The oldest strata in language

(A Study of Structural Evolution in the Western European Languages)

INTRODUCTORY

The following is a disquisition in comparative linguistics or perhaps —considering the specialized and highly technical connotation the term «linguistics» is assuming— in comparative philology, the science of language *and* literature [1]. This latter term may be justified in this connection from another point of view as well: although prevailingly comparative in its disposition this study does not follow the lines universally established in comparative linguistics for the last hundred years. It is out of question here to outline even broadly the principles of comparative linguistics in this latter sense; it will suffice to state the most important points on which its method diverges from the one proposed by the author of this essay. Traditionally, comparative linguistics works on the basis of a reconstruction of an artificially logical proto-language (in the same way as descriptive linguistics has long worked on an equally artificial adaptation of a contemporary language or dialect; cf. Kenneth L. Pike's «Kalaba», invented as the only viable study object for a rigorous application of the methods of «Phonemics» or of the «phonological» analysis then in vogue) [2]. In operating with a proto-language reconstructed in the mentioned way, any kind of evolutionary irregularity, though normally appearing in any naturally spoken language (through loans—dialect loans included—archaism or analogy) is disregarded as an aspect of no consequence linguistically. Actually, the number of discrepancies (that is forms deviating from the reconstructed norm) in any language (as for instance in the case of the theory of «laryngeals» or of apophony), as regarded from the angle of the demands of the protolanguage, as an architecturally flawless structure, has never to the author's knowledge been fully appraised.

1 Cf. Samuel Noah KRAMER, *Sumerian Mythology* (New York, 1961): "comparative philology, the science devoted to language and literature" (p. 26).

2 Kenneth L. PIKE, *Phonemics* (University of Michigan Publications, Linguistics, vol. III. Ann Arbor, 1947).

The present author's perhaps naive reaction is the following: if any contemporary language does not lack in analogical formations, archaisms and datable borrowings (of the undated borrowed elements we can unfortunately say nothing, assuming however that they may in reality be the more numerous ones), it is not conceivable that any reconstructed «protolanguage» would have deviated in this respect. In other words: according to neo-linguistic notions any proto-language is a systematic unit, corrupted and turned mongrel only in later stages of its history; on the other hand, the present author holds that an originally pure and homogeneous linguistic structure in any period is an unimaginable chimaera. Any human language is a heterogeneously structured system held together by regulating and normalizing phonetic and morphological trends, in which *analogy* plays a dominant rôle [3]. Not denying the justification of the terms «borrowing» and «loan», we may still say that the latter are to be explained solely in terms of later acquisitions to the phonetic, morphological or lexical structure of a language, being sometimes traceable as to origin and datable, but in other cases not. An «archaism» (which similarly may affect the phonology, morphology or lexicon of a language) merely represents a delay in or a reaction against a current evolutionary tendency. Thus instead of *stages* in linguistic evolution of an *a priori* uniform language (passing from «Old», «Middle» and «New», etc., according to customary terminology) we may speak of *strata* in a multiform linguistic structure, representing a system of the oldest, later and recent linguistic acquisitions, whether falling within the phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax or «metasyntax» of a given language [4].

The last couple of lines require some comments. While it is evident that a traceable and datable borrowed morphological or lexical form belongs to an *upper* (that is more recent) stratum in a linguistic structure, one may ask how such distinctions can be established within a phonetic system. Still instances showing phonetic features to be of various age may be found: the English common interjection 'ugh' (in probably most of its actual forms of pronunciation) clearly belongs to an older phonetic system, having kept the final velar fricative (which is changed to a labio-dental fricative in 'enough', etc.); other interjections, such as 'phew' —with a bilabial sibi-

3 For the important part played by analogy within the sphere of phonology, compare HOLMER, 1965, pp. 71-75; 1966, § 15.4, pp. 73-75.

4 For the term "metasyntax", cf. HOLMER, 1963, pp. 84-92 (with Note 160, on p. 112); 1965, pp. 83-84; 1969, pp. 134, 140-42. Considering language as uniform (in the above sense) has led to the notion of a language having arisen at a special moment (at least in genealogically based treatises), whereas the idea of a multiform language (also in the above sense) forces us to limit the concept of age to individual sounds, morphological and lexical units, syntagms, etc.; otherwise expressed: words may have an age (althoungh in practice never to be fixed), while language logically cannot.

lant— may be ranged here also. In Irish an initial *p-* (as in *Pádraig* 'Patrick') is a comparatively recent acquisition; earlier a Latin or Indo-European *p* is rendered by *c* (originally *q*), as in Old Irish *Cothrige*, from *Patricius* or zero, as in *athir* 'father' (cf. Latin *pater*). Features of a surviving archaic phonology are seen in such Japanese forms as *pika-pika (suru)* 'sparkle, shine' (cf. *hikaru* 'shine'), *piri-piri (suru)* 'prick, bite' beside the more or less equivalent *hiri-hiri (suru)*, in which latter forms the original **p-* has turned into the *h* sound of modern Japanese phonology. Such cases are currently classed as cases of «onomatopoeic» or «expressive» formation, terms which in fact do not explain anything at all. In this connection may further be quoted cases of *phonetic duplicates*, comprising an older form coexisting with a more recent one, as in Basque *egin* ~ *ein, in* ('do, make'), *edan* ~ *eran, ean* ('drink'), *edo* ~ *eo, o* ('or'), Spanish *llegado* ~ *llegao (llegau)*, Japanese *namida* ~ *nanda* ('tears, crying')—instances of this type may be multiplied in every language.

Examples of older morphological elements surviving in a later period are frequent and well known in all languages: in English 'oxen' (plural form of 'ox'; Anglo-Saxon *exen*) the suffix '-en' has been preserved until today, whereas it has been supplanted by the more common suffix '-(e)s' in, for instance, 'houses' (plural form of 'house'; earlier and dialectally 'housen'); similarly forms with a zero plural suffix ('sheep', 'swine', etc.) survive beside the now regular 'ships', 'houses' (in Anglo-Saxon *sci(o)pu, hús*) [5]. Less attention is being paid to an evolution within the «metasyntax» of a language, that is to say the phase concerning current topics of conversations and points of view in dealing with the same—for the reason that this aspect of language is eminently historical and consequently in no way yields to the mechanical analysis required by linguistics in the initially mentioned sense. Those who will not shrink back from dealing with mere philology will however easily realize that such «metasyntagms» as 'good day' (or analogous ones used by way of greeting, whether or not implying the idea of wishing anyone a pleasant day) have deeper roots than a mere matter-of-fact 'what date is (it) today?', etc. In some Melanesian and neighboring languages it is customary to use the phrase '(go) sleep' for 'good-by' (cf. Fijian *sa moce*), where the time of day (or night) is irrelevant.

