

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](#)



Prof. Paul's Principles of the History of Language, **translated by Prof Strong. Sonnenschein. 10s. 6d.**

E. R. Wharton

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 04 / April 1889, pp 180 - 181
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194648, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194648

How to cite this article:

E. R. Wharton (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 180-181 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194648

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

known to him, for in a list of works given 'for the convenience of the student' he includes 'Grant's Aristotle,' and 'Grant's Ethics of Aristotle,' apparently not knowing that they are only different editions of the same book.

Mr. Burt's chief guides are Hegel, Ueberweg, Zeller, and Schwegler, all of whom he appears to have used with care and judgment. There would not seem to be any marked originality about the method of the book or about his interpretation of Greek philosophers. He has walked very well in the footsteps of his guides, but, other things apart, the book is too largely a compilation to have much independent value. Perhaps the earlier part is the better, for when he comes to philosophers with whom we have a close acquaintance his account of them becomes too much an epitome. There is much information compressed into small compass by the art of the abstract-writer, and those who are preparing for certain examinations may find here what they want. The style is fairly clear and the facts are presented in an orderly and sensible way.

H. RICHARDS.

Prof. Paul's Principles of the History of Language, translated by Prof. STRONG. Sonnenschein. 10s. 6d.

As a translation, this book has been so exhaustively criticised in the *Journal of Education* of Oct. 1, 1888, that no further remarks are needed. Those who have attempted to read—and understand—the *Principien* in the original German, will feel grateful to Prof. Strong for his work. Especially noteworthy is his substitution or insertion of English instances where Prof. Paul gives only German ones.

The book itself is a difficult one to review fairly; the matter is so good, the form so bad. Every page is irritating, even in the translation: we sigh for a French writer, who could have told us just as much in half the space and twice as intelligibly. What can the ordinary scholar, not being an Oedipus, make of such utterances as the following?

'The effectual scrutiny of the conditions of historical growth, taken in conjunction with general logic, gives at the same time the basis for the doctrine of method which has to be followed in the verification of each single fact.'

'All purely psychical reciprocal operation comes to its fulfilment in the individual mind alone.'

'The question naturally presents itself—What is the analysis of the motory and sound sensations respectively, and to what grade are the special factors in their analysis consciously perceived?'

'Not unfrequently, in referring to what has preceded, an inaccuracy arises owing to the displacement of a word by the idea of a word etymologically related with the word actually employed, where the speaker might equally well have employed either.'

This last example beats Aristotle's *καὶ ἐνιορε ποσσιθέσιν ἀνθ' οὗ λέγει πρὸς δ' ἔστιν* (*Poetics* xxi. 6). It is true that Prof. Paul is not always like this: the following are striking observations well expressed:—

'There are as many dialects spoken as there are individuals to speak them.'

'Sounds are produced and taken cognisance of without any clear consciousness.'

'A further source of deception lies in the habit of starting not from the spoken, but from the written word.'

'Writing bears about the same relation to language as a rough sketch bears to a picture worked out with the utmost care in colour.'

'If we, generally speaking, create no new material of language, this is simply due to the fact that the need for doing so exists no longer.'

'A considerable portion of the dialectic differences is taken no account of in writing.'

'We are at present accustomed to regard the affirmation as the only normal sentence: the sentence of demand is, however, as old, if not older.'

'It is pure prejudice when any particular district is picked out in which it is alleged that the "purest German" is spoken.'

O si sic omnia! Such gems are few and far between.

The title of the book, as Prof. Paul himself hints in his Introduction, is misleading; perhaps even more so to the English reader than to the German. The subject is not the history of language, at least as we understand the term 'history,' but rather the philosophy of language, or the philosophy of the history of language. The tone throughout is that of the *à priori* philosopher, not of the *à posteriori*: the instances are brought in to support the rules (we might almost say, to make the rules intelligible), the rules do not follow from the instances. A further and doubtless more important defect is the extreme limitation of the range of instances. When Prof. Paul mentions language he means the Aryan languages, and not only the Aryan languages but the Teutonic group. He is himself indeed a specialist, a Teutonic scholar of the highest eminence, and naturally feels on safe ground when he draws his illustrations from German sources; but for un-German readers this is a serious drawback. We may forgive him for ignoring the fact that the Aryan languages are but one out of about a hundred different groups of languages existent in the world; but within the Aryan circle he might at least have taken more from the languages which every scholar knows, Latin and Greek. One of his most important chapters, IX, is on the process of creating words, which he, no doubt rightly, thinks is perpetually going on, especially in the case of words to express sounds or movements: he gives a whole page of instances, but all of them German, so that we cannot really tell whether the phenomenon may not after all be confined to the Teutonic languages.

The main object of the book is (p. xxxvi, note) 'to trace the development of language from the effects which individuals produce on each other.' The ordinary etymologist takes what is no doubt the easiest course, and in the case of dead languages the only possible one, and begins with the word, not with the sounds which the word symbolises: the value of Prof. Paul's book lies in the skill with which he points out the dangers of this method and insists on the priority of speech to writing. His theory of sound-change (chap. III.)—that a chance deviation from the normal pronunciation led by infinitesimal degrees to a notable difference in the sound, convenience having a slight but quite subordinate effect on the process—is not so convincing as most of his theories: it is too much like the Lucretian idea that the world was formed by atoms falling eternally downwards in straight lines till some of them were accidentally deflected. Is the doctrine of Chance a satisfactory resource?

