9c9m

B

REPORT

of

COMMITTEE ON THESIS

THE undersigned, acting as a committee of the Graduate School, have read the accompanying thesis submitted by Elsa P. Krauch for the degree of Master of Arts. They approve it as a thesis meeting the requirements of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

F. Klaeber
Chairman

Carl Schlenker

Theo. H. Schroedel

May 27, 1915

The University of Minnesota
College of Science, Literature, and the Arts
Minneapolis

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY

May 29, 1915.

Dean Guy S. Ford,
Graduate School.

Dear Sir:

I beg to hand you the committee reports on the thesis and the examinations of Miss Elsa P. Krauch.

Very truly,

Frederick Klaeber.

The Individuality of Languages Exemplified by an Historical Comparison of German and English.

A Thesis Submitted

to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the

University of Minnesota by

Elsa P. Krauch

in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

May 20, 1913.

MOM
9K86

CONTENTS.

Introduction 1.

I. Sounds 6.

II. Inflection 14.
- a. Nouns 14.
- b. Adjectives 30.
- c. Verbs 34.

III. Syntax 49.

IV. Word Formation 53.

V. Vocabulary 59.

VI. Phraseology 82.

Conclusion 87.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LIBRARY

184941

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Behagel, Otto: Die Deutsche Sprache. Leipzig, 1911.

Bergmann, Karl: Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der deutschen, englischen und französischen Sprache. Dresden und Leipzig, 1912.

Bradley, Henry : The Making of English. London, 1907.

Brandt, H.C.G.: A Grammar of the German Language for High Schools and Colleges. Boston, 1895.

Braune, Wilhelm: Althochdeutsche Grammatik. Halle a. S., 1911.

Bright, James W.: An Anglo-Saxon Reader. New York, 1894.

Curme, George O.:"The Development of the Analytic Genitive in Germanic." Modern Philology, XI,(1913-1914).

Finck, Franz Nikolaus: Der Deutsche Sprachbau als Ausdruck Deutscher Weltanschauung. Marburg, 1899.

Hempl, George: German Orthography and Phonology. Boston, 1897.

Henry, Victor: A Short Comparative Grammar of English and German. London, 1894.

Holthausen, F.: Altsächsiches Elementarbuch. Heidelberg, 1900.

Jespersen, Otto: Progress in Language with special reference to English. New York, 1894.

Lounsbury, T.R.: History of the English Language. New York, 1894.

Marsh, George P.: Lectures on the English Language. New York, 1874.

Münch, W.: "Zur Charakteristik der Englischen Sprache". Die Neueren Sprachen, VII, (1899), 65-96.

Skeat, Walter W.: A Primer of English Etymology. Oxford, 1910.

Sütterlin, L.: Werden und Wesen der Sprache. Leipzig, 1913.

Sweet, Henry: A Primer of Spoken Language. Oxford, 1911.

Sweet, Henry: The History of Language. London, 1908.

Toller, T.N.: History of the English Language. London and New York, 1900.

Weise, O.: Unsere Muttersprache, ihr Werden und Wesen. Leipzig und Berlin, 1909.

Will, Otto: Die Tauglichkeit und die Aussichten der englischen Sprache als Weltsprache vom Standpunkte der Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachstatistik. Breslau Dissertation, 1903.

The Individuality of Languages Exemplified by an Historical Comparison of German and English.

INTRODUCTION.

The printed page can never do justice to the spoken word. There are as many ways of saying "Oh", as there are people, multiplied by all the various thoughts and emotions which might give rise to the utterance. "Oh", she said, as she caught her first glimpse of the Grand Canyon. "Oh", she said, as the hot liquid burned her tongue. She probably said two very different things, and everyone who reads it, knows that, and thinks two very different 'ohs', each pair of which, is undoubtedly quite different from the pair in anyone else's mind. The 'Grand Canyon' oh which you imagine may be as unlike the 'Grand Canyon' oh which is present in my mind as it is from your 'burned tongue' oh.

Thus the same letters do not convey the same meaning to any two people, nor even to the same person

under different conditions. Language portrays not only the individuality of the speaker, but also his mood at a certain definite time.

When people are habitually good-natured, little 'smiling' lines appear at the corners of the mouth, and these remain even when their owners are scolding; the general condition prevails, and is present as the dominant characteristic. It is said that a 'school-madam' who has taught for many years, affects a dictatorial unrelenting manner of speech, which has been demanded by her profession; she says: "I know" and "Do this, please" instead of "I believe" and "Will you please do this?" By these signs shall you know her. It has become a dominant characteristic.

Our manner of speaking then, as our appearance, although naturally widely divergent at different times, is characterized or individualized by that manner which is most frequently adopted; it is more strongly-marked in some people than in others, as, for instance, in the personalities on the stage and in books.

If each of us were to insist upon speaking his own language, were that practically or psychologically

possible, we might have as many languages as there are people. But in order to be mutually understandable, one must adopt common designations for objects or ideas to be discussed; pet expressions have no place in the statement of ideas which are to reach a large number of people. Nor is this a difficult task. It is not only easier to deliberately make use of words prepared for us by others, but it is impossible not to imitate those about us. Even when the rest of the environment remains unchanged, the influence exercised by another person is alone sufficient to change one's own speech habits.

I have read of a group of people being likened to a collection of vari-colored marbles, confined in a box. These, upon being shaken, are brought into contact with each other, and their colors, not being fast, are soon considerably intermingled. So do people adopt habits from each other, and although no two speak exactly alike, there is apparent a general tenor which is characteristic of the group. This is true of the language of a nation. Especially to a foreigner do the general characteristics stand out; the individual colors of the marbles represent

the elements in the physical environment of a nation; the reciprocal effect of the marbles is like that of the individuals upon one another, the resultant 'average' color, like the language of the country.

It, is, then, not impossible to pick out certain 'qualities' of the language of a nation and to say that these are characteristic; nor to trace them through the medium of the language. "Demnach gehen Sprache und Art eines Volkes immer Hand in Hand als rechte Zwillingskinder, die demselben Geist entsprossen sind." (O. Weise, Unsere Muttersprache, p. 37).

A study of the individuality of language, on the basis of an historical investigation, is especially pertinent in the case of the English and the German. These two languages, the greatest ones of the Germanic family, and which are spoken by about two hundred and twenty-five millions of people, have led a separate existence for some fourteen hundred years and can be traced back on literary monuments for some twelve hundred years. Starting from a very similar, if not identical basis, they have gradually but steadily diverged from one other

and each of them has worked out an individual character of its own. It is the purpose of this study to follow up the salient features of these two languages in the light of their historical development. That the vast subject cannot be considered in all its bearings and detailed manifestations, will be readily understood.

A language is composed of words connected in a certain way to give expression to thoughts and feelings. The word, first of all, in its elements and its various forms must be taken into consideration; secondly, the collection of words in the language or the vocabulary in its development and composition; and thirdly, the combination of these words, and their mutual relations, namely phraseology and syntax, demand an examination.

I. SOUNDS.

In listening to a foreign language we are often able to tell what language it is, even if we cannot understand one word of what is being said. For each language has certain predominant characteristics of phonetic structure.

The frequency of either vowel or consonant sounds is very noticeable, and so is the sequence of the latter. A harmonious language has few, but well-differentiated, sounds; an indistinct and monotonous one, many transitional sounds. The reason for this divergence is to be sought for in the organic basis of the language. Sweet says: "Every language has certain general tendencies which control the organic formation of its sounds, constituting what is called its organic basis or basis of articulation". (The History of Language, p. 136 f.).

This organic basis of English has been described as follows.

1. The tongue is flattened, causing a widening of the

vowels; it is also hollowed, which gives rise to a general resonance, especially noticeable in the l.

2. The retraction of the tongue leads to the development of mixed vowels.

3. The neutral position of the lips results in the elimination of front round vowels.

4. Rounded (labial) sounds such as w, uw, in 'who' are formed without any pouting of the lips.

(Sweet, Henry: The History of Language, p. 137).

(Sweet, Henry: A Primer of Spoken English, p. 4).

The organic basis of German has been characterized as follows.

1. The lips are more active in German, in round vowels more rounded, in unrounded vowels opened to a narrow slit (especially noticeable in front vowels.)

2. The tongue is more active, and is kept in a more tense position; it is drawn further back than in English in the formation of back-vowels, and pressed further forward in sounding front-vowels.

3. In making German shut consonants, the parts that meet are more tense, and not as much surface touches,

eliminating that muffled sound, common in English.

4. The tongue touches the teeth in t, d, l, etc., giving these a clearer, more i-like sound.
(Hempl, German Orthography and Phonology, p. 113).

The English and German vowel sounds developed from the same Germanic vowels; a, e, i, o; ū; ā, ǣ, ē, ī, ō, ū; au, ai, eu. In Old English we find the same short vowels as in Germanic, with the addition of the short æ and y besides. Of the diphthongs the ai changed to a, (Got. draif, OE. drāf), the au changed to ēa (Got. ausō, OE. ēare), and the eu to ēo (Got. dius, OE. dēor).

In Old High German the short Germanic vowels are unchanged, and the long vowels became ā, ā, ie, ī, uo, ū, respectively. The diphthong ai became ē or ei according to the vowel in the following syllable (Got. mais, OHG. mēr, Got. hails, OHG. heil); au became ō or ou (Got. rauþs, OHG. rōt, Got. augō, OHG. ouga); eu became io or iu, (liuht, liuhtan). In Middle High German the number of vowels was increased by further umlaut changes.