In the following treatise stratification within the phonology is of no account. Yet it must be pointed out that special phonetic systems may be characteristic of particular epochs in the evolution of languages. In regard to this reference may be made to an early paper by the author (published in Studia Linguistica, Lund) with the title *A Proto-European Consonant System*

5 As early as late Anglo-Saxon *húsas* could appear instead of the regular *hús*.

and the Pronunciation of Sumerian, where an original system of occlusive phonemes is assumed to have prevailed, characterized by (1) voiceless strongly aspirated occlusives (occasionally preaspirated, as still in some parts of Europe), (2) voiceless non-aspirated occlusives (*«lenes»*) and finally —although more sporadically— (3) voiceless glottalized stops (hence: *k', k, k'*; *p', p, p'*; *t', t, t'*, etc.), a system gradually changed into one of a basically voiced-voiceless opposition (hence: *k, g; p, b; t, d*, etc.) and in which the glottalized members are absent. Within the European languages (or at least those of Indo-European stock) a triple system of plosive consonant phonemes often survives, generally reconstructed as **k, *g, *gh; *p, *b, *bh; *t, *d, *dh*, etc., an additional fourth member *(*kh, *ph, *th)* being comparatively much more rare. The above form of the system prevails in the Indo-European languages in India; in those of Europe certain members have been discarded (especially **gh, *bh, *dh*) and in English the system is reflected in the following way: *h, k, g; f, p, b; th, t, d*, etc. The original values of the sound symbols usually represented as above can, of course, not be ascertained; various plosives appear to have been missing in the now extinct Hittite and Tokharian (Indo-European languages in Asia) and indications of a similar state of things seem traceable in Gaulsih or Continental Celtic, letting us suspect that the voiced values of the plosives *(g, b, d)* have made a later appearance [6].

In this connection reference will be made to a theory previously advanced by the author (HOLMER, 1969, pp. 111-13; 1977, p. 190), according to which a phonetic law (or' tendency) operates on complex phonetic entities (rather than individual phonemes), being largely directed by the force of analogy. A phonetic change may consequently start in a single —typical or often pronounced— word or form (rather than simultaneously all over),

6 A case in point is the Latin *carpentum* (a kind of wagon; of Celtic origin, the root of the word probably identical with that of Latin *corbis* 'wicker basket'). In Old Irish this word is still represented as *carpat* ('car, chariot'), which turns into modern Irish *carbad*, while in most Scottish Gaelic dialects the voiceless pronunciation survives *(k'ar(a)pət)*. Other borrowed words of this type in modern Celtic languages support the author's theory: forms which in medieval Latin or French occur with voiceless unaspirated stops are adapted to the Old Irish system (which the author supposes to have been analogous to the one described above) in such a way that the mentioned stops of the Romance languages are retained in Old Irish (written: *c, p, t*), later on passing into voiced stops (written and pronounced: *g, b, d*), in Irish, although still voiceless in Scottish Gaelic. Hence modern Irish *radán* (Scottish Gaelic *radan*, pronounced *ratan*), Irish *clog* 'bell' (Scottish Gaelic *clag*, pronounced *k'lak*), Irish *cába* 'cape' (cf. French *rat, raton; cloche*, Medieval Latin *clocca; cape*, Italian *cappa*). Incidentally, the forms derived from Medieval Latin, such as *clocca*, parallel those derived from the Gaulish stem *bicco-, becco-* 'little' (in names), in Old Irish *becc*, modern *beag* (in Scottish Gaelic pronounced *bek*), Welsh *bychan* (cf. Welsh *cloch* 'bell' = Irish *clog*). The current opinion among Celtic scholars (assuming Old Irish orthography copies Early Welsh) does not appear to provide a satisfactory explanation. (On the phonematic level, however, either opinion holds.)

spreading by analogy to all similarly structured sound complexes. This means of course that the evolution is not in the first place one of single phonemes, but of a characteristic sequence of phonemes. By acceptance of this point of view many cases of an irregular phonetic evolution may be dismissed. In other words, the final result of the phonetic change governed by sound laws must in some way fit in with the general structural character of the phonology as well as morphology of any language (hence Gothic *reiks* instead of **reihs,* from Gaulish *-rix* 'king', *-hs* being unusual in early Teutonic —perhaps in *saihs* 'six', cf. Latin *sex*— whereby a phonetic as well as morphological anomaly is removed; cf. HOLMER, 1969, p. 113).

While in Latin, for instance, the original sequences *-ct-, -gt-* and *-ht-* undergo a slight leveling whereby all ultimately pass into *-ct- (dictus, actus, tractus)*, this principle is not followed in an original sequence *-rct-, -rgt-*, etc.: beside *farctus* (from *farcire*), involving an unusual sound complex in Latin, one may find *fartus* (with the far more common sequence *-rt-*; cf. *artem, partem, mortem, vertere*, etc.) and also forms with medial *-rs-*, being a common product of original *-rts-* or *-rtt-* (cf. *ars, pars, mors, versi, versus*, etc.); a basic form showing *-rs-* underlies Latin *farsilis* (which is to *farcire* as *coctilis* is to *coquere*) [7]. In the same way we find: *mersus* (from *mergere*), *parsus, parsimonia* (from *parcere*), *sursum* (beside *surrectum*; from *surgere*) [8] and, finally, *ursus* (for **urctus*; cf. Greek *arktos*). For cases of a more far-reaching adaptation to a characteristic phonetic-morphological pattern, see in HOLMER, 1966 (§ 15.4, pp. 73-75). The views expressed here do not in any sense detract from the value of a scientific method: the phonetic «law» may in reality be a «tendency»—within the morphology of a language, however, changes take place which are still less controllable by laws.

