



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

G. H. BALG, Ph.D. A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language, with especial reference to English and German. With a preface by Prof. FRANCIS A. MARCH, LL. D. Mayville, Wisconsin, 1887-1889.

The ninth and last part of this work has just appeared, and the author is certainly to be congratulated on the result, taken as a whole. The chief value of the book is undoubtedly to be found in the large mass of materials, assembled in a single handy volume. The meanings of the words are abundantly illustrated: in most of the later articles every occurrence of a given word in the entire literature is noted. What a pity that the author did not, with blind trust in the unequalled value of such collections, make a complete concordance of the entire body of the Gothic literature! He has exhibited sufficient pluck and faithfulness for such a task. The value and permanence of his work would have been thus increased manifold, and he might have made room by reducing the pleasant etymological *causeries*—interesting enough they are, to be sure—without seriously impairing the value of his work.

I agree cordially with Professor March and Dr. Balg, in their prefaces, that Gothic is the fundamental Germanic language, the Sanskrit among them. The phonetics and morphology of either Old High German, or Anglo-Saxon do not present ancient Germanic speech in such limpid perspicuity as Gothic. Gothic is *not* Proto-Germanic any more than Sanskrit is Indo-European, but each stands at the very threshold of the reconstructed period of speech—that period which we designate in the one case by Proto-Germanic, in the other by Indo-European. Thus the value of Gothic radiates in two directions. The student of German speech finds in it more help than in any other dialect, when he grapples with the multiform developments of later Germanic speech; the student of language in any other I. E. domain finds in Gothic on the whole the forms and functions nearest, and most in sympathy with those of his own language.

This pivotal position of Gothic points out a lesson which Teutonic scholars in America should quickly appropriate. It is this, that they cannot stop short at Gothic: they must in a reasonable measure also understand that attraction which constantly brings the student of the remaining I. E. languages over into their domain. We may as well be plain-spoken. In our belief one can no more understand Gothic or Old High German without a knowledge of the more prominent I. E. languages, than one can understand later German forms of speech without a knowledge of Gothic and Old High German. The apparatus of a serious-minded German student is not complete without a correct apprehension of the speech-forms of at least the more prominent I. E. languages, Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. Need we go into details? The writer needs but to refer to *ablaut* and Verner's law, or the I. E. surd and sonant aspirates to indicate his meaning. He is willing to add that he has scarcely met with an instance, in which these phenomena were understood fully, down to the bone, without this background. He begs, therefore, to supplement the remarks of Professor March, by urging upon students of German in the earlier years of their career an acquaintance with the general outline of I. E. speech.

I do not believe that I do Dr. Balg an injustice in pointing out, that the want of just such training, or perhaps rather of a sufficient amount of it, forms one of the most conspicuous defects of his excellent work. Let me dwell upon one example somewhat at length. It is his treatment of the relation of *frathman*

'to ask' to OHG. *forskōn*, NHG. *forschen* 'to inquire' on p. 102. He describes *forskōn* as = **forskhōn*, and explains the root-syllable **forh* as due to metathesis of **frēh* in *frathna*. Neither explanation is correct. There never was a Proto-German **forskhōn*, but only *forskōn* without *h*. This appears clearly, if we compare Latin *pol(y)scō*, Sk. *prchāmi*, Zend *peresa-*. The final *h* of the I. E. root *preh* was lost in front of the inchoative suffix *-sko-* before the separation, before Germanic speech: the 'ground-form' of all these is **prskō*, and this never presented any opportunity to turn a *h* into *k* by Grimm's law. Worse still is the assumption of metathesis in this assumed **forh*. Even from the point of view of German alone one can understand that *forh* is the so-called weak, toneless form to *frēh*, holding to it the same relation as *bud-* in *budum* to *biud-* in *biuda*, as *bund-* in *bundum* to *bind-* in *binda*, as *vairp-* (*vorp-*) in *vairpum* to *vairp-* (*verp-*) in *vairpa*, etc. In just such cases a modest knowledge of comparative grammar has a most clarifying and pervasive influence. *frathna* corresponds well with its strong root-form to Sk. *pragna*, but *forskōn* to Sk. *prchāmi*, and we see here that *or* is the German rendition of the I. E. *ṛ*-vowel, which appears as the Sk. *ṛ*-vowel.

Similar cases are the following: On p. 45a *banja* 'wound' is compared with *φόνος*, a very old comparison, which goes back to Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen*, I¹, 225. But now it is a commonplace of grammar that *φόνος* together with *θείνω* both represent in Greek the I. E. root *ghen* (Sk. *hānmi*, *ghands*), and the initial of such a root must appear in German either as (g)v or g. As a matter of fact Old Norse *gunnr*, Ags. *gūð*, OHG. *gundea* 'slaughter' are the representatives of this root in the German dialects. For *banja* cf. KZ. XXV 171.