Certain parallel changes have taken place in English and in German, in German in the transition from

the Middle to the Modern High German period, in English in the late Middle English period. These are the changes from ī to 'ai' (OHG. mīn, MnG. mein, OE. mīn, MnE. mine), from ū to au (OHG. hūs, MnG. Haus, OE. hūs, MnE. house), and the lengthening of the short vowels in the open syllable, affecting in German all the short vowels, and in English only a, e, o. Exx.:

MHG.	MnG.
sagen	sagen
nemen	nehmen
vile	viele
vogel	Vogel
jugent	Jugend

OE.	late ME.
nama	nāme (name)
stelan	stēlen (steal)
open	ōpen (open)

Of notable differences in the vowel system resulting from historical development, the following

should be mentioned. The ü and ǖ have been lost in English and there is a scarcity of the short a sound; there have been developed the ə, æ and the u sounds (e.g., her, hat, but).

In German the rounded vowels ö, ȫ, ü, ǖ are retained, and the short a sound is much more frequently used.

Regarding the vowels in unaccented syllables, it is to be mentioned that the German keeps the quality of all vowels as pronounced in the accented syllable, with the exception of the e, which passes into the neutral vowel ë, whereas in English all unstressed vowels tend towards the neutral sound. Secondly, owing to a somewhat greater levelness of stress accent in German, the final e has in this language been retained in many instances where it was dropped in English. Exx.: Münze, mint; Kirche, church; Pflaume, plum; Almosen, alms.

The respective retention and development of vowels in the two languages is to be explained largely by the peculiarities of the organic basis. For instance, the development of the mixed vowels, ë and u (from short u),

is due to the retraction of the tongue and the unrounding of the lips. This inactivity of the lips accounts also for the loss of ü, ǖ, ö, and ȫ in English, which sounds have been retained in German.

Although the majority of the consonants are said to be pronounced in German as in English, not even those as much alike as the *k* or *d* sounds are really identical. In German the consonants are much more clearly pronounced because of the placing of the tongue further forward in the mouth. The initial *kn*, *ks* and *ts* are lacking in English. On the other hand, we find there such combinations as final *ksts* in *texts* , resulting from the loss of the vowel of unstressed syllables. The *w*, the *wh*, the *ð* and the *þ* are lacking in German; also the *dzh* and *zh* sounds except in foreign words, the former in words derived from the English, and the latter in those taken from the French.

As regards the spelling, it can easily be seen that the German has been by far the more progressive, the English the more conservative language. This conservatism has prevailed, broadly speaking, since Shakspere's time;

in the earlier periods the spelling in English was at least approximately phonetic. An illustration is afforded by the treatment of the older ī, English and German 'ai', e.g. OHG. *tīd*, OE. *tīd*, MnG. *Zeit*, MnE. *tide*. In German the change from ī to ai was recognized by a modification in spelling; in English the old spelling was substantially retained, although the same change in pronunciation had taken place. Thus it has happened that the names of the letters representing the English vowels are different from those used by other peoples.

The pronunciation of the people of London set up a standard to be followed by all those who speak the English language. This centralisation and definiteness of ideal as to what is right, does not exist in German. Local and dialectal differences are still tolerated; it is looked upon as a violation of the rights of personal freedom to dictate to anyone as to how he shall speak; 'Jeder schwätzt wie ihm der Schnabel gewachsen ist.' Although the language of the stage and of the schools is comparatively free from dialectal peculiarities, it does not follow that it is recognized by everyone as the best German;

the standard language is truly a 'Schriftsprache'.

II. INFLECTION.

NOUNS.

We find both in the Old English and in the Old High German a fairly large number of noun classes, four or five cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental), and three genders. The two main divisions of noun declension are distinguished as vocalic (or strong) and consonantal declension, according as the stem ended originally in a vowel or in a consonant. The subdivisions of the former are known as the a (ja, wa), ō, i, and u classes. The most important of the latter is the n- declension, to which Jacob Grimm gave the name of weak declension.

The history of the noun declension in English is marked by a thorough process of simplification, as regards the number of declensions, the number of case forms, and the distinction of gender.

Even in Old English some of the vowel

declensions, namely those of the i- and u- stems, had begun to decline. Accordingly, the main vowel declensions were those of the a- stems (masculine and neuter) and ō- stems (feminine).

The principal paradigms are subjoined.

		Sg.		Pl.
1. Masc.	Sg. N.	stān	Pl.	stānas
	G.	stānes		stāna
	D.	stāne		stānum
	A.	stān		stānas
2. Masc.	Sg. N.	ende	Pl.	endas
	G.	endes		enda
	D.	ende		endum
	A.	ende		endas
3. Neuter.	Sg. N.	hors	Pl.	hors
	G.	horses		horsa
	D.	horse		horsum
	A.	hors		hors

4. Neuter.	Sg. N. scip	Pl. scipu
	G. scipes	scipa
	D. scipe	scipum
	A. scip	scipu

5. Fem.	Sg. N. caru	Pl. cara
	G. care	sara, carena
	D. care	carum
	A. care	cara

6. Fem.	Sg. N. wund	Pl. wunda
	G. wunde	wunda
	D. wunde	wundum
	A. wunde	wunda

7. Weak declension.

7. Masc.	Sg. N. oxa	Pl. oxan
	G. oxan	oxena
	D. oxan	oxum
	A. oxan	oxan

Neuter. Sg.	N. ēage	Pl. ēagan
	G. ēagan	ēagena
	D. ēagan	ēagum
	A. ēage	ēagan

8. Radical consonant or Umalut declension.

Masc. Sg.	N. tōđ	Pl. tēđ
	G. tōđes	tōđa
	D. tēđ	tōđum
	A. tōđ	tēđ

From these examples it can be seen that only in declension 1. did the case-ending of the genitive singular (-es), denote only this case, and the case-ending of the plural nominative and accusative cases (-as), only these cases. In the other declensions there was a much greater chance for ambiguity; for instance, in declension 6. the ending -e might represent either the genitive, dative or accusative singular, or -a the nominative, genitive or accusative plural. Thamks to this advantage, the o- declension survived the others and is, in a modified form, the only living declension in English to-day.

Its development is briefly as follows. The natural leveling of the unaccented vowel sounds to the e sound resulted in the change of (stānas, then) stōnas to stǫnes, so that this latter form came to stand for the genitive singular, the plural nominative and accusative; stāna became stōne; stānum, stōnen. Hence, by the beginning of the ME. period the declension assumed the following shape.

Sg.	N. stǫn	Pl.	stǫnes
	G. stǫnes		stǫne
	D. stǫne		stǫnen
	A. stǫn		stǫnes

In early Middle English the gen. pl. ending ena of the consonant declension, (7.) weakened to ene, was frequently preferred to the ending -a, as being more distinct and unambiguous. On account of its unwieldiness this was dropped, however, and the pl. gen. took the form of the pl. nom. The e of the es ending having disappeared in the following centuries, the form stōnz (spelled stones) came to to be used for the gen. sg. and the pl. nom. gen. and

and acc. These have been retained, undifferentiated in pronunciation, altho we distinguish the genitives in spelling (stone's, stones'). The dative of the sg. naturally dropped the -e ending, and the dat. pl. , by analogy, took the same form as the accusative.

Hence, the modern English type.

Sg. N.	stone	Pl. stones
G.	stone's	stones'
D.	stone	stones
A.	stone	stones

Of the other types of declension, only some relics are preserved. E.g., the unchanged plural forms of the neuters (declension 3.) is to be seen in the plurals of sheep, swine, and deer, and of the weak declension (7.) we still have an example in oxen, whilst the umlaut declension (8.) is continued in foot-feet, tooth-teeth, goose-geese, mouse-mice, man-men, etc.

To an English-speaking person who learns a foreign language which contains 'grammatical' gender, a

great difficulty presents itself; and he is likely to set down the offending grammatical feature as a peculiarity of the particular language he is studying, until he realizes that it is his own language which is unusual in this respect.

For the complete adoption of 'natural' for 'grammatical' gender did not take place until the middle period. Up to the year 1000, 'grammatical' gender was used in English as in other Indo-European languages, but in the course of the next two centuries there was brought about an important change. Owing to the frequent confusion of forms in the Danish part of England, the adjective was no longer declined to show gender or case, and the invariable article <u>the</u> (OE. se, sēo, þæt, etc.) was employed for all cases, genders, and both numbers, just as it is now. As a result, the former genders of the nouns were gradually forgotten, since the principal reminders of the old distinction had been lost. Natural gender, based on sex, took the place of grammatical gender, those nouns which have no relation to sex or may belong to either sex, being assigned to the neuter gender.

An important innovation in the system of declensions in English, is the use of the phrasal or 'of' genitive, as, for instance, 'the hat of the boy' beside the older 'the boy's hat'. The introduction of the former seems to be due chiefly to the example of the French, though the theory of an independent development has been strongly defended. (Curme, "The Development of the Analytic Genitive in Germanic." Modern Philology, XI, 1913, 1914.).

Many nouns adopted from the French continued to form their genitive in English in the same manner as in their own language; that is, by _de_ in French, so by _of_ in English; and later this method was carried over to other nouns as well. Although no rule can be given for a clear differentiation of the meanings of these two modes of expression, yet there is felt to be a difference in emphasis, which could not be conveyed in any other way.

Another development is that of the 'group-genitive'. This device arose from the feeling that the _'s_ signifying the genitive is a separable element, and could therefore be placed after a whole phrase, which describes the possessor in the following substantive.