On the lexicological level irregularities may arise alike due to the same tendency to conform to general structural patterns. The trend of evolution in each separate case may however be concealed. Although there is hardly any doubt about the fundamental identity of Gaulish *Taranis*, the Celtic Jupiter or 'thunder' (and 'Thursday') god (cf. Irish *torann* 'thunder'), and the corresponding Teutonic form (Anglo-Saxon *thunor*), yet to discover the reason why the expected **Tanar(is)* has been reshaped into *Taranis* by a metathesis *(-n-r- > -rn-)* would perhaps require a statistic analysis of the entire Celtic vocabulary. Words, in order to be remembered and popularly

7 A form **farsus* may not exist in classical Latin, but it is reasonably the base of French *farce*, Portuguese *farsa* ('farce'), the French spelling being inluenced by Latin *farcire* (?).

8 Latin *sursum* is hardly from **subversum*, which has an almost opposite sense.

used, generally demand a transparent, if not meaningful, etymology; unfamiliar forms are either simplified or adapted to some kind of «folk etymology». The word *philomele* 'nightingale' (whether or not the original form) is acceptable in Greek (cf. *philos* 'dear', *melos* 'song'), but not in Hungarian, where it appears as *fülemüle* (also *fülemile*; cf. *fül* 'ear', *mile* 'hamlet'), while in Persian and Turkish the form is simplified into *bulbul,* respectively *bülbül* (probably treated as an «echo word») [9].

PART I

With these preliminary remarks in mind, which may at the same time serve to illustrate the author's particular points of view on linguistic evolution in general and particularly on points where these views deviate from neolinguistic tenets, our attention will be directed to the main subject of this study, which falls within the section of morphology.

The morphological structure of a language at the lowest level concerns the placement and sequence of the constituent morphological elements. This aspect has, of course, been observed by all linguists who have attempted a structural classification of languages, being at the same time the concrete basis on which the earlier division into «agglutinative» and «flectional» languages (according to von Humboldt) is founded [10]. The former term is used to indicate that grammatical modifications of the word (which are still not considered as «flections») take place by adding determinating morphological elements to a concrete (nominal or verbal) word stem in such a way that each added element determines the preceding part of the word. The theory consequently implies that each component element (or «agglutination») is a bound morpheme, with exclusion of the primitive concrete stem, which is often found to function independently.

As a matter of fact, this principle holds for all systems of typological classification based on the placement of morphemes. However, a pervading tendency exists to maintain the same order or sequence of elements even when the latter do not occur as bound morphemes. Hence we find that in Arabic the free form (*al maliki* 'of the king') in the construction *dâru l-maliki* 'the king's house' occupies the same place in regard to *dâru* 'house' as the bound form (*-hu* 'his') in *dâruhu* 'his house', the tendency evidently being in this case to make the determining part follow the determined part.

9 The term "loan word" is intentionally avoided for reasons given in a previous context.

10 Karl Wilhelm VON HUMBOLDT, *Ueber die Kawisprache auf der Insel Java.* Berlin, 1836-40.

In point of fact, in order to understand this symmetry of construction it is an advantage to adopt the present author's distinction of a *subject* and a *predicate* part in place of a *determinative* and *determined* part [11]. According to the analysis proposed by the author, in the construction (Old) Turkish *türk budun* 'Turkish people' ('people of Turks'), for instance, the first one of the free morphemes *(türk)* represents the *predicate* part and the second morpheme *(budun)*, the *subject* part (cf. *op. cit.*, § 4.2, p. 28) in the same manner as in the construction (Old) Turkish *budun-i* 'his people', the first morpheme *(budun)* is the predicate part, while the bound morpheme *(-i)* represents the subject part (cf. *op. cit.*, § 4.6, p. 31). Hereby the guiding principle in this kind of «agglutination» is that the predicate part precedes the subject part; in operating with the terms 'determining' and 'determined', on the other hand, a discrepancy would arise between the constructions *türk budun* and *buduni*, insofar as the determining element precedes in the former sequence *(türk budun)*, but follows in the latter sequence *(buduni)*.

In the present morphological analysis bound (abstract or grammatical) elements are normally to be considered the subject part, while the free (concrete or lexical) element is to be considered the predicate part. Instead of these terms we may with equal right and to make the analysis more clear use the terms *formative* and *stem*, respectively. The basis of our analysis of a morphological system (eventually with a classification of the language) is the placement of the formatives in relation to the stem of the inflected word (we use the term 'inflected' to denote any kind of grammatical modification, including «agglutination» and other changes not counted as «inflection» in the classical terminology referred to above). In the various systems arising in consequence of this analysis (including grammatical structure on the syntactic level) the force of analogy plays an essential part, as directing the building up and maintenance of the system.

The formation of the vocabulary of a language —although in some measure subject to normative tendencies, affecting both its formal (phonetic) and semantic appearance— is in a lesser degree controlled by analogy and involves a kind of symmetry much more elusive and difficult to define (cf. above). The vocabulary of a language is changeable in consequence of the interdependence of word and object, that is owing to its intimate connection with the material and social culture of the speakers of the language. Although there may be concrete forms in a vocabulary which have survived thoroughgoing cultural changes in the society where it is in use, it must be acknowledged that the majority of lexical forms are ephemeral in relation to forms within the morphological system of the same language. Further,

11 For an analysis of these terms, see in HOLMER, 1966, §§ 2.1-10.

although any element in the structure of a language may be «borrowed» (that is to say created afresh through new contacts), these borrowings are far more intermingled in the vocabulary than in the morphology, appearing in the character of more or less transparent «loan words».

