ABSTRACTS OF THE ADDRESSES

DELIVERED ON DECEMBER 28, 1924

Professor HERMANN COLLITZ (Johns Hopkins University), The Scope and Aims of Linguistic Science:

In order to ascertain whether and to what extent linguistics is entitled to the name of a science, we must remember that in Modern English the term 'science' may be understood in two different ways, viz.: (1) in a broad sense, as the equivalent of the German word *Wissenschaft*, i.e., scholarly knowledge; (2) in a more modern and more technical sense, so as to be applied exclusively to branches of learning concerned with permanent and invariable relations, such as mathematics, chemistry, physics. These and similar sciences, it is claimed, are able to make predictions for the future.[1] If interpreted in this way, the term would not be applicable even to the evolutionary branches of natural science, such as geology and biology. Whether or not we approve of limiting the scope of 'science' in this manner, we certainly cannot close our eyes to the fundamental difference as to aims and method between abstract science and the study of natural phenomena from the viewpoint of evolution or progress.

A similar distinction is clearly traceable in the domain of linguistics:

I. As branches of linguistics concerned with permanent conditions, we may claim, above all, general phonetics and general grammar. Phonetics nowadays has assumed such proportions as almost to constitute a science by itself. However wide its scope, its limits are clearly defined in that it concerns itself with human speech merely from the point of view of articulation. In general or 'philosophical' grammar, on the contrary, stress is laid principally on the relation between grammatical forms and mental categories. For a while, and owing chiefly to the attraction emanating from historical grammar and comparative philology, philosophical grammar had to be satisfied with a back seat in linguistics. There is no reason, however, why the two should stand in each other's way, and in recent years conditions have been rapidly

[1] See, e.g., W. Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837) and his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1840).

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

improving.[2] The science of linguistics is, moreover, concerned with uniformities and permanent or steadily recurring conditions in human speech generally. We may count here, e.g., topics like the relation between language and dialects, the causes of phonetic change, the nature of phonetic laws, the mutual relation between appellatives and proper names, the various systems of counting (e.g., decimal and duodecimal systems), etc.

II. The same material which general linguistics is using for its theories, appears subordinated in historical (or evolutionary) linguistics to the point of view of gradual development and progress.[3] As a result of linguistic evolution, languages all over the globe are found divided up into large 'families' (like Indo-European, Semitic, etc.). The comparative study of each one of these families or of one of their branches (such as Teutonic or Romance languages) has gained such proportions as almost to require lifelong study by itself. Dead languages are in every instance no less important than living ones. From single languages the study proceeds to that of dialects, of single authors, of special grammatical topics. The further the specialization is carried on, the more urgent the need for co-operation with students of philology, literature, history, archaeology, etc.

Each of these two subdivisions of linguistics being almost boundless, we ought to be the more grateful for the occasional attempts to survey the whole field in the brief compass of one or two volumes. I have in mind here the well known lectures of Max Müller and of W. D. Whitney; the manual by G. von der Gabelentz, entitled *Die Sprachwissenschaft* (1891); and the more recent works by Leonard Bloomfield, *An Introduction to the Study of Language* (New York, 1914), and O. Jespersen, *Language: its Nature, Development and Origin* (New York, 1922).

III. To a third subdivision of linguistics—and again one of vast dimensions—we may apply the name of 'practical' or 'applied' linguistics. The study of languages together with the history of grammatical studies may justly lay claim to a leading position among the practical branches of linguistics. Yet there are other important topics belonging to the same category, e.g., grammatical nomenclature (a subject closely

[2] I would refer in this connection to an able study written by an American scholar, namely: *Grammar and Thinking, a Study of the Working Conceptions in Syntax*, by Albert D. Sheffield (New York, 1912).

[3] As to the method and the general aspect of historical studies, a reference must suffice here to the first two chapters of E. Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (5th and 6th edition, Leipzig, 1908).

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

connected with general grammar); the relation between speech and writing or printing; the many attempts, made at various times, to devise simplified or artificial languages; efforts toward simplifying the current spelling; etc.

A matter worthy of our particular attention is the study of ancient and modern languages in our public schools and colleges. It is not saying too much that as a vehicle of general culture the study of languages stands unrivalled among the various branches of instruction. Linguistics, to be sure, cannot in this respect boast of any exclusive merits, for the reason that it is impossible to study any particular language without perusing at the same time specimens of the literature written in that language. The study of Greek, e.g., means the study of the Greek language and of Greek authors. Obviously it is the combination rather of these two subjects than the nature of either one of them singly which renders them valuable for educational purposes. This Society, in any case, has every reason to join hands with the educators endeavoring to secure for the study of languages the place due to it—in the interest both of mental and of moral culture—in the curriculum of our schools.