The phrase is treated as though it were a unit, and the construction, because of its directness and force, is a most useful and fortunate one.

Turning to the history of noun declension in German, we find that a partial simplification occurred in the number of case forms only.

The two main types of the vowel declension are the a- and the i- types. The masculines of these classes are represented by the words 'Tag' and 'Gast'. The words 'Tag' and 'Gast' in the OHG. were declined as follows.

Sg.	N. tag	Pl.	taga
	G. tages		tago
	D. tage		tagum
	A. tag		taga
	I. tagu		

Sg.	N. gast	Pl.	gesti
	G. gastes		gesteo
	D. gaste		gestim
	A. gast		gesti
	I. gasti		

The similarity between these declensions led to a confusion of the two, and many words originally of the 'Tag' type were carried over to the 'Gast' type. For instance, MHG. hof-hove became Hof-Höfe. Some words whose present plural formation causes them to be put into a separate class, formerly belonged to the 'Tag' type, as Eber-Eber, Himmel-Himmel. The former plural termination -e, following an unstressed syllable (er) or (el), was lost. In some cases a further modification of this type has taken place, namely of words capable of umlauting, as 'Vogel' and 'Hammer'. The plurals of these words were formerly 'vogele' and 'hammere'; on account of their positions, these plural endings were lost, and the plural nominative and accusative became identiaal with those of the singular. In order to affect a distinction, a new plural form came to be used, by analogy with the 'Gast' type, Vogel-Vögel, Hammer-Hämmer.

Of the neuter nouns of the strong or vocalic declension we have the OHG. forms:

Sg. N. wort	Pl.	wort
G. wortes		worto
D. worte		wortum
A. wort		wort
I. wortu		

Sg. N. lamb	Pl.	lembir
GG lambes		lembiro
D. lambe		lembirum
A. lamb		lembir
I. lambu		

Of the 'wort'type, the sg. nom. and acc. could not be distinguished from the plural, and therefore, by analogy with the masculine nouns, an -e was added in the plural, as early as the MHG. period. A remnant of the unchanged plural, however, is found in the use of such words as Pfund, Stück, etc. to denote plurality, a use which has been carried over to masculine and feminine nouns as well. Besides the ending -e, that of -er, belonging originally to the 'lamb' type, was frequently added to denote the

neuter plural, so we have Holz-Hölzer, Feld-Felder. A record of the earlier forms is present in place names like Roshaupten and Rheinfeldem (dat. pl.). There are as a result of this, at present cases of doublets (plurals with different meanings): die Bande-die Bänder, die Dinge-die Dinger, die Worte-die Wörter; those forms with the -e ending contain the older meaning of the word, and appear somewhat archaic. Even a few masculines have in the MnG. taken the -er ending by analogy with neuters: der Geist-die Geister, der Mann-die Männer, etc.

The feminine nouns in the modern German fall mainly into two classes forming their plurals in -e or in n or (-en) respectively. The latter is called the weak declension and has developed from two declensions of the OHG., namely the weak (-n) and the ō declensions. The OHG. paradigms were as follows:

The ō declension:

Sg.	N. klaga	Pl. klaga
	G. klaga	klagōno
	D. klagu	klagōn
	A. klaga	klaga

The weak declension:

Sg.	N. zunga	Pl.	zungūn
	G. zungūn		zungōno
	D. zungūn		zungōn
	A. zungūn		zungūn

In the MHG. these have to a great extent, assumed the same forms:

Sg.	N. klage	zunge	Pl.	klage	zungen
	G. klage	zungen		klagen	zungen
	D. klage	zungen		klagen	zungen
	A. klage	zungen		klage	zungen

Later these forms were so united that they constituted one paradigm,in which the singular forms of klage, on account of the more definite differentiation from those of the plural, survived, while the plural forms of zungen took the place of those of klage, which so closely resembled the singular.

Words of other types were later assimilated to this group, which, as it contained the words of two original types, was naturally a large one. Thus masculine

-n roots have passed over to this feminine class, as die Traube for der Trauben or die Backe for der Backen. Furthermore, as there is an identity of form between the plural of the vocalic masculines, die Tage and the singular of the feminines die Klage, some of the vocalic masculines were felt to be singular in form, and gained a new plural, as die Socke (sg.) die Socken (pl.) MHD. sg. der soc; die Woge, die Wogen, MHG. der wac, involving, of course, a change in gender.

The strong feminines with -e endings in the plural have developed from the old i- type of feminines. In OHG. these were declined as follows.

		Sg.	Pl.
Sg.	N.	fard	ferdi
	G.	ferdi	ferdio
	D.	ferdi	ferdium
	A.	fard	ferdi

This type was influenced by one of the minor consonant declensions represented by the OHG. feminine naht.

	Sg.	Pl.
N.	naht	naht
G.	naht	nahto
D.	naht	nahtan
A.	naht	nahtu

By analogy with the sg. gen. and dat. of *naht*, the form *fard* was adopted in the gen. and dat. sg. of the vocalic declension, while the umlauted forms of the '*ferdi*' type effected a change in the plural of the consonant types, resulting in such forms as *Nächte.*

Development of the masculine of the weak declension. The OHG. declension:

	Sg.	Pl.
N.	hano	hanon
G.	hanen	hanōno
D.	hanen	hanōm
A.	hanon	hanon

The endings were eventually leveled to an -*en*, resulting in the declension of such words as *Knabe*, *Affe*, G*efährte*, etc.

In other nouns, the *e* of the singular nominative has been dropped owing to specific phonetic conditions,

e.g. in Graf, Herr, Fürst, MHG. herre (OHG. hērro), grāve, fürste; these words show the consonant declension in all the oblique cases, however. In another group containing der Adler, der Herzog, der Mond, etc. the transition to the Tag type has been complete. In certain other words an -n or -en was added in the nom. sg. and an -s in the gen. sg. This n is the result of analogy with other cases. Exx.: Daumen, Garten, Balken. Sometimes a duality of forms has arisen in this way, and we find pairs of words like: der Tropf, der Tropfen, der Lump, der Lumpen, the older form (lacking the n), generally denoting persons or animals. The differentiation is evidently due to the fact that nouns denoting living beings are frequently used in the nominative case, as the subject of a sentence, and in the singular, and accordingly have been able to resist an analogical change to the -en form.

It will be seen from this brief survey that the modern German not only retains the threefold gender

distinction, but has a variety of declension types practically as complicated as those found in the old period.

ADJECTIVES.

In Old English as in Old High German the adjective shows the full declension of the three genders both of the strong (or indefinite) and the weak (or definite) type.

In modern English it is not declined at all; one invariable form is used irrespective of grammatical position, gender, case, or number. The loss of inflection arose from a confusion of endings resulting from the mixture of peoples speaking languages much alike. The co-existence of the different dialects of the English themselves, and the introduction of the Danish language into the country led to an uncertainty of inflectional endings, which eventually brought about their entire loss. At the time of the Norman Conquest, monks unfamiliar with the language came to England, and through them the fluctuating

inflections of the spoken language began to be carried over to the written words as well, and the simplified endings gained a recognized place in the speech of the people.

In German the adjective is still declined, and has six forms. When no article or demonstrative precedes the adjective, it follows the strong or pronominal declension, which has been derived from the corresponding OHG. declension.

Sg.	Masc.	Fem.	Neuter	Pl. Masc., Fem., Neuter.
N.	guter	gute	gutes	gute
G.	gutes	guter	gutes	guter
D.	gutem	guter	gutem	guten
A.	guten	gute	gutes	gute

When the adjective is preceded by an article or a demonstrative pronoun, it is declined like the weak or 'consonant stem' nouns, namely:

Sg.	Masc.	Fem.	Neuter.	Pl. Masc.,Fem.,Neuter
N.	gute	gute	gute	guten
G.	guten	guten	guten	guten
D.	guten	guten	guten	guten
A.	guten	gute	gute	guten

The masculine forms agree fully with the endings of the consonant nouns.

N.	der Knabe	gute
G.	des Knaben	guten
D.	dem Knaben	guten
A.	den Knaben	guten

In the feminine and neuter genitive and dative we find that the old forms of the consonant declension, which have been changed in the noun, have been retained in the adjective:

	modern	old form	adj.
Neuter.	N. das Auge	daz ouge	gute
	G. des Auges	des ougen	guten
	D. dem Auge	dem ougen	guten
	A. das Auge	daz ouge	gute

	modern	old form	adj.
Fem.	N. die Zunge	die zunge	gute
	G. der Zunge	der zungen	guten
	D. der Zunge	der zungen	guten
	A. die Zunge	die zunge	gute

The plural endings show exactly the same development as the plural forms of the nouns, as die Knaben, die Zungen, die Augen, so guten.

Masc.	Fem.	Neuter	adj.
N. die Knaben	die Zungen	die Augen	guten
G. der Knaben	der Zungen	der Augen	guten
D. den Knaben	den Zungen	den Augen	guten
A. die Knaben	die Zungen	die Augen	guten

VERBS.

In all Germanic languages, the verb had the following forms:

1. Two leading conjugations, strong and weak.
2. One voice, active; with some traces of the passive.
3. Three finite modes, indicative, subjunctive, imperative.
4. Infinitive; an active and a passive participle.
5. Two simple tenses, present and past.
6. Two numbers, singular and plural; with traces (in Gothic) of the dual.
7. Three persons, first, second and third.