Closely connected with the structure of the vocabulary, or the lexical inventory of a language, is the «metasyntactic» system (that is the structure of its metasyntax, an aspect of language which has been dealt with by the author —although for evident reasons not exhaustively— on previous stray occasions (HOLMER, 1963, pp. 84-92, with the Note 160, on p. 112; 1965, pp. 83-88; 1969, pp. 137, 140-42), according to the norm that a language does not mean *how* «things» (whatever this word may imply) are said, but *what* is said. This truly complicated problem involves the relation of speech and «reality», or of word and object, or else of linguistic construction (whether phrase or context) and situation. It is evident —if we accept the postulate that concepts of situation exist at all— that any object existing in reality can be described in a number of different ways and that any situation can likewise be conceived differently by different individuals or members of different societies. In Eskimo, as well as in Japanese, for instance, situations which to our mind have a positive character are nevertheless expressed by negative forms: In (Greenland) Eskimo 'good' is *ajunngilaq* (formally 'not bad', from *ajortaq* 'bad'), 'to know' or 'be known' is expresed by *nalunaipoq* (formally 'does not ignore', from *naluvoq* 'ignores'), while in Japanese a positive assertion that something 'is' may be expressed by *nai koto wa nai* (formally 'as for not-being, it is not', i.e. 'not-being is not') [12] or by *nakenashi* (formally 'there is not not-being'), etc. [13] and the idea of 'must' or 'ought' is expressed by, for instance, *naranaba ikanai* (formally 'if it does not happen, it does not *or* will not go') or *nakereba ikanai* (formally 'if it is not, it will not do', or the like). It is clear that the «situation» is identical in each case whether considered from the Eskimo, Japanese or English point of view, while the verbal expressions are quite different.

This circumstance hence disproves any strict connection between word and fact or reality. How can we as a matter of fact know whether a thing is 'good' or 'not bad', whether we 'know' or 'do not ignore something' or whether it is 'good or necessary to do something' or 'won't do if we don't', etc., that is whether the positive or negative assertion represents a true des-

12 Cf. Basil HALL CHAMBERLAIN, *A Handbook of Colloquial Japanese*. London and Tokyo, 1889.

13 Cf. Old Japanese *nakenaku* 'the fact being not that there is not'; see Masako YOKOYAMA, *The Inflections of 8th Century Japanese*, Language Dissertations No. 45, in Supplement to *Language*. Baltimore, Md. 1950.

cription of «reality». It is hence evident that any situation (if not any thing or object) can be represented in an infinite number of ways, equally justifiable. The 'situation' —at least in an ordinary European *milieu*— is evidently the same whether expressed in the English or Spanish way ('go to bed', *ir a la cama*) or the French or Gaelic way (*aller se coucher*; *dol a laighe* 'go to lie (down)'), while other expressions migth be preferred elsewhere (German *schlafen gehen* 'go to sleep', which, incidentally, may connote 'fall asleep' in English). The present author has often pronounced the opinion that the only true representation of «fact» is by means of the positive and negative adverbs 'yes' and 'no', as these exclude a «wrong» idea without at the same time asserting any other, which would necessarily be inexhaustive.

It is to be understood that neither morphological (including syntactical in the usual sense of the term) nor metasyntactical constructions aim at expressing facts or reality (as is no doubt the prevailing notion not only of people at large, but also of most linguists), but must be looked at as dependent on prevailing tendencies to co-ordinate and systematize a linguistic structure. This then is a process absolutely parallel to the one in which any cultural element is assimilated to an accepted model. If therefore we allow that any natural phenomenon is essentially one and the same to members of various societies, yet the linguistic reaction toward the same will be widely different according to the different means and habits of expression inherent in any language; in more or less the same way the event of a stroke of lightning is not regarded identically by a physicist and a person without a corresponding scientific knowledge. We consequently analayze the structure of a language not in its relation to «facts» or «reality» (insofar as these can be established), but in its relation to structures in other languages or in the same language in an earlier or later stage of evolution.

PART II

In an analysis of the structural evolution of a modern Western European language (such as English, which may in many respects be considered as a model), it will be an advantage to begin our analysis by considering such evolutionary tendencies as are noticeable in its latest stages, that is during the last few centuries of its history, tendencies which by the way coincide in a general sense with what the author has assumed to be characteristic in the formation of a new structure type (Type V), somewhat vague in its outlines and so far limited to restricted areas [14]. It is noteworthy that most attempts to create an artificial universal language (that is from Za-

14 See HOLMER, 1970 b, p. 42, Note 5.

menhof's *Esperanto* or von Wahl's *Occidental)* are, as if intuitively, based on such a type. As far as the special trends in the development of this type go, it is rather evident that —excepting the evolution in the very latest period— these are to a considerable extent due to the influence of French (roughly dating back, as far as English is concerned, to the symbolic year of 1066, although in reality begun before and continuing after this term). But even so —if any importance is to be given to a recent «Type V»— it is still as much of a problem to trace the origin of this type as it is to trace that of the other types (see HOLMER, 1970 b, pp. 41-44).

1. Features within the range of analogies between French and English

To follow the typological evolution of the Western European languages according to the method proposed by the present author (cf. above), our plan will necessarily be to deal in the first place with those aspects of the morphological structure which have served as basis for our typological classification, that is to say the placement of bound «subject» morphemes in relation to free «predicate» morphemes (for the terminology along with alternative terms, see above and in Note 11), as evolved into a system. In this system the double nature of the «subject» morphemes stands out, which are either *pronominal* or *adnominal* [15].

The pronominal «subject» morpheme does not exist in Old English in the declension (being restricted to the conjugation of the verb). Possessive relation is expressed by independent possessive pronouns (*mín, thín, sín,* etc., answering to Modern English 'my', 'thy', etc.) or else by the possessive form of the personal pronouns, which are free morphemes. As mentioned in a previous context, however, free morphemes often follow suit as regards placement and the construction of the pronominal forms in Old English is in a way significant [16]. In Beowulf there is a large number of cases in which the possessive pronoun follows the noun determined: *Hygelác mín* 'my Hygelac' (vocative), *hláford thínne* 'thy lord' (accusative), *tó hofe sínum* 'to his court', etc., which we may consider as the original Type II construction (cf. Note 16). In Modern English, however, such a construction may safely be considered anomalous (cases such as 'mother (of) mine' for 'my mother' are mere remnants). In French a free construction of the possessive

15 See HOLMER, 1966, §§ 4.5-6, p. 30 and further especially §§ 6.1-7 and 8.1-3, pp. 42-49 and 51-54.

16 Sometimes the border line between a free and a bound morpheme is indeterminate: in Hittite, for instance, the possessive pronouns are *enclitic* (and hence bound), in such cases as *attašmiš* 'my father', yet they are inflected (accusative *atta(n)min* or *attašmin*) just as the corresponding *free* morphemes in Latin (*pater meus* or *meus pater, patrem meum* or *meum patrem*).

pronouns (in the above sense) would be still less possible [17]. Although inflected (as in Hittite; see Note 16), the French possessive pronouns are in reality bound pronouminal morphemes, always preceding the governed noun (that is in contrast to Hittite and the Type II languages) and consequently in this respect indicating a different type of language (our proposed Type V) [18]. As far as English is concerned, the modern word order is no doubt a replica of the French one, which in its strict application furthermore appears in several other Western European languages [19]. It seems, however, most firmly rooted in French, as a center of diffusion [20].