Professor PAUL HAUPT (Johns Hopkins University), The Influence of Caucasian Idioms on Indo-European Languages:

The ancient Iberians in Georgia, north of Armenia, may be connected with the Iberians of the Pyrenean Peninsula and the pre-Celtic inhabitants of *Hibernia*, Ireland, just as the Albani of the southwestern shore of the Caspian may be identical, not only with the Albani of Alba Longa (the mother of Rome) and the modern Albanians (south of Montenegro), but also with Albion (the ancient name of the British Isles) and Albania = Scotland. This Caucasian name cannot be combined with Latin *albus;* the designation Albion is not derived from the chalk-cliffs of Dover, and the old name of the Tiber, *Albula*, cannot mean White River. In the southern dialect of Albania this name appears as *Arberia*, and in the northern as *Arbenia*. The Greeks call the Albanians *Arbanites*, and the Turkish name is *Arnauts*. Armenia and Auvergne (*Arvenia*) seem to represent the same name. We have *r* also in French *argoulet*, which denotes a member of a corps of mounted archers instituted by Louis XII c. 1500; they were similar to the *estradiots* (< στρατιώτης) in the service of the Venetian Republic and other European countries in the 15th and 16th centuries, who were recruited in Dalmatia and Albania, etc., and wore a semi-Oriental dress.

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For the *g* in *argoulet*, cf. Ital. *saggio* = *savio* (< Latin *sapere*) 'sage, wise,' and our *sage* = Ital. *salvia*, German *Salbei* (*ZDMG* 69.564). The southern Albanians (in Epirus) call themselves *Tosk*, which is identical with *Tusci* (< *Tursci*) 'Etruscans,' Greek Τυρσηνοί < Τρωΐσα (Hittite *Taruisa*) > Τρωΐα > Τροία 'Troy.' The Roman patricians, who were Etruscans, were called *Trojugenae*.

Nine years ago I quoted Hugo Grotius' remarks (1644) on Chaldeans, Lydians, Etruscans, and M. v. Niebuhr's suggestions (1857) with regard to Etruscan and Basque. There is a connection between Basque, Etruscan, Lydian, Sumerian (Braun adds Pelasgian, Carian, Raetian, Ligurian), and the Caucasian idioms, and we find traces of Caucasian influence in the Indo-European languages. The dialects of the Ossetes in the Caucasus, which are Iranian, sound almost like Georgian, just as the Spanish spoken in Chile sounds Araucanian. Certain peculiarities of Armenian and Albanian must be attributed to Caucasian influence. Both languages have also been affected by Turkish. In modern Armenian, the order of the words is neither Indo-European nor Caucasian, but Tataric, and Tataric belongs to the Turkish branch of the Altaic stock. The loss of gender in Armenian long before 400 A.D. is due to Caucasian influence. In *Haiq*, the native name of the Armenians, the final consonant represents a non-Indo-European plural suffix as in Basque *zaldi* 'horse,' *zaldia* 'the horse,' *zaldiak* 'the horses.' Similarly we have Armen. *Gamirq* 'Cappadocians' < *Gamir* = Heb. *Gomer*, Ass. *Gimir*, which is identical with Crimean, Cimmerian, Cimbrian, Cambrian (cf. Cimmerian Bosporus and Cimbric Chersonese; also *Odys.* 11.44). The *g* for *k* is due to partial assimilation. *Cymru* is the native name of Wales, north of Cornwall whence the Tartessians obtained their tin. In various parts of Cornwall, there are remains of ancient dwellings and blast furnaces with tools of ancient smelters and blocks of tin in the rude molds of earth in which the metal was cast. These ancient blocks of tin are called *Jews' tin*, and the ruins *Jews' houses*. Tartessian adventurers may have sailed from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Black Sea and the North Sea in the fourth pre-Christian millenary. Both the *Odyssey* and the Babylonian Gilgames epic are based on yarns of Tartessian sailors, but Homer *veris falsa remiscet* (Hor. *Epist.* 2.3.151). The early culture in southwestern Spain (Plato's *Atlantis*) may antedate the dawn of civilization in Babylonia and Egypt. The dynastic Egyptians may have been Caucasians, while the predynastic Egyptians were Semites.

We have a suffix article not only in Basque and Sumerian, but also

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Albanian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian. In the Albanian name of Scutari, *Shkódra* (cf. *Scodra*, Livy 44.31), the final *a* represents the definite article; without the article the form is *Shkóder*. For the post-positive article in Norwegian and Swedish, we must remember that there seems to have been in Norway a fishing and hunting population which was neither Indo-European nor Finno-Ugric, as far back as c. 6000 B.C. The Lapps entered Norway c. A.D. 900–1000, while the Teutonic element cannot be traced in Southern Norway before B.C. 1700, and the invaders' advance northward was extremely slow. Braun thinks that there may be Caucasian influence in the Germanic weak preterit with dental suffix, the exuberance of the *n*-stems, the prefix *ga-*, the suffix *-isk*, as well as in a number of Germanic words like *berry, sheep, hand, fist, sea, hut;* but his Caucasian etymologies are very precarious (*OLZ* 27.179; cf. 128,169). Excavations at Tartessos may shed light on these interesting problems (*ZMDG* 78.16). Cf. the two papers *The Hittite Name of Troy* and *Ascanius and Alba Longa* in *The American Journal of Philology* 45.252–259.