The two conjugations were the

A. Old (Strong) a. ablaut verbs. b. reduplicating verbs.

B. New (Weak).

These two conjugations were distinguished by an addition or non-addition of a dental suffix (da, ta) to the root to form the preterit tense of the verb: kill-killed, love-loved, think-thought; lieben-liebte, schenken-schenkte. In the case of verbs which did not take a suffix to form the

preterit tense, there occurred a vowel change; this has commonly come to be regarded as an unfailing sign of the 'old' or 'strong' conjugation, but falsely, since it is found as a result of umlaut in 'new' or 'weak' verbs as well, in conjunction with the dental element. Anglo-Saxon, sellan-pret. sealde, modern English sell-sold; German denken-dachte.

A general change found both in English and in German is the transition of many strong verbs, by analogy, to the weak conjugation. E.g., English, seethe, creep, weep, wash; German walten, ziemen, kauen, waten. Occasionally, though, the opposite change has occurred , as in English wear, dig, German preisen, schweigen. A mixture of strong and weak conjugation has resulted by such analogical process in cases like English hide, show, German salzen, spalten.

The English Verb.

The development of the verb forms will be illustrated by the verb sing, Old English singan, a strong ablaut verb. In Old English the present indicative was:

Sing. 1. singe	Pl. 1-3. singað
2. singest	
3. singeð	

The Middle English forms were:

	Southern	Midland	Northern	
Sing. 1.	sing-e	sing-e	sing	sing-e(s)
2.	sing-est	sing-est	sing-es	sing-s
3.	sing-eth	sing-eth	sing-es	sing-es
Pl. 1-3.	sing-eth	sing-en	sing	sing-es

The modern forms are:

Sing. 1. sing	Pl. 1-3. sing
2. (singest)	
3. sings (singeth)	

The modern paradigm, it appears, is partly based on the Midland, and partly on the Northern forms. The singular forms sing, singest, singeth go back regularly to the Midland dialect; also the plural sing represents the normal development of the Midland form singen, which lost

first the n and then the e. But the usual third person singular sings was introduced from the North; it practically crowded out the Midland singeth, which became restricted to biblical, archaic and poetical language. The form singest likewise was supplanted, to all intents and purposes, by the second person plural: you sing.

The forms of the subjunctive, Old English singe (sing), singen (plural) became, by the regular change, Modern English sing. The preterit indicative was in OE.:

Sing. 1. sang Pl. 1-3. sung-on

2. sung-e

3. sang

It is in Modern English:

Sing.: 1. sang Pl. 1-3. sang

2. (sangest)

3. sang

The vowel of the 2nd person sg. came to be changed by analogy with the 1st and 3rd persons to a, and the pl. was naturally shortened to sunge and from this to sung. The difference of vowel in sg. and pl. preterit existed for a

considerable time, but was later leveled to the sg. a in both numbers.

In some cases, the pl. vowel triumphed over the sg., as in the case of bit, whose sg. form bāt would normally be represented by bote in modern English, (OE. sg. bāt, pl. biton), as AS. wrāt is by wrote, the pl. vowel here having been changed through the influence of the sg. (OE. sg. wrāt, pl. writon).

The German Verb.

The development of the conjugation of the verb in German is shown by the following paradigms of the OHG., the MHG. and the MnHG. periods:

Indicative Present.

OHG.	MHG.	MnHG.
Sing.1. nimu	nime	nehme
2. mimis	nimest	nimmst
3. mimit	nimet	nimmt
Pl.1. nëmumēs -amēs,-emēs	nemen	nehmen
2. nēmet (nëmat)	nimet	nehmt
3. nëmant	nëment	nehmen

Preterit Indicative.

OHG.		MHG.	MnHG.
Sing. 1,3.	nam	nam	nahm
2.	nāmi	nāme	nahmst
Pl. 1.	nāmum (umēs)	nāmen	nahmen
2.	nāmut	nāmet	nahmt
3.	nāmun	nāmen	nahmen

Present Subjunctive.

Sing. 1,3.	nëme	nëme	nehme
2.	nëmēs	nëmest	nehmest
Pl. 1, 3.	nëmēm (amēs,-emēs)	nëmen	nehmen
2.	nëmēt	nëmet	nehmet

Preterit Subjunctive.

Sing. 1,3.	nāmi	næme	nähme
2.	nāmīs	næmest	nähmest
Pl. 1.	nāmim(ēs)	næmen	nähmen
2.	nāmīt	næmet	nähmet
3.	nāmīn	næmen	nähmen

	OHG.	MHG.	MnHG.
Infinitives.			
	nĕman	nĕmen	nehmen
Participles.			
Present.	nĕmanti	nĕmende	nehmend
Past.	ginoman	genomen	genommen
Imperative Mode.			
Sing. 2.	nim	nim	nimm
Pl. 1.	nĕman (ēs)	nĕmen	
2.	nĕmet	nĕmet	nehmt
			2. (polite form) nehmen Sie

These paradigms show that the development of forms involves the regular change by the weakening of endings. In addition, analogical leveling of forms has affected the first person sg. of the present indicative, which has adopted the vowel of the plural. Similarly, in the preterit indicative, the sg. and pl. took the same vowel, just as in English.

The present verbal system has, in the case

of a weak verb thirteen, and in the case of a strong verb, either sixteen or seventeen different forms.

A juxtaposition of a German and an English paradigm will bring out the differance in the number of forms in the two languages.

Present Indicative.

	German.	English.
Sing.	1. singe (1)	sing(1)
	2. singst (2)	singest (2)
	3. singt (3)	sings (singeth) (3,4)
Pl.	1. singen (4)	sing
	2. singt	sing
	3. singen	sing

Present Subjunctive.

	German	English
Sing.	1. singe	sing
	2. singest (5)	singest
	3. singet (6)	sing
Pl.	1. singen	sing
	2. singet	sing
	3. singen	sing

Preterit Indicative.

German.			English.
Sing.	1.	sang (7)	sang (5)
	2.	sangst (8)	sangest (6)
	3.	sang	sang
Pl.	1.	sangen (9)	sang
	2.	sangt (10)	sang
	3.	sangen	sang

Preterit Subjunctive.

Sing.	1.	säange (11)	sang
	2.	säangest (12)	sangest
	3.	säange	sang
Pl. 1	1.	säangen (13)	sang
	2.	säanget (14)	sang
	3.	säangen	sang

Imperative Mode.

Sing.	2.	singe	sing
Pl.	2.	singt	sing
	2.	(polite form) Singen Sie	

Infinitives.

German.	English.
singen	to sing

Participles.

	German	English
Present.	singend (15)	singing (7)
Past.	gesungen (16)	sung (8)

In the case of a verb like 'nehmen' in which the 2nd and 3rd persons of the present sg. have a different vowel from the 1st person and therefore the 3rd person sg. differs from the 2nd person pl., the number of forms in German is seventeen; in a weak verb, in which the vowel of the preterit is the same as that of the present tense, the number is thirteen.

The Formation of Periphrastic Tenses.

There was no distinctive manner of expressing the future in Germanic; when a future idea was to be denoted in Anglo-Saxon, an auxiliary was employed suggesting obligation(sceal) or a wish (wille). Later these same terms were used with simply as neutral sense of future time, and

the older definite meanings of the auxiliaries were forgotten; finally the differentiaion between 'shall' and 'will' was worked out, and their respective uses, as a means of implying a simple future idea, or of showing determination, became capable of being stated in definite rules. The German verb <u>werden</u> was assigned the role of expressing the future tense.

An interesting difference between German and English is seen in the formation of the perfect tenses. While the German employs the auxiliary 'have' with certain verbs, and 'be' with others, the English uses the former exclusively, although traces of an earlier difference are noticeable in such expressions as 'he is come'. The loss of the verb 'to be' in this connection, is due to the use of the same verb in the formation of the passive voice and the confusion arising as a result. This is avoided in German by forming the passive with 'werden', which desirable auxiliary has been lost in English.

Summary.

The chief difference between German and English inflection is seen to be the much more thorough simplification of the latter, which is due in great part to the external history of the language. In the first place, the close contact between the English and the Danish in late Anglo-Saxon times, and secondly, the strong influence of Norman French in the early Middle English period may be considered mainly responsible for the paucity of inflectional forms in the present English.

In the province of English nouns, we have only one living type of declension. This has in the singular the common case, and the genitive in '<u>s</u>; in the plural the <u>s</u> in the common case, and <u>s</u>' in the genitive. There is a slight differentiation in the spelling of the genitives and the plural common case, but this is not observed in speaking. There is no longer any 'grammatical gender', a result,outwardly, at least, of the loss of inflection. As Münch says, "Man wird glauben dürfen, dass der starke willensbewusstsein und persönliche kraftgefühl

in der englischen rasse mitwirkte, um jedes nicht persönliche gegenüber alsbald als blosses objekt empfinden zu lassen." ("Zur Charakteristik" etc. , p. 86 f.).

Although the loss of noun inflection in English is generally regarded as an unmixed advantage, it has an undesirable influence on sentence-structure in that it demands a very rigid word-order. In poetry, where this is often impossible, it frequently gives rise to confusion, as to which word is subject and which object. This drawback is still further accentuated by the formal identity of many nouns and verbs, like make, call, wire, reply, etc.