The same tendency in English to pass from an old Type II construction to a more recent, or modern, Type III (or V?) construction is seen in the ranging of the adnominal morphemes. In Beowulf some few instances are found of the use of a postposition in place of a preposition: *Scedelandum in* ('in Scania'), *Fréslondum on* ('in Friesland'), *him mid* ('with him'; cf. Latin *secum*). Such constructions are, of course, not found in Modern English and in French they have disappeared without a trace (more correctly, one should probably say that they have never existed) [21]. While in other Teutonic languages traces of the postpositional construction may survive (German *den Fluss* entlang = English *'along* the river'), the later absence of such constructions (except in petrified adverbial forms such as 'hereby', 'therewith', in which the first element is not a nominal word) is without a doubt due to the direct normative influence of French.

The part of the morphology where Type II features find their clearest expression and most important application is in the declension of nominal words, as appears in the old Indo-European and classical languages and, among the modern Western European languages, to some extent still in German (earlier to about the same extent in Anglo-Saxon). In Modern English a trace exists —although not in the significant local case forms— namely in the possessive form, where original masculine and neuter singular

17 The Creole *papa moin* ('my father'), etc. is most likely attributable to an African (Type III) construction.

18 Historically French *mon ami* continues, of course, the Latin *meum amicum* (free morphemes), with exclusion of the parallel Latin construction *amicum meum*. In Spanish both ways are possible and current: *mi amigo* (bound construction) and *amigo mío* (free construction), sometimes with a difference in meaning: *mi madre* and *madre mía*.

19 The older construction, of which instances have been quoted from Beowulf (cf. above) recurs in the old Scandinavian languages (runic inscriptions —where it appears normal— and elsewhere).

20 Neither English nor French have perpetuated the direct translation of the Latin *pater noster* of the Lord's Prayer (by analogy with German *Vater unser* or Spanish *padre nuestro*), but stick to the normative *notre père*, 'our Father'.

21 The Latin *mecum, tecum, secum*, which survive in a modified form in Spanish and Portuguese (*conmigo, commigo, contigo*, etc.), are not reflected in French, being replaced by the entirely different *avec moi*, etc.

forms in *-es* survive in the later generalized modern possessives in *'s*, a form now mostly used of nouns denoting persons (including proper names) and even here showing signs of being supplanted by a construction with the preposition 'of' ('the works *of* William Shakspeare' for 'William Shakspeare's works'). In Beowulf the synthetic possessive, or genitive, form (answering to the modern possessive in *'s*) is the only one in use: *Higeláces thegn* ('Hygelac's thane'), *sunu Hygeláces* ('Hygelac's son'), but also *sweordes ecg* ('the edge of the sword', while 'the sword's edge' in modern usage would seem stylistic). The analytic possessive (with 'of') —as also the possessive with *van* in Dutch— rather clearly copies the French possessive form with the preposition *de* (form Latin *de* = Anglo-Saxon, English *of*, Dutch *van*, etc.), the only one employed in French, while having a limited occurrence in German.

The influence of French —though in a quite different section within the declension— may account for the generalization of a plural suffix *-(e)s*. Plural forms in *-s* occur both in Old English *(-as)* and Old Saxon *(-os)*, though restricted to certain categories of nouns. From late Anglo-Saxon onward the suffix *-as* (later *-es*, etc.), however, spreads with few exceptions ('sheep', 'oxen', etc.; cf. above) to all nouns. The same has happened to a considerable extent in Dutch (*jongens* 'boys', *meisjes* 'girls'). The French, Spanish and Portuguese plurals in *-s* represent a generalization of certain Latin forms in *-s (-os, -as, -es)*, whence *-s* may be said to have become a typical Western European plural suffix (reflected also in most of the artifical languages) [22].

In the verb, neither the pronominal nor the adnominal construction is fully represented in the Indo-European languages in Western Europe. The Modern English conjugation is a simplification of the Anglo-Saxon, which on several points represents a primitive Indo-European type, while the modern French conjugation very nearly represents the Latin one (in several respects a secondarily evolved type). Consequently, there is hardly any possibility for French verbal morphology to exert an influence on that of English- with one important exception. This is the case when both languages show a perfect (or past) tense expressed analytically by means of the auxiliary verbs *avoir* and 'to have' (to some extent also by *être* and 'to be'). Missing in the classical languages of Europe (and as a matter of fact in most Indo-European languages), it must have arisen in the Mediterranean area, showing up in Western Europe in the Romance languages (and then also in Basque) and further in Modern Greek (*ekho demeno* = *vinctum habeo* 'I have bound'). In Old English this construction is not general, although not

22 Cf. HOLMER, 1965, pp. 60-61.

unknown [23]. One may consequently assume with a sufficient portion of probability that past forms with 'to have' in English (as well as in German) owe their spreading and frequency to the influence of French (in Old French both *avoir* and *estre* are used as auxiliaries, although more sparingly than later on).

One important feature of Modern English concerning which it differs from Old English is the use of a definite article (in the cases in which the demonstrative *se* 'the one, that one', etc. are used, for instance in Beowulf, these forms have far more the character of a demonstrative pronoun proper —that is English 'that one', etc.— than of a definite article) [24]. As far as English is concerned, it is reasonable to think that the use of simplified forms of the demonstrative pronoun 'that' (Anglo-Saxon *se*, etc.) as a definite article is gradually established, following the French model (as early as Old French a definite article exists, derived, by analogy with other Romance languages, from the Latin demonstrative *ille*, etc.). In considering cases where a demonstrative word is used as a definite article, it is however necessary to take into account the semantic value of such forms. A great number of languages exist throughout the world in which a demonstrative pronoun is used profusely before or after a nominal word, but in widely different functions which are *not* analogous to the various uses of the definite article in the languages of Western Europe (regarding this, cf. further on, in section 3, below).

