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](#)

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.

R. S. Conway

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 05 / June 1901, pp 279 - 280

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030456, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030456

How to cite this article:

R. S. Conway (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 279-280 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030456

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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

happy form the fruit of the voluminous research of recent years; for example the note on page 260 gives all the main points of Wheeler's acute and convincing essay on the development of grammatical Gender (in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, 1899 (ii.) p. 528). And even this is not the most recent research which Mr. Giles has made accessible; light is thrown on many points from work only published last year, for example, on p. 520, the reader has the benefit of the results of Mr. Arthur Evans' most recent discoveries in Crete, bearing on the history of the Greek alphabets. The treatment of the changes of I.-Eu. η^* in Greek on p. 125 may be quoted as an example of the author's readiness to

accept the best view available though it involves the abandonment of his previous doctrine. One may regret in passing that Osthoff's wild speculations as to the 'double' treatment of sonant η and η are still given with so much prominence (p. 148), though there is some reserve in their statement. In § 45 a rather fundamental question ('Is Philology an exact science?') is still left without a very explicit answer, and on p. 226 there seems some obscurity in the description of 'the new accent' (in Greek nouns). But these are trivial blemishes in an admirable book.

R. S. CONWAY.

CARDIFF, May 1901.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Euripides Hippolytus. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. E. HARRY. Pp. xlv, 175. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1899. 6s.

It is strange that so seldom appears a new edition of the *Hippolytus*. The press positively reeks with notes on the *Alcestis* or the *Hecuba* or the *Medea*, while not more than about once in ten years does anybody find anything to say in English on the *Hippolytus*—almost the greatest, if not the greatest, monument of Euripides' genius. However, one is content to wait for a good book, and Prof. Harry has given us one.

The introduction is full. The life and opinions of the poet are dealt with at length and then follows a good section on Euripides' 'dramaturgy,' in which the editor defends the Euripidean prologue. From the Euripidean point of view Prof. Harry makes out a good case, though from the artistic standpoint there is little can be said for it. Then follows a criticism of the poet's shortcomings as exemplified in the use of the *deus ex machina*; in the break in interest which occurs in some of the plays; and in the ineffectiveness of the choruses dramatically considered. A brief account of Euripides' style and language succeeds and the remainder of the introduction is taken up with an analysis of the characters of the play, an account of the myth, and a description of the illustrations, eight in number, which occur in the volume. The whole of the introduction is interesting and useful.

The text and notes show Prof. Harry to be a conservative critic. He does not bracket or transpose lines simply because a better sense (as it appears) may be obtained by doing so, nor does he admit emendations needlessly. An emendation is too often made to cut the knot which sympathy with the poet and close study of his thought might have untied. Sometimes however the editor is almost too conservative, as for instance when he retains 32-3. He defends them on p. 148 though in the note below the text he remarks that the text is corrupt. One or two other points may be noticed; in 111, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ calls for something more luminous than 'more circumstantial and cautious than simple $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ or $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$.' It might seem from the note that $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ might take $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ in the construction, which the editor certainly would not intend. 167. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. To the references given might be added *P.V.* 645. There is a good note on $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (200) in which the femininity of Phaedra's character is well brought out. 246. $\delta\mu\mu\alpha$ surely means 'face' here; cf. 'shame hath covered my face.' 270. Is it not rather too strong to say that the use of $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is an innovation of Euripides? There are three instances at least in Aeschylus—*P.V.* 867, 929. *Pers.* 215. 328. $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \tau\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ is taken in the sense of 'fail to keep thee' = to lose thee, instead of 'fail to gain my request from thee.' The following lines, too, taking Prof. Harry's interpretation of the thought, make good sense without transposition or omission (Nauck). There seems no sufficient reason