

## V. bei zeit- und zahlangaben:

E. 312, 858.

A. vacat.

Die ergebnisse vorliegender untersuchung sind demnach:

- 1) *se, sêo, þæt* findet sich in *E.* und *A.* syntaktisch vollkommen gleich verwandt, wenngleich numerisch in *E.* etwas überwiegend.
- 2) Letzterer umstand hat seinen grund zum teil in dem behandelten stoffe, zum teil in der reicheren verwendung von relativsätzen in *E.*
- 3) Auch das zusammengesetzte demonstrativ *þes, þeos, þis* ist in beiden gedichten gleich gebraucht.
- 4) Die angestellte vergleichung ergibt nichts, was der annahme, Kynewulf sei auch der verfasser des Andreas, widerspräche.

KOLBERG, Juni 1892.

G. WACK.

## IS 'BOOK' FROM THE LATIN?

The English word 'book', with its cognates, has generally been regarded as a derivative of 'beech'; but it has recently been pointed out (Sievers in Paul's 'Grundriss,' I., 241; Murray in the Oxford Dictionary, the Century copying,) that 'book' is an apparently primitive consonant stem, and 'beech' a derivative *n*-stem; which would make the derivation of the former from the latter impossible. In the fifth edition of his dictionary Kluge comes to the defense of the old theory, cf. Buch, Buchstabe. It would appear that he regards *bōk(j)ōn-*, 'beech', as derived from a primitive noun meaning the same (Stammbildungslehre § 83), and that this primitive noun continued in use as the name for something made of the wood ('buchen-täfelchen zum einritzen von runen'), and so a 'book',—which does not agree with his theory that Gothic *bōka* 'buchstabe' shows, the more original meaning of the word, and that the idea of 'writing, document' only came through the plural by analogy of Lat. *litteræ* to *littera*. There can be no doubt that beech-wood tablets and twigs were early used by the Germans for writing purposes, and that 'book' and 'beech' were from the earliest times associated by those that used the words; and yet we are justified in doubting the kinship of the Gc. conso-

nant stem *bōk-* with the *o*-stem seen in Greek-Latin *fāgos*, 'beech', which would lead us to expect as the primitive of *bōk(j)ōn-*, a *bōkō-* or *bōko-*.

The fact that, as Kluge states, the gender and inflection of the word differ in the various Germanic dialects, should lead us to suspect the word to be an adopted foreign word. Now, we have every reason to believe that, as our ancestors learned writing and got their alphabets from the Romans, they also learned from them the use of writing-tablets. These were employed by the Romans particularly for business and legal documents and for letters. They were called *pugillares*, for the hand; *tabulæ*, *tabellæ*, and *caudices*, or boards; *ceræ*, from the wax surface; *abietes* (pine), *buxa* (box), &c., from the kind of wood. It is but natural to suppose that with the thing the Germans learned the name, and that that one of the various names would have the best chance of becoming established which offered an apparent association with the material of which the thing was made. Lat. *buxum*, popular Lat. *buskō*, would become Gc. *buks(o)*, nt. or m. (Kluge in Paul's 'Grundriss' I, 344). The Germans did not know the box-tree, *buxus*, f., and naturally associated the foreign word *bukso* with the name of the German tree whose wood so closely resembles the box, — the beech-tree, Gc., *bōk(j)ōn-*, and adapted it to that, so that popular Lat. *bukso*, instead of becoming Gc. *buks(o)*, became *bōk-s*, the voiceless *s* of the foreign word, and the juxtaposition of this *s* to the preceding consonant, guiding the word into the consonant declension instead of the *o*-declension, into which *vinum* *vinō* etc.. went. As might be expected, the most primitive recorded meaning of Gc. *bōk-s* is 'writing-tablet' (cf. Heliand 232 ff. and Sievers as above), while it has in Old English just such other meanings as one would expect from the use of writing tablets among the Romans, namely 'deed', 'charter', etc. Gothic *bōka* 'buchstabe' (as well as Gc. *bōkstafo-* itself) we must, then, with Sievers, regard as a derivative of Gc. *bōk-s* 'writing-tablet, book.' And this is only what was to be expected; for the Germans did not become familiar with writing by learning first the ABC, but their first acquaintance was with written communications sent on writing-tablets by the Romans to their chiefs, who had to secure the services of interpreters to explain them. That the plural of *bōk* 'writing-tablet' was

often used in the sense of 'document' or 'book' (Gothic nt. pl. *frabaſihtaþōka*, OHG. *deo buoh*, OE. *bēč*, &c.) is exactly parallel to the use of *tabellæ* in Latin for 'book' or 'writing', and is due to the fact that such a book often consisted of several tablets fastened together.

That *buxum*, in the sense of a writing-tablet made of box-wood (*buxus*), does not occur more frequently in Latin literature, does not argue against its popular use and hence its adoption by a less civilized people; surely the similar use of 'kids' for gloves made of kid is not fairly represented by its occurrence in polite literature.

It is believed that by this interpretation the difficult matter of the declension is made clear, as also the occurrence of the word 'book' in various Ge. dialects as m., f., and nt.; while the traditional association of 'book' and 'beech' is explained.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN. FEB. 24. 1892.

GEORGE HEMPL.

---

<sup>1</sup> When it was later imported from Italy, it brought its Latin name with it, OHG. *buchsbaum*, etc.