2. Syntactical features connected with the African influence in Western Europe

This section does not deal with any kind of direct African influence on either early or modern English or French, but with a number of cases in which points of rather evident contacts between Semitic-Hamitic and certain Indo-European languages may be traced, originating during various periods. According to the present writer's theory, the Indo-European languages originally belonged to our Type II (as also the Finno-Ugric languages), while many African languages (Semitic and Hamitic being included in this type)

23 There are a few instances in Beowulf, where the verb *habban* 'to have' has the function of an auxiliary: *hæbbe ic maertha fela ongunnen on geogodhe* 'I have undertaken many heroic deeds in my youth'. It still seems, however, that wherever a choice is possible between a synthetic and analytic past tense form, whether in English or Spanish, the former is more archaizing than the latter; in Portuguese and Galician the analytic construction is reserved for special functions, while in French the synthetic *passé défini* is hardly used at all in the spoken language.

24 The corresponding Gothic demonstrative (*sa*, etc.) may likewise be used in a way which recalls the use of a definite article, but it must be remembered that most of our Gothic texts are almost literal translations from Greek and that many of the agreements between these languages arise in consequence of this fact; still Gothic keeps *in himinam* ('in Heaven'), in spite of the Greek *(ho) en tois ouranois* (in the Lord's Prayer).

belong to our Type III (as suggested in HOLMER, 1970 b, pp. 57, 74-75 (§ 16.1), with the Note 47, and elsewhere). Even the earliest languages of Indo-European type show traces of a structural influence of the Semitic-Hamitic type (Egyptian, Coptic, Hebrew, Arabic). Some of the syntactical analogies between these languages were noted by Julius Pokorny, who proposed a direct African impact on early Celtic (or rather Western Europe), according to his well known theory expounded in *Das nicht-indogermanische Substrat im Irischen* (Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie, vols. 16-18). According to this theory a remarkable number of structural analogies (on various levels) are to be found between Semitic (Hebrew and Arabic), Hamitic (Egyptian and Berber) and especially the Goidelic branch of Celtic (or Irish), which would be based on a primitive, preponderantly racial, affinity existing between Western Europe and Africa. The present writer would by no means deny the importance of the analogies observed by Pokorny, but would rather look for a different explanation. One must in the first place remember that the oldest extant specimens of the Irish language do not go back even to the beginnings of the Christian era; at the time when the assumed peculiar «non-Indo-European» traits begin to appear, similar traits may be discovered in vulgar Latin and the Romance languages and it is rather likely that a considerable portion of the pretended analogies are not any older and that they may actually have reached Ireland via France and the Iberian peninsula, during the early part of the first Christian millennium. Still since in those early days communication and trade was principally by sea and since we know that Phoenicians reached the British Isles at a very early date, it would hardly be surprising if an influence from this source should have had a certain effect on Irish (or Celtic) and, as a matter of fact, should have exerted a stronger imprint in those areas than on parts of the European mainland.

It is doubtful whether the oldest contacts between Indo-European and the languages of southwestern Asia and northern Africa had any preferential relation to Celtic. In the oldest Celtic known (archaic texts in Old Irish, if not in Gaulish) the constructions are considerably more like those of the oldest Indo-European languages (for instance Hittite) [25]. The oldest influence of the «African» type belongs to the oldest strata within Indo-European and appear as much in Indo-Aryan, Hittite, Greek, etc., as in any of the western Indo-European languages. Starting from the hypothesis of an essentially Type II structure of Indo-European, we find intermingled in this structure features which are not indigenous in that type, although common in Types III

25 Cf. Calvert WATKINS, *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb* (Dublin, 1962, pp. 74-89); Myles DILLON, *History of the Preverb* to (Eigse, vol. 10. Dublin, 1962).

and IV. Apart from the early occurrence of prefixed or infixed morphological elements (the so-called «prothetic», «unstable» or «mobile» *s-* or the nasal infix *-n-*, formatives reappearing in Semitic and Hamitic), primitive Indo-European further shows several clear parallels to the «African» type, to be dealt with in the following section.

3. Morphological contacts between Indo-European and Semitic-Hamitic

Semitic and Hamitic are at the outset (if we can use such a term in dealing with language) on several points structurally related to the Indo-European languages. Phonetically, the consonant systems show oppositions reflected in either (triple or quadruple series of plosives) and the supposed existence of «laryngeal» sounds in the proto-Indo-European language is probably inspired by the existence of such phonemes in Semitic (and possibly Old Egyptian). There are or have been scholars (in the first place Hermann Möller) [26] who have attempted to discover a common origin of Semitic and Indo-European (regarding this, cf. further ahead). As far as the theory of Indo-European «laryngeals» goes, one can only say that although logically conceived it is not supported by actual facts. There is hardly any direct trace of any «laryngeal» sound in any Indo-European language; the only phoneme of vaguely similar character (and otherwise absent in the Indo-European languages at large) occurs in Hittite (being variously represented by *h*, etc.), a sound which may rather be identified with the Arabic or Hebrew sound in the word for 'brother' (Arabic *akhun*) and hence *not* a laryngeal. Besides, this sound hardly ever occurs in Hittite where expected according to the postulates of the «laryngeal» theory.

On the other hand, the phonetic systems of some of the Indo-European languages show an enrichment apparently under the influence of Semitic and Hamitic, by adoption of new phonemes fundamental in the latter languages (various classes of sibilants and affricates; cf. HOLMER, 1966, páginas 71-73) [27]. Another feature of the same kind is the Indo-European apophony. Assuming that the latter languages are primarily of our Type II structure, one would hardly expect the original existence of an *ablaut* system (all kinds of vowel alternation being rare in or foreign to Type II languages). The regular alternation of such forms as (Arabic) *malaka, malikun, mâlikun, mulkun, milkun, mulûkun* in Semitic or still better an apophony of the

26 Hermann MÖLLER, *Semitisch und Indogermanisch* (Copenhagen, 1906), *Vergleichendes indogermanisch-semitisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen, 1911).