A remark on p. 400 that 'no doubt the first foundations of word-formation and inflexion came into being by the coalescence of elements originally independent' gives us cause for alarm: are we really to have the 'Agglutination-theory' of Bopp and Schleicher revived with all its absurdities? *Μὴ γένοιτο*: yet even Brugmann believes in a 'Wurzel-periode.' Prof. Paul indeed goes on to say that we

can never tell whether a form has arisen from 'a syntactic word-group' or merely follows the analogy of a form already existing: what need then to assume that the 'syntactic word-group' ever existed, that the termination was ever a separate word at all? Isolated instances in German, or in the outlying members of the Aryan family, Irish and Sanskrit (which from their position would be peculiarly exposed to un-Aryan influences), prove nothing: new words take the ending of some old word, but that old word itself may well have been a unit. That our ancestors ever 'talked in roots' is an idea inconsistent with all we know of the actual history of the Aryan languages.

E. R. WHARTON.

NEUE'S well-known *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* is being published in a third edition by Dr. C. Wagener (Berlin, Calvary), in whose hands the book is undergoing a thorough revision, including a fresh verification of the greater part of the references. Dr. Wagener begins with the second volume (including the adjectives and verbs) and has completed pp. 1-63.

A work of similar scope is the *Lexicon of Latin Word-Forms* by Dr. K. E. GEORGES, in which, however, the words are arranged not in grammatical but in alphabetical order. It is being published by Hahn of Leipzig in *fasciculi*, and is now nearly complete from *A* to *H*. Both books will probably be found indispensable as works of reference.

Quaestiones Ammianae Criticae. Scripsit OTTO GÜNTHER, PH.D. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1888. Mk. 1.60.

THIS pamphlet, the work of a man of sense and learning, will be found useful to students of Ammianus.

H. N.

Cram's Universal Atlas, geographical, astronomical, historical. With statistics, diagrams, and a complete gazetteer of the United States. New York: George F. Cram, 1888.

THIS ambitious work claims attention here only because of the thirty-eight historical maps of the ancient world, on pages 202-222. These maps, the execution of which is exceedingly careless, are in the main copies of inferior originals from various collections. They are of little value to the classical scholar, and at many points will mislead the general reader. Such things as Oystus (Dystus), Gleusis (Eleusis), Anschesinus, Pholecanro, Appolonia, Heracea, Lamsacus, etc., are more amusing than edifying. On the map of 'Athens and its vicinity,' due North of the acropolis there rises to an equal height a huge hill, the westward outlook of which is closed in by mount Lycabettus! The modern maps and the statistical letter-press of the atlas are meritorious and useful; it is unfortunate that the maps of Greece and Rome should be made practically worthless by gross blunders in proof-reading.

J. H. WRIGHT.

OLD LATIN PALIMPSEST OF THE ACTS AND APOCALYPSE:—In the February number of the *Classical Review* (p. 12) I wrote that the continuous text of the Acts in the Paris palimpsest, as far as I knew, had not yet appeared. I ought not to have forgotten that the indefatigable M. Belsheim had included a somewhat rough and hasty reproduction of it in his *Appendix epistolarum Paulinarum ex codice Sangermanensi Petropolitano* (Christiania, 1887). Meanwhile a thoroughly trustworthy edition of the fragments of both Acts and Apocalypse has just been published in pamphlet form under the title *Le palimpseste de Fleury* by M. Samuel Berger, to whose kindness I owe an early copy.

F. J. A. HORT.

LATIN GREEK AND GRAECO-LATIN GLOSSARIES. (*C.R.* No. 22, p. 129).—The gloss *abolit ἐπιθυμεί* I had corrected *avet, βούλεται, ἐπιθυμεί*. Mr. David Cowan, writing to me from Lincoln's Inn, suggests what I have now no doubt is the true reading, *adolet ἐπιθυμῆ*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

ON THE REVIEW OF MR. ARCHER-HIND'S EDITION OF THE *TIMAEUS*.

I SHOULD certainly not have felt called upon to notice a curious piece of eristic signed 'J. Cook Wilson' in the last number of this *Review*, had the writer been content with offering his own opinion, whatever it were, of my work. But he has also freely scattered accusations of dishonesty: and since in civilised society such imputations are not usually made with absolute recklessness, it is possible that some readers, who happen to be unacquainted both with my book and with Mr. Wilson's controversial method, may be led to misapply their indignation. It may therefore be worth while, by exhibiting three or four typical specimens of Mr. Wilson's style, to show what sort of material his *farrago libelli* is composed of: after which I have done with him.

With such portion of Mr. Wilson's remarks as consists of idle invective and unsupported assertion it is needless for me to deal—and

in so saying I have washed my hands of much the greater part of his nine pages: nor do I intend to enter into any controversy with him—ἀξίω ἀμφισβητεῖν μὲν, ἐρίζειν δὲ μῆ. Leaving then the ἀξία or ἀπαξία of my commentary to the judgment of others, I shall confine myself to the following illustrations of our critic's manner, when he adventures to be comparatively definite.

(1) Mr. Wilson (who seems exasperated because I have used the original text, rather than a Latin translation, of a passage in Galen explanatory of 78 B. foll.) has these observations: 'In one place, Plato's theory of respiration, the editor gives the reader the impression that he has done a piece of original and meritorious research by using the Greek of a commentary (Galen's) only known in "a defective Latin translation" when Martin wrote All that he rightly gets out of it, and even the illustra-