Maney Publishing
Modern Humanities Research Association

Review

Author(s): W. J. Sedgefield

Review by: W. J. Sedgefield

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jul., 1913), pp. 394-396

Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3712697>

Accessed: 20-10-2015 04:33 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Maney Publishing and Modern Humanities Research Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

seeing the line 'Ausus inexperta tentare pericula cymba,' might at first be in doubt with which word to take 'inexperta.' He could not get out of his difficulty worse than by adopting Mr Hall's translation, 'Daring in my untried fishing skiff to attempt perils yet untried' (*ibid.*). Nothing could be more careless than the author's rendering of 'sæpe ipse pedum vestigia quæro: Et si quid manibus tetigisti, floribus orno,' 'Often I search for thy very footprints—and if I find any, I adorn them with flowers' (p. 61).

Mr Hall's idiosyncrasies are not seen merely in his relation to the classics. He tells us that the Mosella is the Meuse (p. 43); he speaks of 'Spanish eclogues by Camões' (p. 86) and of 'a dose of "hell-bore"' (p. 28). Other errors are less serious, such as his spelling of Dr Greg's name as 'Gregg' (pp. 73, 139), his ignorance that Killingworth is the same place as Kenilworth (p. 98 *note*), the date 1610 for 1510 (p. 65 *note*), 'Sir J. Hawkin's' for Sir J. Hawkins' (p. 186 *note*), his non-acquaintance with Dr Boas' edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher, and an occasional absurdity, such as 'As an island play "Sicelides" belongs, topographically at least, to the same category as Nashe's "Isle of Dogs."' Spellings such as 'nearby,' 'hardby,' and expressions such as 'the last of the lot' (p. 29), 'a bit stiff' (p. 163), are not classical with us.

Mr Hall's book, as we have said, appears to have merits, but it must be read, to use his own words of another book, as 'an interesting work, but not very accurate,' and we may feel some surprise that the heads of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University did not assist the author to clear it of some of its surviving errors before it was sent to the press with their *imprimatur*.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Science of Etymology. By W. W. SKEAT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. xviii + 242 pp.

The object of this book, which Professor Skeat just lived to see published, is, we are told in the preface, 'to draw attention to some of the principles that should guide the student of etymology in general, and of English etymology in particular, in order that any one who employs an etymological dictionary may be able to do so with some degree of intelligence and to some profit.' It is clear that Dr Skeat, having incorporated the results of recent philological investigation in the latest edition of his well-known Etymological Dictionary, felt constrained to subject to revision his earlier books dealing with the methods of etymology, especially his *Principles of English Etymology*. The first ninety pages of the work under review give an outline of some of the general principles underlying the study, some 'useful canons,' and numerous examples, taken from various languages. A characteristic chapter on the folly and wickedness of 'pedants' closes the

preliminary portion of the book. Much of this matter has already appeared in earlier works of the author, but a fuller account is here given of the methods of comparison by which 'speech types' are arrived at, and a useful chapter on 'the value of English in the scheme of comparative philology' provides interesting analogies for the student. The remaining part of the book consists of chapters dealing with the principal language-groups of the Indo-European family of speech. Here the author gives in summary form, including long lists of examples, the results of the investigations of specialists, making large use of Brugmann's *Grundriss* as well as of Fick's and of Uhlenbeck's works, to all of which Dr Skeat fully acknowledges his indebtedness. His treatment of the subject is purposely made from an English point of view and is thereby rendered more interesting and helpful to the English student.

As the book is likely to be recommended to youthful but serious learners, and as especial stress is laid by the author on the necessity of accuracy and scientific method (*e.g.* on p. 2), it seems advisable to note some points in which these requirements are not strictly fulfilled. On p. 18 we are told that 'the scribes invented the symbol *gh* to express this guttural (*i.e.* the sound of *h* in the O.E. *riht*), but Norman dislike of it gradually prevailed upon the majority to suppress the sound itself!' (The note of exclamation is Professor Skeat's.) On p. 203 it is stated that the O.E. word *hors* supplanted the word *eoĥ* because 'perhaps the form *eoĥ* (or *eh*) had become too attenuated; it represents an early Teut. type **ehw-oz*, and the form that resulted from the loss of the nom. suffix *-oz* was not a happy one.' The explanation of *i*-umlaut given by Dr Skeat on p. 53 runs thus: 'the man who becomes very familiar with the form **badi* may come in course of time to say *bedi*; because, knowing that he has to sound *i* in the second syllable, he unconsciously somewhat raises the tone of *a*, by imperceptible gradations, till at last it becomes a clear *e*, and there it remains, because *e* is so well known and so common.' This gives a somewhat misleading idea of what really takes place in speech-change, as it implies that such a change as umlaut takes place and is consummated in the speech of the individual, and further that the individual is conscious and unconscious at the same time with regard to his pronunciation.

Such occasional weaknesses, however, do not detract from the usefulness of the book as a storehouse of aptly chosen and informing examples of linguistic correspondences, which throw a flood of light on questions connected with English, and in general with Indo-European, etymology. In particular the chapters on Celtic and Lithuanian-Slavonic correspondences may be recommended to students whose attention has been limited to Germanic, Greek and Latin.

We are unwilling to conclude this notice of Professor Skeat's last piece of work without paying a tribute to the great services rendered by him to the study of English. Of these services the two greatest, we think, apart from his ever-ready helpfulness, were that he made the study of early English authors more interesting as well as more easy to

students, and that he invested the subject of English etymology with a charm which it had never before had, and which was compatible with due observance of scientific method. In these days of specialisation it is unlikely that any one scholar will ever again loom so large in the field of English philology as the late Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

Patience, a West Midland Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited by HARTLEY BATESON. Manchester: University Press. 1912. 8vo. x + 149 pp.

Mr Bateson, as Faulkner Fellow of the University of Manchester, has produced a very useful edition of a poem which certainly needs more attention than it has hitherto received. In his Introduction he gives an account of its relation to the other poems of the group to which it belongs, and of these to one another, which may be regarded as in the main sound, assigning to the purely alliterative poems, *Patience* and *Cleanness*, the earliest place, placing *Sir Gawayne* next to these, with a special relation to the latter of the two, and *Pearl*, chronologically last in the series. Mr Bateson, however, is rather too apt to digress, and in consequence his argument is less clear than it might be. Instead of setting forth his own views independently, he is much too constantly engaged in dealing with those of other critics, some of which might be left altogether alone and others discussed separately. What is the use, for example, of mentioning the conjecture that Chaucer's 'philosophical Strode' was the author of the poems? Mr Bateson calls it 'plausible,' and yet he admits that there is no evidence for it of any kind. Even if Chaucer's friend were to be identified with the Ralph Strode whose name occurs in the registers of Merton College, it is practically certain that the poem there ascribed to him, the 'Phantasma Radulphi,' was in Latin elegiac verse and cannot have been identical with *Pearl*. (Incidentally it may be said that the originator of the suggestion was not Professor Gollancz but Dr Horstmann.) Again, there are too many allusive references, assuming familiarity on the part of the reader with the work of former critics, when direct statement of the issues would have been the more convenient method. It is doubtful, too, whether the discussion of a possible relation between *Patience* and the various texts of *Piers Plowman* is a profitable one as conducted by the editor. The alliterative combination of patience and poverty is not much to go upon, especially as the connexion is emphasised by Tertullian, to whom the author of *Patience* is known to be indebted. The multiple authorship of *Piers Plowman*, which seems to be assumed by Mr Bateson, is certainly not yet proved.