Professor FRANZ BOAS (Columbia University), The Problem of Kinship among American Indian Languages:

At the present time, the American Indian languages are so distributed that a large number are confined to small districts, while others occupy extended areas. The extension of the larger groups of languages seems to be in every case a recent phenomenon. It can be shown that many languages have perished and that their areas are now occupied by peoples speaking languages belonging to other stocks. It may be inferred that a great local differentiation of languages, similar to a great local differentiation of cultural life, was characteristic of earlier times.

At the present time, many primitive languages show certain similarities which are not sufficiently detailed to permit the claim that they are members of the same linguistic family. The question arises whether these differences may be explained as due to long continued historical changes and whether these languages are actually derived from the same source.

Another possibility would be the occurrence of hybrid languages, which would be analogous to the development of modern cultural types which have developed from the contact and integration of distinctive developments. It is doubtful whether historical proof of this process can ever be given. Numerous examples are known of the hybridization of lexicographical material, and it can also be shown that phonetic

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

features may be imposed upon distinctive linguistic stocks. It is more doubtful whether fundamental morphological traits can be transferred from one language to another one. The only possible method of approach to this problem is a study of the distribution of definite morphological features. If it is found that a group of languages which are contiguous have certain morphological traits in common, and that one or the other of this group of languages has other features in common with languages of another area, the conclusion seems admissible that such overlapping distribution must be due to the dissemination of morphological traits. The only other possible explanation would have to be based upon the assumption of a community of certain traits over a large area, which partially disappeared in different local groups. The latter explanation does not seem plausible.

It may also be pointed out that linguistic mixture among primitive peoples differs from the type of mixture which has taken place among peoples speaking Indo-European languages. Since many primitive languages are spoken by a very small number of individuals, and since the habit prevails among primitive tribes of bringing foreign women into the tribe, the social conditions of mixture are quite different from those prevailing in Europe, even as early as two or three thousand years ago.

Professor HENRY ALFRED TODD (Columbia University), The Complete Phonetic Elimination of Certain Monosyllabic Words in the Sentence Structure of Old French:

The phenomenon of which I shall speak has long been observed and commented on by Old French scholars, but without eliciting, as it seems to me, a clear explanation of its real nature and history.

In an Old French sentence in which two personal pronouns of the third person, being the direct and indirect objects of a verb, immediately succeed one another, the direct object is very frequently suppressed; thus *jo le li done* (Modern French *je le lui donne*) very often becomes *jo li done*.

For a long time the commentators of texts varied in their accounts of the relative frequency or regularity of this suppression, some declaring that the omission of the direct object pronouns was virtually constant, others discovering as time went on that the occurrence or non-occurrence of the direct object was apparently a haphazard affair, in which it was difficult to determine whether the phenomenon was normal or abnormal. At last, in 1895, Georg Ebeling edited elaborately and admirably for Max Niemeyer of Halle a brief poem of 670 verses, under the title *Auberce:*

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Altfranzösisches Fabel, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen, in which he traced the history of the discussion, and contributed a very large collection of examples of the presence and the absence of the direct object pronoun under the conditions named. His treatment of the subject appears in the form of a highly elaborated note to verse 655 of the poem, covering several pages of fine print.

It is not my purpose here to summarize the opinions of his predecessors as set forth in his note, nor even those of himself; but rather on the contrary to point out what I conceive to be the very simple situation of the case.

In the Old French sentence structure, and elsewhere in various languages, monosyllabic pronouns tended strongly to become enclitics and at the same time to lose their vowel element. The unstressed object pronouns of the third person all have the initial *l:* direct object, *le la les;* indirect object, *li lors*.

[Professor Todd's notes, so far as they could be found after his death, end at this point. The balance is supplied by the Secretary of the Society, from memory:

It follows that with the loss of the vowel of the direct object in *jo le li done*, there is left *jo l li done*. This is found *jol li done*, and also *jo li done*. Metrical needs may be responsible for the variation between *jo le li done* and *jol li done* or *jo li done*. This is the explanation of the apparent complete loss of the direct object pronoun, and of the assumption of double value by the indirect object.

A similar phenomenon is seen in Portuguese, where the feminine article *a* is contracted with a preceding preposition *a* to *á*, differentiated to the eye by a printed accent, but not distinguishable to the ear from the mere preposition.]

https://doi.org/10.2307/409547 Published online by Cambridge University Press