27 Cf. Italian in comparison to Latin. Although the latter may have had sounds approaching the corresponding Italian ones in such words as *Cicero, scientia*, yet they evidently did not occur as phonemes.

type *e* ~ *o* ~ *ê* ~ *ô* in Egyptian (cf. Coptic *nûhem,* representing original **nôhem, ~ nohm ~ nehme,* from the verb 'to save') [28] is reflected in the Indo-European alternation **ped-, *pod-, *pôd-* ('foot'), etc. [29]. The *ablaut* alternation has probably evolved in the course of time, both in Semitic, Hamitic and Indo-European: in the latter languages, for instance, it is least evolved in Hittite, Tokharian (?), Celtic and Italic, reasonably well in Teutonic and Greek, while it is most highly developed in Slavic, Baltic and Indo-Aryan, where, besides, quite new *ablaut* systems have gradually arisen.

If we assume that the pronominal inflection in Indo-European was originally on the same lines as in Hittite (*attašmiš, attaštiš, attaššiš* 'my, your, his *or* her father'), that is by an enclitic construction, no further evolution under the influence of «African» morphology needs to be taken into account, since this is precisely the «African» word order (Arabic *'abî, 'abûka, 'abûhu,* etc.) [30]. If consequently the French construction *(mon, ton, son père)* along with the English one ('my, your, his *or* her father'), characterizing the author's proposed Type V, is not mirrored in any primary «African» model, it could still have been molded on the (secondary) pattern in one Hamitic language, Egyptian (cf. Coptic *paiôt, pekiôt, pefiôt* 'my, your, his father'), which is the only word order possible in Celtic (Old Irish *mo máthir, do máthir, a máthir* 'my, your, his mother) [31], from the oldest time (and thus a very good example of what Pokorny considered to be due to the African influence). The Coptic construction is, however, secondary, representing possessive formatives very regularly *suffixed* to a demonstrative stem (serving as an article), much in the same way as in Italian *il mio,* Portuguese *o meu,* etc.

As for the pronominal construction in the conjugation of the verb (that is the way in which person is expressed), one will similarly notice that both Semitic (in the perfect tense), Hamitic (primarily in Old Egyptian) and Indo-European originally make use of personal *suffixes.* In Celtic this tendency prevails to such an extent that any pronominal form occurring before a finite verb form changes the character of the latter into that of a relative form, according to the following pattern: (Scottish Gaelic) *mise their sin* '(it is) I *who say* that' (a construction which in the Old Irish language would have required a relative form of the verb). Whence then does the

28 Cf. Walter TILL, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik* (Munich, 1961), p. 138.

29 Cf. HOLMER, 1966, pp. 34-35.

30 It is reproduced in French Creole (in the West Indies): *mamman-ou, papa-ou* 'your mother, father' *(maman vous, papa vous),* most likely due to African influence.

31 In Old Irish MSS. Always represented in one word: *momáthir, domáthir, amáthir,* thus falsely suggesting a Type I possessive inflection (Aztecan *nonan, monan, inan* 'my, your his *or* her mother').

only possible French construction *j'aime, tu aimes,* etc. (involving bound morphmes) originate? One can only conjecture that this word order (having its roots in late spoken Latin), according to which the personal pronouns regularly precede the verb forms, likewise goes back to Semitic-Hamitic prototypes: compare (Arabic) *'a-'lamu, ta-'lamu, ya-'lamu* (that is *je sais, tu sais, il sait*—notice that the expression of the pronoun is a bound morpheme in either language); (Coptic) *eï-eime, ek-eime, ef-eime* ('I know, you know, he knows'). In these latter flections—that is in Coptic—the pronominal elements are historically *suffixes,* added to a particle *e-* (in Old Egyptian *iw,* corresponding more or less to the Arabic *'inna* or the Hebrew *hinnê*: Arabic *'inna-hu ya-*, etc., probably to be analyzed historically as 'see-him *who* ...'; also cf. *wa yaktubu* 'and he writes'). Whether or not such constructions with an introductory particle may actually account for the *prefixed* pronominal forms in Semitic, they still point toward the origin of our assumed Type V construction of conjugation forms [32].

Similar observations hold for the declension system in Indo-European. Primarily case *suffixes* are used, as also in Semitic: Latin *servus,* Arabic *'abdu(n),* Latin *servi,* Arabic *'abdi(n),* Latin *servum,* Arabic *'abda(n)* [33]. Local case relations, however, are expressed in the older Indo-European languages either by local case forms (by means of suffixes) or by adverbial forms (usually and originally postpositions), hence all the time by postfixed elements, while in Semitic and Hamitic analogous relations are expressed by prepositions; this marks the only essential difference between these languages in respect of local-case construction. The influence exerted by Semitic or Hamitic on the later development of Indo-European would consequently consist in the preponderantly growing use of *prepositions* in place of postpositions (or postfixed morphemes in general) within Indo-European and particularly in the modern languages of Western Europe.

The oldest Indo-European languages (especially Hittite) know neither of a possessive case form in **-ī* (or a formative containing an *i*-element),

32 A similar attraction of a suffix by an introductory word or particle takes place in the Indonesian group of languages (Type IV): Malay *kĕlip kĕlip ku sangka api* 'fireflies I thought (were) fire' (hence *ku* 'I' appears as prefixed to *sangka* 'thought') and similarly in Tagalog: *hindî ko ina siya* 'she (is) not my mother' (otherwise *ina ko* 'my mother').

33 As is well known, the Arabic accusative (in *-a(n): abda(n)* 'slave') also serves many functions of the Latin ablative. Further, the Semitic accusative in *-a-*, in its adverbial sense ('with'), is semantically related to the dual nominative in *-â-* (cf. Indo-European instrumental singular and nominative dual in *-ô*, etc.), while the oblique cases in both linguistic groups show an *i*-diphthong (Indo-European *-oi-* and Arabic *-ai-*); the idea is near at hand to identify the Indo-European accusative in **-om* with the Semitic indeterminate accusative in **-am* and the Indo-European instrumental in **-ō*, with the Semitic determinate accusative in **-a* (Semitic paradigmatic vowels, *-u, -i, -a*, representing Indo-European thematic or "stem" vowels).

as in Latin *viri*, Old Irish *fir*, nor (in Hittite) a corresponding qualifying (adjectival) suffix, as in Latin *-ius*, Greek *-ios*, Sanskrit *-(i)yas* (in Old Indian a suffix *-ī* occurs in a different, but perhaps related function). The possessive-qualifying *-i* is important in Semitic: Arabic *maliki(n)* 'of (a) king', *mulûkiyyu(n)* 'royal' (like Latin *rex, regius*; also cf. Latin *servi* ~ *servilis*). If we are allowed to assume that this possessive-qualifying termination first arose in Semitic, its adoption as a double formative in Indo-European would not be less maintainable than the adoption of a French suffix *-é(e)*, as in *employé(e), fiancé(e)* into English ('employee', 'fiancé(e)') and subsequent generalization (as in 'payee', 'draftee', etc.) [34].