The German is not entirely free from ambiguities of this kind. Indeed, the very fact that the German word-order is not fixed, coupled with the identity of forms in certain cases, (e.g., of feminine nouns) sometimes leads to a difficulty in understanding what is meant. This is especially true in relative clauses, such as, Die Feinde, die unsere Truppen besiegt haben. The number of cases in which this might occur, however, are not sufficiently great to over-balance the advantage gained by a free word-order.

The adjective in English has only one form and is in no position declined. In German there are two distinct declensions, with forms varying with gender, number, and case. Besides this, we have the predicative adjective, which is never declined. The same freedom of position which was noted in the case of the noun, is possible in German in the case of the adjective.

The conjugation of the verb in English shows eight different forms, of which, however, not more than five can really be considered 'living', the forms singest, singeth, and sangest, being used almost exclusively in poetry or archaic language. The German, on the other hand, has thirteen forms in the weak verbs, and either sixteen or seventeen in the strong verbs.

The subjunctive mode, which gives rise to many additional forms in the German verb, has almost completely disappeared in English. This is indeed one of the greatest losses English grammar has suffered. The only formal trace of the subjunctive is now found in the verb 'to be' (if you were) and the absence of the final s in the third person

singular; and even these distinctions are beginning to disappear, so that expressions like 'if you was' may be heard quite frequently.

There has developed in English a very definite distinction between the past and perfect tenses, the former being used when an action is represented as going on in the past, and latter with referance to an action finished in the present. In the German these two tenses are used somewhat interchangeably, and in some dialects one of the two forms is employed exclusively, to express both ideas. In south Germany, for instance, the past tense is almost unknown in colloquial speech. This shows the needlessness of two tenses, whose respective uses are so sharply marked in English.

III. SYNTAX.

It is not possible to separate a consideration of syntax from a study of inflection. It is the degree of the loss or retention of the latter in a language which determines the possibility of a free word-order.

So in the English, with the loss of case-endings we have been forced to place the subject and object of a sentence in their prescribed positions in order to avoid ambiguity. It is this fixity of sentence structure, and the sacrificing of every other grammatical or logical rule for the sake of conciseness and directness of expression, which constitute the leading principles of English syntax.

Two very convenient and time saving devices adopted from Latin into English are the use of the absolute and appositive participles. Exx.: The child having entered the house, the woman went on. Taking his hat, the man left. The use of personal instead of impersonal verbs mentioned in the consideration of phraseology shows the desire for directness which accompanies the inclination toward brevity.

The omission of the relative pronoun without any further change in the sentence is a true gain, for the meaning is quite as clear as before. Here should be mentioned also the use of intransitive as transitive verbs (to fly a kite), and of transitive as intransitive (the dress wears well), the interchangeability of nouns and verbs (name, make, etc.), the attributive use of the substantive, that is of the noun used in the function of an adjective,(as 'a wool dress'), the use of adjectives as substantives, (as 'greens' for 'green vegetables'). The ease with which a word-form can be transferred from one grammatical category to another, shows the subordination of all other considerations to that of practical expediency in English.

Progression and emphasis denoted by the present and past tenses of 'be' and 'do' with the present participle of the verb are useful but scarcely necessary distinctions. The same might be said of the differentiation in the use of 'shall' and 'will'; the puzzling and complicated rules governing these uses certainly are not compensated for by the distinctions of meaning gained which are

clearly enough expressed in German by much easier means. The use of 'do' in negative and interrogative sentences is also unnecessary and confusing.

In German the tendency is consistently toward conservatism. This is seen in the retention of impersonal verbs, even when the personal verb corresponding to it is also used, e. g. es verlangt mich, ich verlange; es reut mich, ich bereue. It appears clearly in the retention of the old inflection, which permits the free word-order.

The inverted order of words, when the sentence begins with part of the predicate, is a disadvantage, as is also the use of the relative 'welche' with a following noun, and especially the crowding of subordinate clauses into one main clause, causing a most undesirable complexity in the sentence. These two last features are unfortunate imitations of Latin sentence-structure.

We find in the English then: rigidity of expression, directness and conciseness, but not entire freedom from unnecessary encumbrances; in German, a word-order which the retention of inflections has allowed great freedom; retention of disadvantages which English with more

regard for practical needs has discarded; a strong inclination toward Latin construction, at least so far as formal or 'bookish' prose is concerned.

IV. WORD-FORMATION.

Word-composition, though inherited from the Indo-European, is especially characteristic of the Germanic group of languages, as compared with the Romance group.

The relation between the elements of a compound word may be of various kinds. Generally speaking, the second element names the group or genus, which is specified by the first element. E.g. birdcage.

In the Indo-European the first element consisted of the stem of a word without any inflectional ending; so the particular syntactical relationship to be expressed was determined by the sense. We no longer recognize the 'stem' in English, for it does not differ from the 'common case' of a noun, but we realize that a compound word may express one of many syntactical relationships. A compound of this sort is a 'proper' compound.

There are other compounds, consisting of words which through frequent juxtaposition have been united with the traces of their syntactical relation retained. Exx. bird's-nest, father-in-law. These are called 'spurious' or 'improper' compounds.

There was a much greater number of compounds

in Old English than there is in the present language. This is partly due to the great influence of Italic (Latin and French) languages on our tongue, in which languages we find little composition. Besides, many compounds formerly existing in English were replaced by Italic, especially French synonyms. Thus, both indirectly and directly, the number of compounds was reduced.

This readiness to do away with compounds can be traced in part to the English love of conciseness, noticeable in every phase of the language. Besides this, it is often difficult to loose consciousness of the separate meanings of the respective parts of a compound to a sufficient extent to grasp the entire word as a unit in itself. To the English mind, a foreign word, having no associations other than those contained in the word itself, was more satisfactory, because more accurate and definite in meaning.

The German, on the other hand, has not only kept its old power of forming compounds, but has even increased their number in recent years, in consequence of the agitation for the 'purification' of the language.

Such words appeal more to the sense, to the imagination.

Of the compounds in present English, many have been retained because a phonetic change obscured the original form of their elements to such an extent that these are no longer discernible, as daisy (day's eye), gospel, hustings. They are, in fact, compounds only in an historical sense.

In English, then, a compound must not be felt to be such; one single unit of thought, standing definitely and accurately for one conception, is the ideal. In the German, connections and relationships between thoughts and sensations are expressed, and words suggesting the carrying over of impressions from one realm of thought to another are felt to be the most successful conveyors of ideas.

Composition is the joining of two elements, each of which has a separate meaning of its own; derivation is the joining of two elements only one of which is valid if it stands alone; the other, the affix, has a meaning only when it is joined to another word.

All such affixes had at one time a definite individual meaning, although it is sometimes impossible to tell just what this was; in some cases words which were formed as compounds are now regarded as derivatives, because one of the elements comprising it has been reduced to an affix and is constantly used as such. Ex. wisdom.

We find in English affixes which are Germanic, Italic or Greek in their origin. Foreign suffixes have been introduced because they provided a concise means of expressing what had been expressed by a long phrase; sometimes a German affix was supplanted by a foreign one.

It became at any rate possible to use any affix in any way which considerations made seem advisable; no instinctive feeling against the formation of hybrids was strong enough to counteract the desire for conciseness and exactness. Thus we have words like, joyful, cordially, troublesome, in which the affix is Germanic and the stem French; endear, laughable, dislike, where the affix is Romance, and the stem Germanic.

A number of Germanic prefixes and suffixes are

still common to the English and German. Thus, the prefixes un- (uneven, uneben), be- (besiege, befähigen); the suffixes -er (fisher, Fischer), -ung, -ing (writing, Führung), -dom, -tum (wisdom, Irrtum), -hood, German, heit, keit (manhood, Freiheit, Heiligkeit), -kin (from the Dutch), German -chen, (mannikin, Mädchen), -ly, -lich (manly, männlich), -less, -los (joyless, freudlos).

Various useful affixes have been entirely lost in English, notably the prefixes ge-, ur-, zer. The commonest of these, ge-, was used in Old English as in German both with nouns and verbs. As a nounal prefix it had a collective meaning, e.g. OE. gelīc, Ger. gleich, OE. gefēra, gewǣde, Ger. Gebirge, Gefilde. As a verbal prefix it expressed the obtaining of some end by means of the action named by the simple verb; thus, OE. winnan, to strive, OE. gewinnan, Ger. gewinnen, to obtain by striving. Hence it became customary to use it with the past participles of verbs, as is still done in modern German. Otherwise the prefix er has to some extent taken the place of the former perfective ge- in German, e.g. erschlagen, erschiessen.

Greatly reduced is the number of English verbs formed with the prefix for- (forget, forbear, forswear, forsake, for(e)go), whereas the corresponding German ver- is still in full use. It has commonly a pejorative meaning, as in verbrauchen, verlieren (OE. forlēosan), but sometimes changes an intransitive into an active verb as in verdienen (dienen).

The number of foreign affixes in modern English is quite considerable. Note the prefixes, en, in, dis, anti, pro, post, inter, sub, prae, non; the suffixes ation, al, ize, ist, ism, ite, let, (diminutive). Many of these may be used in German as well, yet they are not felt to be naturalized, and are still looked upon as exotic elements.

V. VOCABULARY.

Grammatical and lexical similarity are the criteria used in determining the relationship between two languages. The latter demands a manifold consideration. First we must decide whether the similarity is based upon direct relationship (English and German), or upon contact (English and French).

In the latter case we must also ask whether the contact is geographical, that is due to a direct mixture of two peoples, as happened with the Danish and English, or the Normans and English; or whether there has been merely a cultural influence, as exemplified by the influence of Latin upon both English and German at the time of the Renaissance. The time of adoption is also to be considered, for words taken into the language at an early period have become more naturalized than those more recently introduced.

