

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](#)



Indogermanic Numerals *Die Distributiven und die Kollektiven Numeralia der Indogermanischen Sprachen.* Von K. Brugmann. Mit einem Anhang von Eduard Sievers. Altnordisch tvenn(i)r renn(i)r, fernir, from Vol. XXV. of the 'Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königl Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.' Leipzig: D. G. Teubner, 1907. M. 3.60.

S. E. Jackson

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 05 / August 1909, pp 164 - 165
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003528, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003528

How to cite this article:

S. E. Jackson (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 164-165 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003528

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

INDOGERMANIC NUMERALS.

Die Distributiven und die Kollektiven Numeralia der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Von K. BRUGMANN. Mit einem Anhang von EDUARD SIEVERS. Altnordisch *tvenn(i)r þrenn(i)r*, *fernir*, from Vol. XXV. of the 'Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.' Leipzig: D. G. Teubner, 1907. M. 3.60.

THIS work is of great interest both to the student of Comparative Philology in its exposition of the origin and use of these numerals in the Indogermanic languages, and also to the Classical student in its clear statements of many points in Greek and Latin usage, which have hitherto been only too vaguely apprehended; in particular several difficult uses of the so-called distributives (*bini*, etc.) are explained by a careful consideration of their collective origin. The main results of the book are the following. The true distributives are first dealt with. Here Brugmann finds three principles:

(i) The Iterative. Skr. *ēka ēkas* is the type. Class. Gk. *μία μία* (*δύο δύο* etc. are later). As a later development forms joined by 'and' are found, e.g. O.E. *twaem ond twaem*.

(ii) The use with a pronoun: Gk. *εἷς ἕκαστος*. Lat. *unus quisque*. Irish *cach oen*, 'quisque unus.'

(iii) The use with prepositions: Skr. *prati*, e.g. *praty ēkam*, 'one by one.' Gk. *κατὰ, ἀνὰ* etc. The Gk. *κατὰ* through its use in Patristic Latin comes out in Romance, e.g. Ital. *cada uno*, 'one by one.'

Connected with (iii) is the use of the Vedic suffix *-sas*, e.g. Skr. *ēka-sas*, 'one by one.' There can be little doubt that it is identical with Gk. *-kas* in *ἐκός, ἀνδρα-κός*. With regard to its origin, which is disputed, Brugmann's theory is that it is from *†kns* from a root *kens-* seen in Lat. *cēnsō*, Gk. *κόσμος* from *†κονσμος*. Vedic *sāsa-ti* 'counts,'—so that the original meaning was 'according to a fixed measure or order,'—seems likely to be the true one. Possibly

the form itself was once really an Imperative 'count one,' 'count two.'

In dealing with the Collective numerals (under this heading are included (1) forms which have both the Collective meaning and a later acquired Distributive meaning, and also (2) forms which though Collective in origin have become merely Distributive), Brugmann first considers the formative elements;—three in number, *-o*, *-no* and *-go* added to the cardinal.

(i) The forms in *-o*; Indg. *†dueio-*, *†dūeio-*; *treio-*, *troio-*; *-bheio-*, *-bhoio*. Vedic adj. *dvaya-s*, 'two-fold'; subst. *dvayam*, 'duplicity'; *traya-s*, 'three-fold'; *ubhaya-s*, 'both.' Lat. *bes* and *bessis*, *†be[x]-essis* from *dueio-* with elision of the last vowel of the stem, so *tressis* from *†treio-essis*; *†quetuero*, *quetuoro*. In Aryan only found in the Vedic substantive *catvāra-m*.

As regards the Lat. *decuria*, Brugmann dismisses Schulze's conjecture of a stem *†deku-*, and advances a theory which can hardly be doubted, namely that the form arose analogically from *†q^uetur-iū*; so that while the ending *-eriū* spread to '5,' e.g. Unbr. *pumperiā*, in the form *-uriia* it spread to '10' and '100.'

(ii) The forms in *-no*:

bini from *†bisno-*; *terni* from *†trisno-*; *quaterni* from *†quatrino* (or analogical after *terni*?); *sēni* from *†secsno-*; *quini* from *quincino*; *septēni* from *†septensno-*; *octoni* from *†octōsno-*; *noueni* from *†novensno* (probably the *-sno-* form of the suffix started from *†bisno-*, *†trisno-*, *†secsno-*).

