AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

When in 1889 I brought out the part of my work containing the account of Noun Morphology, I had in my mind, and partly on paper, a simpler plan for the remainder of the work than that which the reader has before him. I meant it to include the presentation of the forms of declension and conjugation, and little more. In view of the confusion and uncertainty that reigned in this department, where many questions of origin and history seemed utterly unsettled, I then thought it best to restrict the work to these limits; and I only hoped that perhaps after the lapse of years, if a second edition should be called for, the further developement of a science which had already made such rapid progress would have put me in a position to give a practical and useful history of Noun and Verb Inflexion. But in the course of my work I was gradually converted from this pessimism; the difficulties no longer seemed insurmountable; and I at length decided to attempt a more complete account, not merely exhibiting the results of the different developements, but even now as far as possible tracing their course. Thus the work grew; and thus it comes about that the size of the latter part is so greatly out of proportion to that of the former.

In giving up my first plan, I was influenced not a little by my belief, that from a comprehensive work such as this,

a work in which it is sought to present the facts and problems of language in connected form, more might reasonably be expected than what I had at first proposed. A student might fairly ask that the many questions which await an answer should not be simply avoided, but that some honest attempt should be made to advance a step towards their answering. It must surely be useful that he should not only read that which can be called certain, not only be taught well established facts, but that he should at the same time find the various problems and puzzles, with which the study of Indo-Germanic inflexion abounds, at least briefly mentioned and conveniently arranged. So will the scholar guard best against the mistake which not the best scholar is wholly free from, the danger that in trying to bring order and light into his palace of knowledge, he may leave some dark riddle unattempted, and only move it from one corner to another. If amidst these shifting theories I have often taken a decided stand, and declared myself for one or other of them, adding therewithal other and many new views and explanations, I am yet far from believing that I have placed beyond all doubt the view which I have preferred. In these matters to indicate a path for future research or simply to establish a *prima facie* case is far harder than most people think; and many a theory which seemed to be fixt on the firmest foundation and to offer no point to attack, has been broken down in the end. I can only hope that the mistakes which these volumes must inevitably contain, may help to supply the means for their own correction.

A few of my readers perhaps may wonder why certain new and some very recent theories upon Ablaut, proethnic Accent, formation of Roots and Suffixes, and other such matters, have in these last volumes been either altogether disregarded or only just glanced at. A good deal of the most recent work I would indeed have included in this last volume

but that it had to be finished in 1891.¹⁾ In other cases I saw before me hypotheses, which attractive as they are, and fruitful as they may prove to be, at the time of their publication were too slightly worked out by their authors, and had been too little tested to allow of my making them the basis of my own account. In this volume I have practically not touched the newest theories of Ablaut; I confess that I approach the glib and symmetrical systems of Ablaut Series (cp. Bartholomae in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*, xvii 105) with very little confidence, and I must refer to what is said on this matter in Vol. I § 309. Even a question of Verb Morphology so important as the form of proethnic Roots (whether they were monosyllabic or not) I have left on one side; I believe neither the one thing nor the other, but only that in the present state of our knowledge we can know nothing about it. If in spite of this I have used hyphens freely, I would remind the reader that the hyphen means a real point of composition in such words as *Διός-κονροι*, *τοῦ-το*, *ἀνα-βάλλω*, *ἔ-φερον*, but in *ἄγ-ο-μεν* or *φέρ-ο-μεν* it only shows the etymological and morphological likeness of certain elements. And though I now as ever call *-ο-* in *ἄγ-ο-μεν* a suffix, I do not thereby commit myself to the statement that such elements were originally independent words. See I § 14 pp. 16 ff., II § 8 pp. 18 ff.

Whether in all these things I have been so happy as to hit the golden mean, scholars must decide. Bearing in mind

1) Since then I have had to do without any systematic examination and use of the new works which keep streaming in, or my book would never have come to an end. Only now and then have even the more important works been used, such as those of Bartholomae, Bechtel, Buck, Johansson, G. Meyer, Per Persson, von Planta, W. Schulze, Streitberg, and others; Streitberg's work *Zur Germanischen Sprachgeschichte* first reached me (in proof sheets) after my book was in print as far as the Additions and Corrections; in these I was able to make reference to it. However, I was glad to observe that I am in agreement with many others in matters not a few.

the paramount object of this work, I would rather be blamed for giving too little space to the newest speculations than give any reason for the reproach that I have allowed them too much.

A word is necessary as to the principle on which the labours of my fellow-workers have been cited or not cited in the text. Complaints have not been wanting that in giving various theories and views I have not always given the name of him who first suggested them, or mentioned others who before me had thought of much the same thing. My principle has been as a rule not to mention the originator of each view, or all those who *ante me mea scripsere*, except in such cases as Verner's Law, which I mention under his name. My book does not in the least aspire to be a compendious history of the new school of philology, or to display the part each of us has taken in the gathering of the spoil. Where reference is made in the text to the works of other scholars, this is done for practical ends and no other.

In these last two volumes I have had from Thurneysen the same generous and ready help as before in all that refers to Keltic. Here, as before, the reference to his advice in a few special paragraphs does not in any degree express my obligation to his aid. If the treatment of Irish questions (for I have rarely touched on the British dialects) is at all on a level with recent research, and sometimes even carried beyond it, this is due to Thurneysen. But I must again beg that he be not held responsible for any errors I may have made in using his communications, or for anything but the paragraphs in which his own words are given. I have also to thank Hübschmann for a number of communications on Armenian.

In the text a number of corrections (mostly in unimportant details) have been silently made, which I have received from

reviews and from private letters of fellow-scholars,¹⁾ among whom I would specially name Messrs. Conway, Holthausen, Leskien, Leumann, Osthoff, and Rouse. More detailed additions which should bring the first parts of the work up to date, I am obliged to forego, since thanks to the rapid progress of our science, whole paragraphs and pages would have to be remodelled. Naturally enough I am now in a position to improve upon many of the views I formerly express, particularly in the Phonology (Vol. I) published six years ago. Some of these I have expressly corrected, some tacitly. The reader should therefore consult in each case the explanation which I have given latest.

LEIPZIG, July 2. 1892.

K. BRUGMANN.

1) Lith. *galù* ('I can') and the like forms are not misprints or oversights; see I § 26 p. 29. To avoid misunderstanding, I again call attention to the fact that while *for* (Ger. *aus*) denotes a regular phonetic connexion, *instead of* (Ger. *für*), denotes analogical substitution. Thus "*φιλοῦμεν* for *φιλέομεν*", but "Att. *δαίμοσι* instead of pr. Gr. **δαίμα-σι*".