The Latin phonetist will scarcely be grateful to our author for imposing upon him the duty of deriving *nūdus* from **nugdus*; the student of I. E. phonetics will find it equally hard to mediate between the *u* in **nugdus*, the *a* of Sk. *nagna-*, and Goth. *naqaps*. See p. 293a. *nūdus* for **no(g)vedos*, like *prūdens* for *providens*, establishes an almost exact equation between the Gothic and the Latin and removes the burden of accounting for the relation of a Latin *ū* to Sk. *a* = Goth. *a* = I. E. *o*.

A few more points of the same sort may be added. On p. 371b *skēwanjān* 'to go, walk' is identified with Greek *σεβεσθαι* and Sk. root *cyu*. But the two last are from an I. E. root *q₁ey₁*, and the assumption of a 'ground-form' *okjeveσθαι* for *σεβεσθαι* is against all known phonetics of the language. On p. 210 *jiuka* 'strife, anger' is compared with *ῥσμίνη* in the face of every chance. *jiuka* surely contains the same root as *juk* 'yoke,' and is therefore to be compared to root *zewj* = I. E. *yeug* with initial spirant *yod*; *ῥσμίνη* with initial rough breathing indicates a totally different root with initial *ḷ* (*i* consonans), I. E. *ḷeudh*. In the Greek index (p. 603) *ῥσμίνη* is referred to *jēr*, an evident misprint. On p. 217b *kilpei* 'womb' is compared with Sk. *jaṭhara*, on p. 229a an attempt is made to identify the same Sk. word with *qipus*, but it appears here in the form *gathāras* (!), with two misprints. The Sk. word cannot be compared with both Gothic words: it is in fact identical with *-qiprs* in *laus-qiprs* 'empty-bellied.'

Dr. Balg does not in his work make pretence of being a Sanskrit scholar; nevertheless the demand is not an unreasonable one that the words of that language be cited correctly, and according to some single method of transcrip-

tion. This is not the case. On p. 193b we have *çvid* 'to be white' for *çvit*; p. 219a *jñu-bād̄h* 'bending the knee,' where the mark *~* designates the palatal quality of the *ñ* and the length of the *ā*. Similarly on p. 223a we have *jānami*: both *ā* and *ā* are simply long *ā*. In *jajnau* the *~* belongs to the *n*: the *a* of the second syllable is at the best entitled to a makron; similarly on p. 324b we have *ṛ-nō-mi* and *ṛ-nvā-mi*. On p. 225a *gāni* for *jāni*; 111b *pra* and *pūrna* for *prā* and *pūrṇa*; p. 16b *ayus* for *āyus*; p. 352b Sk. *syā* for *syā* as the feminine of *syas*. On p. 68a we have *dharshas* 'boldness,' on p. 108b *pruṣvā* 'drop': *śh* in the first and *ṣ* in the second are the same sound. On p. 515a *vāra* 'wish,' on p. 516b *wiras* 'man': the initial sounds of both words are the same. On p. 81a *pīṭṛvya*, on p. 371b *cju*: *y* and *j* in these words are the identical sound. Truly a motley assemblage!

In this connection a few other points may be noted. On p. 87a *plta* instead of *p̄lta* is assumed as the ground-form of Sk. *puṭa*; p. 370a *κοειν* is compared correctly with **skarws*: in the Greek index it appears incorrectly as *κοειν*. The verb *bi-rodjan* 'to murmur' is wanting on p. 54a. I have not been able to find it anywhere in the book. The statement on p. 33a that Goth. *asts* is 'allied to Gr. *ἀστος*' is scarcely strong enough: *ἀστος*, or still more palpably Aeolic *δσδοσ*, is sound for sound equal to *asts*. On p. 334a *ἴημι* is omitted in the etymological discussion of *saian*; on p. 55 under *biuga* the related *φειγω*, *fugio*, Sk. *bhuj* deserve mention, in spite of the difference in the quality of the final consonants.

There is one more serious defect, which we especially entreat the author to correct, in case his work should live to pass through a second edition. I refer to the utter absence of references to etymological literature. Etymology is at the same time the most important and the most difficult member of the sciences, which cluster about the study of language. We realize the difficulty more and more, as the study of comparative grammar becomes older. How many words are there for which two and three different etymologies are now contending, though their derivation seemed forever settled to the generation of grammarians preceding ours! They can be counted by scores and hundreds. The etymologist cannot afford to shoulder the responsibility of deciding, without at least giving his readers an opportunity for overhauling his results by giving short references to the works, in which the word has been discussed. The presence of such references lends permanent value, for instance, to the etymological labors of the late Dr. Vaniček on the field of Greek and Latin etymology, though his personal opinion is often not acceptable. The space consumed by them is comparatively small; their value is paramount. By the way, there is a somewhat pathetic analogy between the authors of the two works, Vaniček and Balg. Vaniček started life as 'kaiserlich-königlich-galizischer Cerngalgefallenverwaltungsconceptspraktikant' (see *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Lateinischen Sprache*², p. iv), and performed a large share of his labors in Neuhaus in Bohemia. Balg has undertaken broad philological operations in Mayville, Wisconsin. The labors of each were carried on in the teeth of adverse circumstances: lack of books, intellectual isolation, etc. The day will never come, when these studies will no longer seem to some minds the most refreshing and sustaining of all mental pursuits.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.