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 *Short Comparative Grammar* (VOL. I) *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, von K. Brugmann (Erste Lieferung, Einleitung und Lautlehre 8 vo. 280 pp.; Trübner, Strasburg, 1902, 7 mk.).

R. S. Conway

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 07 / October 1903, pp 363 - 364

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208561, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208561

How to cite this article:

R. S. Conway (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 363-364 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208561

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BRUGMANN'S *SHORT COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR* (VOL. I).

Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen, von K. BRUGMANN (Erste Lieferung, *Einleitung und Lautlehre* 8vo. 280 pp.; Trübner, Strassburg, 1902, 7 mk.).

THE appearance of a book by Brugmann is an event of importance, whatever its subject; still more when the book is a new edition, though in a compendious form, of his great *Comparative Grammar*. The nineteenth century saw the 'stubbing' of many a 'Thurnaby Waste'; but I doubt if any one of them demanded such Titanic labour, and certainly none of them, in the region of the historical sciences, can have produced such wonderful fruit as the first edition 1886 of the first volume of that *Grammar*. It determined once and for all the questions whether or not the 'new school' had justified its existence, whether the use of strict method had made research more powerful or less, whether *Comparative Philology* was or was not an exact science. *Solutum est ambulando*: Brugmann showed that the linguistic universe was built on rational principles, by rationalising it for the first time. What amounted to a new science was securely planted and it has grown apace ever since.

Such an achievement cannot, from its nature, be repeated. The successive volumes of the *Grundriss*, and the second edition of the first volume, containing the *Phonology*, each represented solid additions to knowledge; but they could not effect the revolution in linguistic thought which had followed the appearance of the first. Now we have the first part of an abridgement of the whole, which, save for its delightful and eloquent brevity, is in fact a third edition of the First Volume. It is useless to pretend that it is any less indispensable than either of the other two. Every one must study it who wishes to think or speak intelligently of the development of any single Indo-European language; and there can be no doubt that its more compact form will attract an even larger circle of readers. The chief gain in brevity comes from discarding bodily, in the *Phonology*, the sections on Iranian, Armenian, Albanian, Celtic, and Lithuanian: these languages are not, however, disregarded in the introductory sections to each chapter, that is, in the sections which give a con-

spectus of the evidence for the existence and nature of the various Indo-European sounds. On the other hand five great families, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Germanic, and Slavonic, are treated, so far as one can judge from several months use, with hardly less fullness than in the second edition, though of course the number of examples of particular changes is slightly reduced, and some thorny points are either omitted altogether or dismissed with a few instructive references. To the classical student the book will be even more useful than the larger edition, and that is saying a great deal. It is to be hoped that it will soon find a worthy translator, for it introduces many valuable terms (e.g. 'Grading' and 'Toning' in Ablaut) and in point of scientific and literary form I venture to think it the most perfect of its author's works: every point of the arrangement has been thought out with consummate wisdom.

The treatment of Ablaut may be mentioned as a typical instance of the advance which the book has made even upon the second edition of the *Grundriss*. In that edition the familiar 'Series' were displaced for a prudent, but somewhat bewildering string of single pairs of related sounds. The old trio $\lambda e\iota\pi-$: $\lambda o\iota\pi-$: $\lambda i\pi-$ was split up into $\lambda e\iota\pi-$: $\lambda o\iota\pi-$ and $\lambda e\iota\pi-$: $\lambda i\pi-$, treated in separate paragraphs, and all the phenomena of the other groups were scattered in the same way. At the time this was no doubt a gain in truth; but I think there will be few students who will not rejoice that Brugmann has seen his way to a deeper analysis. He gives us now a new statement of the phenomena which, while it embraces the results of recent criticism and research, allows the whole to appear in a systematic and intelligible form. The new sections on the nature of the Ablaut-changes in proethnic times are of the first importance. Not less admirable are the brief but stimulating sections at the beginning of the book devoted to the Theory of linguistic change. I note in passing that the considerations urged by the Editor of this review (*C. R.* 1899 p. 71) against the assumption of an I.-Eu. spirant j ('yod') as distinct from consonant $\dot{j}$ (Eng. y) seem to be justified by the far more guarded way in which the evidence is now dealt with (§ 302). On the other hand Brugmann still adheres to

the view that I.-Eu. *bh*, *dh*, etc. were first made voiceless fricatives, even medially, and then voiced again in Latin to become *b*, *d*, etc. Postgate (*C. R. ibid.*) holds that medially they were always voiced, and that the Oscan and Umbrian *-f-* denoted medially some sound like Eng. *v*. Neither view is susceptible of proof, but there are some considerations, especially the history of the different symbols for *f*, of which two at least (*F* itself and *ʃ*) were certainly derived from signs representing a *u*-sound¹ which incline me decidedly to the second of the two.