The class of people first influenced by the foreign language is also of importance. Where direct contact has taken place, this is more likely to be the middle and lower classes, in cultural contact, the highly educa-

ted people. In the first case, the words adopted are those of every-day life; as the class which uses them is not familiar with the language from which the words are taken, these are quickly naturalized and become part of the language. Words adopted by people of the higher classes are often used only in a special or technical vocabulary, as is the case with so many Greek derivatives in English; these are not entirely anglicized, do not form part of the common vocabulary, and are still felt to be rather foreign. Many French words adopted into German at all times later than the very early period, have persistently remained more or less French in form, since they were used primarily by people who could speak French and who took pride in pronouncing their words as correctly as possible. When a French word once found its way into the vocabulary of the common people, it very soon became Germanized and sometimes so in a very amusing way.

It is not fair to judge the weight of a foreign influence on the vocabulary by the percentage of the total number of words contained in any dictionary. The kind of words in question, and the frequency of their use in the

speech of the greatest number of people should be considered of more importance.

For instance, a doctor or chemist may have much occasion to use words of Greek or Romance origin; yet these words may be practically unknown to almost every other class of people; they are not part of the general vocabulary.

This must be remembered in connection with the number of foreign words in English. We find many words in the dictionary which are used but seldom, and by a very small percentage of English-speaking people; on the other hand, the 'form-words', the most frequently used of all, are almost exclusively of Anglo-Saxon lineage.

The most characteristic thing about the English vocabulary is its bi-linguality. Words of both Germanic and Romance or Latin origin seem equally 'natural', and to form a new word from a Latin one is a more frequent and facile process than to coin a compound from already existing material. As Bradley says: "It has come to be felt that every Latin word . . . . is potentially English." (_The Making of English_, p. 94). The difference between native

and foreign words is keenly felt in German, in which only those words that were introduced from another tongue at an early period, are considered to be properly a part of the vocabulary.

Since the foreign element in the vocabulary of a language may be the result of direct contact of two peoples, or of an indirect cultural influence, the external history of a nation must necessarily have a most determining influence on this question. It is to this that we look for an explanation of the double vocabulary of English, and its remarkable power of anglicizing Latin words.

By contact with the Romans on the continent the Anglo-Saxon tribes had already borrowed some expressions from them, and brought the words street, mile, silk, mint, butter, pepper, cheese, pound, inch, kettle; crisp, short, with them to Britain. The name of one of the days of the week Satur-day was also adopted from the Latin at this time.

Only a few Celtic words were taken into English in Anglo-Saxon times, such as down, dun, bin. Considerably greater, though on the whole not very large, is the number of those adopted later, words like clan, brogue, shamrock,

fun, Tory, whiskey, crag, glen, etc., or names of places: Aberdeen, Invermass, Caerleon, Cardiff, etc.

With the introduction of Christianity among the English, a great impulse for the adoption of Latin words was given to the language; hundreds of words were thus added to the English vocabulary. Of such words relating to the church we may note as samples: pope, bishop, priest, church, creed, monk, nun, devil. Words relating to everyday life adopted at this time may be exemplified by cook, kitchen, pea, pear, plum, dish, cup, mill, pit. A number of these early Latin loan-words are ultimately of Greek origin.

In the ninth and tenth centuries occurred the Danish invasions of England, and the Scandinavians became most powerful in England. Their settlement on the island could not fail to have a great effect on the language,--a language so like their own that it presented but little difficulty to the new-comers. It was just this similarity that caused the forms of the two languages to become confused, and thereby was instrumental in bringing about the

loss of inflections mentioned in the consideration of that subject. Many very important words also were introduced from the Scandinavian, e.g., *fellow*, *call*, *crave*, *cur*, *haven*, *die*, *doze*, *fro*, *fluster*, *glimpse*, *hurry*, *window*, *scoop*, *law*, *low*, *scrap*, *scream*, *skin*, *egg*, *leg*, *keg*, *kid*, *bask*, *husband*. The manner of their introduction accounts for the fact that most of the Scandinavian elements belong to the indispensable, every-day vocabulary of common speech. Even some grammatical forms in common use have been adopted from the Scandinavian, namely certain pronominal forms. There had arisen in Middle English a confusion of the masculine nominative hē, the feminine nominative hēo, hīe, hī, and the plural nominative hīe, hī, all of which were changed in southern Middle English to one form, *he*. And similarly, the genitive and dative singular *hire* and plural genitive *heora*, were both developed to *here*. Because of the ambiguity arising therefrom, the Scandinavian forms were introduced into Danish England, and in course of time the pronouns *she*, *they*, *them*, and *their* were firmly established in the standard language.

With the reign of Edward the Confessor comes the beginning of the most important lexical influence in England. Through his relations with the Norman court, Norman came to be known in England, and when in 1066 the conquest of England by the Normans took place, that language was no longer a strange one to the conquered people. French was made the language of the court and nobility, of the school, the Church, and the law-courts. The coming of Norman merchants also brought the language into use in the commercial world. The influence, not very great in the first century after the Conquest, grew steadily greater up to the fifteenth century, when it again began to dwindle. The conquering of Normandy by Philipp August of France led to an estrangement of the Anglo-Normans from their brothers on the continent, and a closer relationship with the Anglo-Saxons on the island. They learned the English language, and finally it was the Anglo-Saxon which carried off the victory in the struggle of the two languages. The vocabulary had been greatly modified, however; the bi-lingual language was in existence.

In the 14th and 15th centuries there occurred borrowings from the central or Parisian French, traceable for example in the writings of Chaucer, Lydgate, Caxton, and their contemporaries.

In modern times, especially at the end of the seventeenth century, French exercised a great influence on the literary language of England, on account of the general interest in French literature. This may be called an instance of 'cultural contact' in comparison with the direct contact resulting from the Norman Conquest. The words introduced at this time are still more or less French in form and pronunciation and can thereby be separated from those adopted at an early period when the French was pronounced differently. Ex. chandler (from Anglo-French), chandelier (from modern French).

A table of statistics (is Bergmann's *Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen*, etc., p. 59) showing the comparative number of words introduced from the French during each half century from 1050 to 1900, presents some interesting results. Before 1151-1200 the number was very small,

after which it increased rapidly, (1201-1250, 64; 1251-1300, 27) reaching its highest point in 1351-1400 (1351-1400, 180). Again it diminished (1401-1450, 70; 1451-1500, 76) rising somewhat in 1551-1600 (1551-1600, 91) (literary influence) and from 1851-1900 (1851-1900, 2) was again no higher than it had been before 1050.

Bergmann has also arranged lists of representative loan-words in groups determined by meaning.

Law, justice: jury, judge, verdict, plead, award, prison, jail, heir, guarantee, etc.

Government: crown, state, people, nation, government, parliament.

Church: religion, service, pray, dean, cloister, friar.

Titles of nobility: prince, peer, duke, baron.

Family: consort, spouse, niece, uncle, aunt, parents, fits (Fitzgerald).

War: soldier, sentinel, combat, siege, sally, scout, moat.

Chase: chase, terrier, fawn, ferret.

Expression of joy: disport, (sport), rejoice, joy, jolly, gay, enchant, charm, jest, leisure.

Cooking: roast, fry, boil, hash, lard, bacon, leaven, vinegar, juice, fritter, batter, beef, veal, mutton, sausage, dinner, supper.

Clothing: garment, mantle, cloak, boot, trousers, kerchief, pocket, apron, serge, gimp.

Vocational Expressions: grange, grain, pasture, manger, usury, bale, butcher, carpenter, miner, grocer, surgeon, usher, merchant, lever, chisel, scissors, gimlet, jar, bottle, bowl, mirror, tube, aisle, tower, garret, joist, sash, gargoyle, chimney, remedy, fever.

Terms denoting human characteristics: lazy, intrepid, sullen, restive, haughty, stout, cruel, cordial, sincere, modest, envious, rage, remorse, repent, grief, sentiment, vice, patience.

Parts of the body: face, gorge, gullet, palm, vein, nerve, beak, pinion, plume, pinion.

Names of animals: fawn, ferret, spaniel, squirrel, lion, pigeon, oyster.

Names of plants: cane, cherry, dandelion, gooseberry, grape, gourd, lime, mushroom, nutmeg, peach, onion, peach,

onion, primrose, spine.

Colors: blue, rouge, blank, tawny, bay, blond.

Numbers: pair, dozen, second, simple, double, deuce.

Prepositions: counter, during, concerning.

Other French words of every-day life: perish, pierce, pinch, please, push, punish, reproach, rinse, enter, stay, carry, cry, meager, poor, very, sponge, lace, pail, piece, powder, flower, fault.