With regard to the forms for 'seven,' 'eight' and 'nine'; regularly we should have *†septsno-* becoming *†sesno-* and that *†seno-*; *†octsno-* becoming *†osno-* and that *†ōno-*, *†nounsno-* becoming *nuno-*. Clearly forms which were so far from the cardinal and in which, moreover, the expressions for 'six' and 'seven' had become identical, were not likely to survive. The survival of *deni* may be due partly to the fact that it appeared also in the forms *undeni*, *duodeni*; moreover,

it was not likely to be confused with any other number.

As regards the double forms *terni* and *trini*, *quaterni* and *quadrini*, Brugmann points out that they are distinguished in use; *terni*, *quaterni* are used as Distributives, though the Collective function is not entirely foreign to them; *trini*, *quadrini* are used as Collectives. Bini combines both these functions and for it Brugmann postulates a double origin;—in its acquired use as Distributive from †*duisno*-, as Collective from †*duino* or †*dueino*-. From †*bisnoi*, †*trisnoi*, the -sno suffix as we have seen passed to the numbers from '5' onwards, and these acquired a distributive meaning at the same time as †*bisnoi* etc., without however losing their collective meaning. The form *alterni* might have had some influence in the use of *terni*, *quaterni* as Distributives. Corresponding to †*duisno* is O.H.G. *zwirnēn*, *zwīrnōn*. To †*duino*- and †*trino*- correspond O.H.G. *zwīnal*, *zwīnel*, *zwēnel*, 'gemellus' and Mod. H.G. *drell*, 'linen woven with three threads.' If a criticism may be ventured, these German forms seem rather a slight basis for the creation of †*dueino*- as well as †*duisno*-.

(iii) -qo- forms are represented in Vedic Skt. *dvikas*, 'aus Zweien bestehend' and O.H.G. *zwisk*, 'zweifach.'

In discussing the various uses of the Collective and Distributive forms, Brugmann brings forward many interesting points.

Forms in -o, -no and -go had or acquired a Collective meaning outside the numerals,

e.g. Skt. *asvam* beside *asvas*, Gk. ἱππικόν beside ἵππος; these Collective nouns are, like the numerals, neuter. As regards the use of †(*d*)*kmtō-m*, '100' (where it is an elliptical expression for a 'ten of tens'), Brugmann notes that it is found in its original meaning of 'a group of ten' in Gothic, *sibuntē hund* etc., 'a ten of sevens,' i.e. 70. In Aryan and Slavonic this neuter numeral is found with a genitive plural (in Aryan appearing as a compound, e.g. Skt. *go-dvayam*), but in both these groups we find the adjective use of the numeral as well, while in Italic and Germanic the substantive is only used absolutely, the adjective supplying its place in other cases. Both these constructions are probably Indogermanic, the substantive use was the earlier.

Lastly, the Distributive use is treated: the question is how Latin came to prefer the Collective in this use to the Cardinal and to make it the rule; in Greek we find a parallel use of σὺν with the Cardinal, where the explanation is as doubtful as that of the use of *bini* etc. in Latin. It is in Latin only that the Collective is regularly used as Distributive; in the other Indg. languages it is only an occasional phenomenon.

In discussing the Gk. *δοιοί* and *δοίω* Brugmann inclines to think that they too were collective in origin, and this seems very probable, although the evidence is not sufficient to afford a proof. One can only say in conclusion that this is a work which fully repays the most careful study and consideration.

S. E. JACKSON.

PURITY IN GREEK AND LATIN STYLE.

Latinitas and Ἑλληνισμός. By C. N. SMILEY. Wisconsin, 1906.

THE author of this thesis attempts to estimate the influence of the 'Stoic theory of style,' as seen in the writings of Dionysius, Quintilian, Pliny the Younger, Tacitus, Fronto, Aulus Gellius, and Sextus Empiricus. His purpose is to show that the Stoic theory persisted as a strong literary influence at

Rome for a period of two hundred years after the death of Cicero, and that it was always at war with what he terms the 'Ciceronian or rhetorical' style.

The whole question of Ἑλληνισμός is, as the author knows, beset by many uncertainties. The first enunciation of a doctrine of the kind is supposed to be found in Diogenes Laertius' life of Zeno (vii. 59), where it is attributed to Diogenes the Stoic