatise forms a valuable addition to Italic dialectology and is indispensable alike to the Latinist and the student of comparative Indo-European Philology.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.
New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

¹ See Meringer, *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* xxxix. (1888), p. 131 sq.