
¹ This series SiHoL like the above-introduced ACIL is a newcomer, which will justify us here again in listing the already issued titles:


This readable, well-balanced monograph was produced by the sober hand of a young scholar who is now an assistant professor of German and linguistics at the University of California, Davis. It is a revised version of his 1970 doctoral dissertation written under G. S. Lane, a Tocharian specialist at Chapel Hill to whom this book is dedicated. The above background may have colored his product whether to his advantage or otherwise. To his disadvantage did his unfamiliarity with Sanskrit work (see the list of mistypings below which seem to be attributable to this factor). E. Windisch’s classic works⁴ are not referred to while quotes from this source may of no little interest to readers. Sanskrit, to say the least, was playing the leading role in Indo-European linguistics of the period here treated.

As for the contents, the descriptive title will make it unnecessary to summarize them here. The period concerned is self-evident; indeed its title, descriptive and elongated, itself is somewhat reminiscent of the time in question. Naturally vowels cannot be treated separately from other topics particularly in this era (see J. Schmidt’s speech quoted in p. v and Benware’s own remark in p. vi and the following page.). The author’s thorough, mature knowledge of those linguists and the spiritual background of the period is best illustrated in unusually smooth transition both from section to section and from chapter to chapter.

The reviewer, not being a specialist in history of linguistics, is in no position to voice any critical observation on his carefully documented statement. Hence the following minor points. Most of them are typographical; their emendation will add extra enjoyment to already enjoyable reading:

1. Mistypings:

   - the cover and the flap: "Indo. European" → 'Indo-European'
   - the cover: "beginnings" → 'Beginnings'
   - p. 11, l. 7: "logical" → 'logical'
   - p. 19, l. 4: "Rask, (1787–1832)" → 'Rask (1787–1832)'
   - p. 36, l. 16: "reich. aber" → 'reich, aber'
   - p. 37, l. 19: "noncommittal" → 'noncommittal'
   - p. 46, l. 10: "Deutsche" → 'deutsche'
   - p. 48, l. 2: "pitā" → 'pītā'
   - p. 77, ll. 8 and 20: "(amī)" → '(āmī)'

2. Wrong syllabification:

---

3. Misprinting:
   pp. 58 and 76: the rightmost letters are not clearly printed.
4. Inappropriate term:
   “Zend” in p. 43, l. 13 and p. 63, l. 15 is better replaced by ‘Avestan’. The
   former is a misnomer which has long been out of use.
5. Inconsistencies in glossing:
   p. 48 above “Skt. dāru” and “Gr. παρόις (Skt. parvus)”; Greek and Sanskrit
   words are otherwise invariably glossed. “(Skt. parvus)” is, needless to
   point, is an error for ‘(Lat. parvus)’.
6. Notes on the author’s English style:
   It is a matter of ten-minute practice for a reader to make himself familiar
   with often apparently unnecessarily lengthy sentences, expanded either by
   means of equating a long nominal phrases or by means of relative clauses
   which seem to be only too frequently separated by the commas. The
   following, however, may be considered by the author in terms of stylistic
   change at the time of revision:
   p. 12, l. 5: “Into”—Isn’t ‘In’ a better choice?
   p. 14, l. 11: “As unsatisfactory as”—The first “As” should be left out. Such
   phraseology of around the 17th century or before as this
   is ill-suited for scholarly writing.
   p. 40, l. 2: “principled status”—Instead of “principled” a less idio-
   syncratic word, it seems, is to be sought for.
   p. 42, l. 1: “was”—The grammatical subject of this word is in the
   plural (“The weaknesses”).

Despite these minor flaws Dr. Benware’s 91-page exposition, as a whole,
will prove together with the Delbrück volume a most welcome addition to the
shelves of not only history of linguistics but linguistics in general, for, in his
own wording, “Historical knowledge of one’s own discipline is there to provide
a perspective, not simply to be treated as a subject of antiquarian interest.”
(p. vii) All of us in the same discipline have good reason for congratulating
Dr. Benware on his fair start in the academic career and, moreover, have found
cogent reason to request him to write a companion volume which will deal

---

3) As a word of caution, the below observations are offered by the reviewer without con-
sulting an native speaker. Criticisms to follow, then, may be nothing more than gross
misunderstanding on his side which will betray on the spot his poor English ability.

4) It appears, to non-native English speaker as the present reviewer is, that even restrictive
relative clauses are more than occasionally and accordingly erroneously cut off by the
commas.

5) This main part is followed by appendices of two PIE vowel charts composed by Curtius
and Schleicher, valuable detailed bibliography (pp. 99–121) and index of the authors.
with the subsequent neogrammarian epoch). And the present reviewer, for one, is eager to see how he treats Ferdinand de Saussure, a super-star, in that milieu.
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