By way of comment the same author characterizes the nature of the French element as follows. "Nach den vorausgehenden Ausführungen ist es selbstverständlich, daß die meisten Wörter, die sich auf Verfassung, Regierung, Verwaltung, auf Rechtspflege und geistliche Angelegenheiten beziehen, französisch sind. Da die Geistlichen auch die Sittenlehrer des englischen Volkes waren, so führten sie aus dem Französischen die Bezeichnung für eine Menge sittlicher Begriffe ein. Die Franzosen waren aber auch die Lehrer der Engländer in den meisten Künsten und Wissenschaften;daher besitzt das heutige Englisch französische Bezeichnungen für die allgemeinen und die be-

sonderen Begriffe in der Architektur, in der Heilkunde einschlieslich der Tierheilkunde, usw. Alle Begriffs-kreise, die mit dem höfischen Leben zusammenhängen, wer-den in besonders starkem Grade französischem Einflusse ausgesetzt gewesen sein. Der Gebrauch französischer Wör-ter auf dem Gebiete der Kochkunst wird der Ueberlegenheit der französischen Küche zu danken sein. Wie sehr die Nor-mannen es verstanden, das Leben zu genießen, zeigen die vielen französischen Wörter für Freude und Lebensgenuß, die vielen Wendungen, die sich auf Jagd, Spiel, modische Kleidung beziehen. So kommt es, daß der englische Wort-schatz für alle diese Sprachkreise ein durchaus französi-sches Gepräge zeigt."

On the other hand, of Germanic origin are still found to be most terms relating to farming, seafaring, family relations, nature, and matters relating to every-day life.

The Norman influenced the English language in two ways: first, directly, by the introduction of many French words, and secondly, indirectly, by making it easy

to introduce new words into English. The free adoption of French words marked the abandonment of the old plan in accordance with which native material had been used to translate the new idea expressed by a foreign word; such usage as gave to the language words like bōcere and sundorhælga died out, and the borrowing which gave scribe and pharisee took its place. The language, then, had turned aside from the course, which earlier it had followed, to pursue a track in which, less and less depending upon its own resouces, it more and more lost the singleness of vocabulary which once had marked it. The Norman Conquest broke down the barriers which foreign languages had found so difficult to surmount, and opened free way for the numberless foreign elements which since have found a place in English. The introduction of hosts of words directly from the Latin is one of the most important results of this change of attitude.

We have, then, in English, a two-fold vocabulary; the Germanic element of which is more in evidence when the feelings and thoughts of every-day life are to be

expressed; the Romance element is used in designating greater elegance and accuracy of thought; it is essentially the vocabulary of polite society.

The 'inward' development of the German vocabulary is its most dominant characteristic. An important result of it is the greater vividness of its expression, bringing out the relation of the physical to mental conceptions, showing rather the likeness between ideas than the clearly-cut differentiations more distinctive of English and French. For instance, the German says 'Ausdruck'; this denotes 'pressing out', and the corresponding verb 'ausdrücken' may be used in either a physical or derived sense. In English, the word 'expression' or its verb 'express' have exactly the same meaning in the language from which they were derived; yet to an English-speaking person even though he may know this, the etymology of the word never occurs, either as a hindrance to rob it of its well-defined limited meaning, or as a help to lend to it that picturesqueness or richness of meaning of which the German word may boast.

Again we must look to the external history to

discover the causes which determined at least to a very great extent the present development of the German vocabulary and its method of growth.

Leaving out of account some words, especially geographical names taken from the Celts who occupied part of the present territory of the Germans (e.g. reich, Rhein, Main, Donau, Worms), the earliest foreign terms were introduced from the language of Rome.

The first Latin influence on German, was, as in English, the result of direct contact with Romans. The character of the borrowed expressions therefore was much the same. E.g., Straße, Meile, Pfund, Kessel, Butter, Pfeffer, Mauer, Zoll, Ziegel.

The second Latin influence resulted from the introduction of Christianity, which naturally demanded the use of many new words to express new ideas. Instances of Roman church words are: Münster, Schule, Kanzel, Orgel, Küster, Mönch, Nonne, Priester, Propst, Vesper, Messe, Segen, opfern, Marter, Pein, Engel. Some of the ecclesiastical terms were, according to Kluge, taken over from

the Goths, thus Kirche, Pfaffe, Pfingsten, Teufel (originally Greek).

Other Latin words adopted in this period are e.g. Birne, Kirsche, Kohl, Pflaume, Kalk, Kerker, Turm, Speise, Oel, Tisch, Purpur, Brief, schreiben, Siegel, Uhr, Becher, Pfosten, Pforte.

With the 12th century, and the period of Crusades, the German language received a new impulse in another direction. By contact with the French, a great number of words were taken from that language into German, and the literature of that period shows in subject-matter and in vocabulary traces of French influence. This was due to the superiority of French culture; court life and manners in France set an example to all the world. Paris was a great seat of learning, and French literature was far above that of any other nation.

It was natural that the words adopted should be especially those denoting social pleasures and feudal pastimes, dress and fine cookery; expressions relating to law and trades were also introduced. A classified list of

such words (Bergmann, p. 20ff.) includes terms like the following.

Court life, Titles: Manier, ade, fein, Baron, Prinz, Pöbel, Tafelrunde.

Courtly pleasures: Tanz, Bankett, Flöte, Laute, Posaune, Karte, Schanze, Turnier, Plan, Platz, hurtig, Herold, Harnisch, Wams, Degen, Lanze, Banner, Sold, Lärm, Papagei.

Cookery: Sauce.

Trades: Felleisen, Sammet, Palast, Konterfei, Pinsel.

Dress: Jacke, Habit, Serge, Jewel.

Commerce, Navigation: Kajüte, Küste, Flotte, Matrose, Rosinen, Aprikose, Dutzend, Börse.

Law and Government: Partei, Staat, Arrest.

Other words: Park, Nische, Matratze, Tasee, Kummer, Rente.

During this predominance of French influence the Latin had lost its hold on the language; but with the Renaissance and the rise of humanism its influence became very strong once more. The contact was a cultural one this time; translation from Latin had a marked effect not only upon the vocabulary but also upon the syntax of the German

language. Among others, terms relating to government and politics were adopted, as: Demokratie, Aristokratie, Konsul, Tyrann, Senat, Zensor, Privilegien, Patrizier, Monarchie.

Latin was the language of scholars and became a mark of learning. The German language was despised and thought fit only for the use of the lower classes; and it was this circumstance, which made it easier for French influence to play such a great part for the second time in the 17th and 18th centuries, after the decline of humanism. The devastated Germany of that time (the period immediately following the Thirty Year's War), looked to the intellectual neighbors in the West for guidance. Wars between France and Germany had brought the armies of either country into the lands of their enemy. Huguenots banished from France sought refuge in Germany; the courts of Louis XIV and Louis XV were models for the courts of German princes; and finally, the French language standardized by the French Academy and dignified by the works of eminent French writers gained the position of the diplomatic language of

the world.

To cite some characteristic specimens of words derived from the French at this period, we find society words like adrett, galant, honett, kokett, charmant, brilliant, nobel, Intrigue, Onkel, Tante, Service, Etikette, Salon, Möbel, Fauteuil,

Pleasures: Trumpf, Kaput, Maske.

Dress: Galosche, Rüsche, Plüsch, Musselin, Perücke, Pomade, Weste.

Architecture: Balkon, Sockel, Firies.

Army: Marsch, Rang, Armee, Parade, Bataillon, Offizier, General, Adjutant, Leutnant, retirieren, chargiern.

Minor lexical influences have been at work in the history of German as well as of English. For example, the German has, to a slight degree, been affected by the Italian, the Yiddish, the Russian, the Greek, and the Arabic, Even at present, the French and Latin furnish new words for the language, and in recent years the English has provided a few terms relating to politics, society and especially to sport.

The general tendency of German is toward inner development, however, and it is possible to use only German words in one's speech, if one includes among the German elements those which were adopted so long ago as to be entirely Germanized.

As an illustration of the striking difference between the lexical composition of the English and the German, the number of foreign words in the first chapter of the gospel of St. John may be cited. The King James version contains, among 977 words in this chapter, 7 Scandinavian words and 58 words derived from the Romance, most of them from the French. Luther's translation of the same chapter shows, apart from some proper names, only the following few words of non-German origin: Engel, Priester, Prediger, Feigen(baum), Prophet, Pharisäer, Levit, Rabbi, Messias, (ver)dolmetschen.

No better characterization of this radical difference between the two languages could be given than the statement of a famous author, who had an English father and a German mother. "Sobald wir genauer zuschauen, ent-

decken wir einen furchtbaren, nie gutzumachenden Mangel: das Englische ist fähig, dem Erhabenen und dem Ueberschwenglichen zu dienen, ebenso der energischen Tat, der politischen Debatte, überhaupt allem unmittelbar Gegebenen, damit auch dem Geschäft, dem Spiel, sowie dem Trivialen und dem Rohen, nicht aber ist es möglich, auf Englisch tief und zart zu denken. Selbst das Denken von glänzenden Köpfen versiegt und versandet, und der Halbschotte Kant mußte in Deutschland geboren werden, damit die geniale Gedankenarbeit seines Landsmannes Hume zu Ende geführt werden konnte. Das kommt daher, weil für alle höhre geistige Tätigkeit einzig die lateinisch-französischen Wurzeln in Verwendung genommen worden waren; zum Denken hatte nur der Adelige Musse gefunden, das in Hörigkeit verfallene Sachsenvolk mußte die harte Arbeit verrichten und gewann sich höchstens noch zum Dichten einen Feierabend. Somit fand sich, als die Zeiten für neue Gedankengänge gereift waren, kein gestaltungfähiges Material zur Hand, sondern nur ungelenke, verrostete Rüstung. Die Folge ist aber, daß England von den höchsten Er-