It would be out of place, I think, to attempt to discuss here single points² in the

¹ See *Cl. Rev.* 12, 462, *It. Dial.* pp. 463, 467.

² In one or two places which I have noticed in the Latin sections Brugmann seems to have given his sanction to some recent theorising which hardly deserved it—notably to some guesses of Sommer's. What, for instance, is gained by explaining (p. 84) the *oe* of *foedus*, *poena*, *Poenus* as due to the preceding labial, when *Bellum Punicum* gives us the actual form of the sound as it was spoken? *Poenus* like *moenia*, is the old name, surviving only in poetry and written language generally; *foedus*, (subst.)

phonology. On nearly every page I have found something new and striking; every section is marked by the *curiosa felicitas* of statement that distinguishes Brugmann (and Leskien) from all other living 'Indo-germanists.' And perhaps the secret of the unalloyed sense of satisfaction which this volume produces lies in the fact that the languages it deals with are all within the limits of its author's independent study. The larger volumes include a great deal of other people's writing, notably in the Celtic sections. In this volume there is no clay beneath the gold.

R. S. CONWAY.

CARDIFF, June 13, 1903.

and *poena* are legal terms, *foedus* (adj.) a religious term (of omens, etc., *visu foedum*), all equally kept by the written form. Or again, why did the *-r-* of the suffix preserve *-s-* from change in the root syllable of *miser* (p. 201) but not in *queror*; and why was an adjacent *r* powerless to prevent the change in forms like *horreare*, *pareve raris*, *roris*, *terere*, *terroris*? I am inclined to believe that both Lat. *miser* and Gr. *μισαρός* are borrowed from some South Italic word meaning 'accursed.'

L. MEYER'S GREEK ETYMOLOGY.

Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie.

Von LEO MEYER. 4 vols. Pp. 656, 859, 488, 608. 1901-2. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. Price 60 mk.

No etymological work comparable in size to these four handsome and well printed volumes has been published since the second edition of Pott's *Etymologische Forschungen*. The treatise, however, to which this work stands in closest relation is Curtius' *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*, and Curtius was able to dispose of his subject in far less than the 2,600 and odd pages with which we are presented here. This, however, is a dictionary, while Curtius's was a work on Comparative Philology.

It is to be regretted that neither preface nor epilogue accompanies these volumes to explain the object which the author set before himself. For it is possible that the reader will find some things here which etymological Dictionaries do not always supply and will at the same time be disappointed not to find some things which they do. The author is careful to quote the earliest passages—and at considerable

length—in which a particular word is found. Nothing could be more excellent. Another good feature of the book is its careful treatment of stem suffixes, parallels to rare suffixes being regularly cited and when hardly any exact parallel exists as to the rare *κόμης*, attention is called to the fact.

On the other hand the arrangement of the sounds which has been adopted by the author is a serious detriment to the usefulness of the book. When one takes up a work in lexicon form devoted to Greek Etymology one naturally expects that the words will occur in the usual order in which they are found in the Dictionary. Here, however, everything is arranged differently. In vol. i are treated words beginning with *α*, *ε*, *ο*, *η*, *ω* and in this order, in vol. ii those beginning with *ι*, and its diphthongs, *υ* and its diphthongs, *κ*, *ξ*, *π*, *ψ*, and *τ*, while vol. iii deals with *γ*, *β*, *δ*, *ζ*, *χ*, *φ*, *θ*, and iv with *σ*, *ν*, *μ*, *ρ*, *λ*. Nothing could be more scientific in theory, nothing could be more tiresome in practice. And if it is further remembered that within the word the same order of sounds is adopted as for the beginnings of the words, it will be realised