rungenschaften der letzten zwei Jahrhunderte wie abgeschnitten bleibt, indem es an dem bewußten und unbewußten geistigen Leben des führenden Deutschland nicht teilzunehmen vermag; daher ein Tag zu Tag zunehmendes Zurückbleiben, das dem schärfer Blickenden schon lange nicht mehr verborgen bleiben konnte. Denn unter Denken verstehe ich beileibe nicht bloß und nicht in erster Reihe Philosophie, vielmehr den wertvollsten Teil von Wissenschaft und von Kunst, sowie von Allem, was zu Bildung und Besitz einer Weltanschauung und überhaupt zu einem geistig ausgefüllten Leben beiträgt. Englische Naturwissenschaft z.B. ist selbst dem gebildeten Manne ein gänzlich unverständliches Abracadabra, aus lauter barbarischen griechischen und lateinischen Brocken zusammengesetzt, durchspickt mit noch unverständlicheren und dazu unaussprechlichen deutschen Kunstausdrücken,--sie ist also eine Technik, nicht ein Kulturelement; ein englischer Theolog--um ein anderes Beispiel zu nennen--der der deutschen Sprache nicht mächtig ist, weiß heute nicht mehr, wovon in diesem Fache die Rede ist. Darum dringt in England

keine Spur wahrer Bildung ins Volk: die Sprache, in der das geschehen könnte, ist nicht vorhanden. Bei dem Vergleich zwischen der deutschen und der englischen Sprache trifft das zu, was Fichte gesagt hatte: "Beim Volke der lebendigen Sprache greift die Geistesbildung ein ins Leben; beim Gegenteile geht geistige Bildung und Leben, jedes seinen Gang für sich fort." Die sehr hohe, vornehme, freie Bildung, die man in England antrifft, steht völlig außerhalb des nationalen Lebens; sie übt auf die Haltung der Bevölkerung, auf die regierenden Kreise, auf Ziele und Wege des Staates nicht den geringsten Einfluß." (Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Kriegsaufsätze, p. 31).

VI. PHRASEOLOGY.

In translating from English to German it is very noticeable that quite often an idea may be expressed in several ways in German which would be represented by one fixed phrase in English. This rigidity in English is perhaps due partly to the loss of inflections which makes it necessary to keep a certain word-order in order to avoid ambiguity. But it may also be due to the desire for definiteness and accuracy, demanding that one idea be expressed only in one prescribed manner.

Possibly we may ascribe it to that trait of English character which makes strong display of individualism unpardonable, and strives always to keep within the boundaries of what is recognized as 'proper' by the whole social group. Says W. Münch: "Die ausdrucksweise im gespräch, wie ebenso in briefen, ist überaus wenig individuell, sie arbeitet mit sehr festen wendungen, ja es gehört zum begriff des wohlerzogenen, nicht durch persönlich eigenartiges auffallen zu wollen. Mit der ausdrucksweise ist es hier wie mit kleidung, bewegungen, selbst anschauungen." (Die Neueren Sprachen VII, 92).

In contrast to this, we note the strong English feeling of individual right, and self-assurance. The many direct categorical statements in general use show this: I hate, I love, I never saw such a thing, the very best I ever saw. The impersonal construction is very rare. The infrequent use of the indefinite <u>one</u> compared to the German use of <u>man</u> is likewise deserving of mention.

The impossibility of translating such German adverbs as <u>nun</u>, <u>wohl</u>, <u>eigentlich</u>, <u>doch</u>, etc., shows us another difference between the unequivocal assertions of the English and the much more indefinite and guarded statements of the German.

The self-confidence of the English may well be traced to historic causes, as may also the more careful, hesitating spirit of the German. The development of journalism and oratory in English has helped to foster this confidence, this surety of speech which comes only of practice.

In the business relations the chief characteristics of English idiom are perhaps most clearly brought out; namely, simplicity, conciseness, definiteness and directness.

The more ornate style of the German has long been regarded with amusement, and the insertion of many clauses in one sentence has been ridiculed as a necessary evil of the language. This is not altogether the case, however. For, though it is indeed possible to crowd into a German period a remarkable number of subordinate clauses and explanatory phrases, yet it is by no means a necessity in the writing of an approved and idiomatic style; there may be just as clear and direct statements and sentences as in English, and the tendency has been ever more in this direction of late years. In other words, the Germans may choose between a simple and an ornate, involved type of sentence structure.

Note: As a partial illustration of the English fixity and the German latitude in the matter of phraseology, some specimens of conversation are cited from G. Krüger and C. A. Smith's English-German Conversation Book, (1902).

English	German
Who gives you lessons in music?	Wer erteilt Ihnen Unterricht in der Musik? Bei wem lernen Sie Musik?
Well, what is it?	Nun, was denn?
Can a young lady visit the old world alone?	Kann eine junge Dame die alte Welt allein besuchen? (allein d. a. W. b.)
She had better have a chaperone.	Es ist besser wenn sie eine Anstandsdame hat.
Will you do me a favor?	Wollen Sie mir einen Gefallen tun? Wollen Sie mir eine Gefälligkeit erweisen?
With the greatest pleasure.	Mit größtem Vergnügen. Mit dem größten Vergnügen.

Let's take a walk.	Wir wollen einen Spaziergang zusammen machen (unternehmen). Lassen Sie uns etwas spazieren gehen. Machen wir einen Spaziergang.
I haven't time just now; I'm very busy.	Ich habe gegenwärtig (für jetzt) keine Zeit; ich bin sehr beschäftigt (ich habe jetzt viel zu tun).
I have an engagement for this afternoon.	Ich habe eine Verpflichtung für heute Nachmittag. Ich habe heute Nachmittag etwas vor.
I forgot it entirely.	Ich habe es völlig (ganz) vergessen.

CONCLUSION.

Summary of the salient features noted.

I. Phonetics. English:

inertia: unrounding of vowels; less clear pronunciation of consonants than in German.

conservatism: historical spelling, due to the feeling of national freedom and self-sufficiency.

German:

freedom: individual spelling of many scholars; lack of a definite standard of pronunciation, (compared to the standard English of London.)

II. Inflection: English:

simplicity: paucity of forms.

foreign influence: (Scandinavian)

practicality: interchange of nouns and verbs, and of nouns and adjectives.

differentiation and definiteness: distinction between past and perfect tenses.

III. Syntax: English:

rigidity: (due to loss of inflection).

directness and conciseness.

foreign influence: retention of some Latin constructions.

German: freedom: word-order not fixed.

laboriousness: constructions.

IV. Word-Formation: English:

practicality and self-sufficiency: formation of hybrids; use of any needed element, irrespective of logical or grammatical considerations.

definiteness: a foreign word, the meaning of whose component parts does not intrude upon the meaning of the compound, is preferred to a native formation.

German:

inward development.

vividness: clear expression of relation between fields of thought and emotion (formation of native compounds).

V. Vocabulary: English:

foreign influence: bi-lingual vocabulary.

self-sufficiency: the easy adoption and naturalization of whatever is needed. (historical reason, the bi-linguality caused by Norman influence).

VI. Phraseology: English:

one expression for one idea (compared to a choice in German); the individual is guided by the group.

directness and absoluteness: use of personal verbs; categorical statements.

German:

indirectness: use of adverbs; impersonal verbs.

So we may briefly sum up those characteristics most frequently noticed, and trace their occurrence and significance through the various phases of language phenomena which we have considered.

Taking first the idea of freedom in language, often noted in the German. In phonetics we spoke of the freedom to speak as one chose claimed by every German and also of the licence in spelling made use of by many scholars. In syntax, we remarked on the free word-order; in word-formation, we found a greater elasticity and freedom in the forming of compounds, owing to the inward development of the German. Lastly, in phraseology, we noted that the German expressed in many ways what the English states in one, definite manner.

The principle of inertia in English is represented in phonetics by the unrounding of the vowels, in inflection by the desire for simplicity and identity of forms, in syntax by the doing away with indirect, cumbersome modes of expression, in word-formation, by introducing foreign words instead of forming compounds from native words.

We may relate this to the dominating idea of

practicality in English, which is most important in the consideration of the loss of inflection, and in the simplicity of the syntax. It is very evident in the use of foreign affixes and roots in word-formation, and the easy introduction of foreign words into the vocabulary. Whatever is needed is taken, irrespective of logical or grammatical considerations.

This leads naturally to an examination of the great influence of foreign languages upon the English. The introduction of Scandinavian was, to a great degree, responsible for the loss of inflection, the syntax has been materially influenced by the French and also the Latin, while the word-formation and vocabulary is entirely colored by the foreign element. In no other language can foreign elements or entire words be so easily introduced into the vocabulary and so quickly naturalized.

The feeling of self-sufficiency and the conviction, that, as a nation, they are free to adopt or retain whatever they wish, may account for their conservatism in spelling, a conservatism, which, on the whole, has seemed more characteristic of the German. The idea of individual freedom in the

German, however, seems to be represented by a feeling of national freedom in the English; this materially furthers the introduction of foreign words; it is akin to the self-confidence which is so apparent in the definite phraseology, and the personal, categorical manner of expression in English.

Brevity and simplicity, already mentioned in the statements concerning practicality, are noticeable in inflection and syntax, and are most strongly marked in word-formation and the vocabulary. In the former(word-formation), the shortness of English compounds is significant, as compared with the lengthy German words.

Most important is the accuracy and definiteness of the English. This has been discussed, to some little extent, before. In phonetics, it was mentioned in connection with the consideration of a fixed standard pronunciation in English; in syntax, in noting the rigidity of English word-order; in word-formation, in comparing the fixity of English word-composition with the corresponding elasticity in German; and finally, in phraseology, in speaking of the expression of an idea in many ways in German which was expressed in only one way in English.