Indo-European, Semitic and possibly Old Egyptian (cf. HOLMER, 1965, pp. 79-80, Notes 93-94) are the only languages known to the writer of this essay —disregarding a possibly analogous form in *-a* in Austronesian— to possess a subjunctive mode in the Latin and Greek sense. In Indo-European it is expressed by a vocalic element *(-e-, -o-)* or (from stems already ending in one of these vowels) by lengthening of the stem-final vowel (hence *-ē-, -ō-*): Old Indian *asa-*, from present indicative *as-* 'to be' (reflected in Latin *erit* to *est*), Greek *legē-, legō-*, from present indicative *lege-, lego-*, etc. In Arabic the corresponding form is in *-a-*: *yaf'ala* (cf. the indicative *ya'falu*; = Greek *poieêi*, beside indicative *poieei*). The difference between the indicative and subjunctive form in both languages probably reflects a difference between the nominative and instrumental-accusative case forms (cf. Arabic nominative *rajulu-*, accusative *rajula-* 'man'; Latin *rex, rege, servos (servus), servō*; Greek *pous*, dual *pode* 'foot, feet'—for the relationship of dual and instrumental forms, cf. Note 33). The use of an instrumental-accusative form expressing a circumstantial verbal action (while the indicative-nominative expresses a primary verbal action), in secondary adverbial or object clauses, may be illustrated by a context such as the following: 'he told (him) or said (nominative-indicative) *that* he should do it (accusative-subjunctive)' or 'he came (nominative-indicative) *when* (because, since) he (another) departed (instrumental-subjunctive)' [35]. This analysis becomes possible only on condition that the modal conjugation suffixes are understood to be analogous to original case suffixes (of nominal stems) and the personal conjugation suffixes, to original possessive suffixes, added to an original nominal/verbal stem, in Indo-European as well as in Semitic, that is on the

34 In the same way a similar element in *-i-* has entered Finno-Ugric (whether or not *via* Indo-European): Hungarian *napi* 'daily', *éji, éjjeli* 'nightly', *évi* 'yearly', etc. (from *nap, éj(jel), év*, respectively).

35 A dual-comitative usage would develop into a subjunctive expressung 'at the same time as', etc.

same lines as in the languages of Type II (the construction consequently antedates the final establishment of a model Type III).

Characteristic of the languages of «African» type (Semitic and Hamitic) is the use of a definite article (in Arabic *al*, Hebrew *hâ*, Coptic *p-, t-, n-*), usually preceding the noun determined. If any linguistic contacts eist between these languages and those of Western Europe (cf. above), one would hardly hesitate in maintaining that the use of a prefixed definite article in the Romance, Celtic and (later and gradually) Teutonic languages is directly due to the influence of the afore-mentioned languages of African type.

In dealing with «definite articles», however, caution is recommended. If we accept that a definite article is a demonstrative word (or particle) referring the noun it determines to one mentioned in a preceding context (or otherwise understood) and identified with the same, such cases must be excluded in which no such reference is made. Particles of this kind have nothing to do with Semitic-Hamitic articles. In Old Irish the definite article (originally 'this' or 'that') may be used in this latter way and is in this function possibly much older than any contacts with Africa. As a matter of fact, the latter usage is frequent in the American Indian languages. In Blackfoot (Montana), for instance, a story may begin: «*This* (or *that*) man went hunting. He came to *these* (or *those*) deer», etc. [36]. In the same way in modern Nahuatl (Mexico; in a story taken down by K. Th. Preuss): «two boys went hunting and on the hillside they saw *a* stag» (*okitak* in *masat* 'they saw *the* stag' —incidentally highly reminiscent of a passage in the Old Irish *Life of St. Patrick* (in the Book of Armagh): *airm ifuirsitis* in *torc, port hifuirsitis* in *nelit* 'the place where they should find *the* boar' (i.e. '*a* boar'), '*the* doe' (i.e. '*a* doe'). In Iroquois (Seneca, N.Y.) the same use of a demonstrative word expresses our 'a', 'an', 'a certain', in: *ne' neh ongweh danonhdakhe' 'that* or *the* man was coming (in a canoe)' (i.e. '*a* man')[37]. —In the Type IV languages, still another kind of «article» occurs (Hawaiian *ka hale 'a* house' or '*the* house'), which, however, is an originally classifying particle with no demonstrative connection whatsoever [38].

The Indo-European languages have traditionally a declension system comprising three genders (masculine, feminine and neuter). By analogy with the Semitic and Hamitic languages (Coptic, for instance), certain Western

36 See J. P. B. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG, *Blackfoot texts* (Verh. Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen, afd. letterk., n. r. Amsterdan, 1914), p. 59; the editor of the Blackfoot texts translates the demonstrative words into English by respectively 'a' and 'some'.

37 In *Seneca Fiction, Legends, and Myths*, edited by J. N. B. HEWITT (32d Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, 1918), p. 720.

38 Cf. references in the author's *Oceanic Semantics* (Australian Essays and Studies, vol. V. Upsala, 1966) and in HOLMER, 1966, pp. 15-16; 1969, pp. 124-25.

European languages (Romance and Celtic) tend to transform this system into one of two genders (masculine and feminaine). There are consequently many points of agreement between Indo-European and Semitic; yet to say that Semitic and Indo-European are genetically cognate (as according to Möller; cf. above) is inappropriate for the plain reason that, according to the more realistic view proposed by the present writer and recommended in the Introductory sections to this study, *no* languages are properly speaking genetically cognate.

4. Features representing survivals of Type II in the languages of Western Europe

We now reach the stratum where the supposedly primary Type II characteristics show up in Western Indo-European languages, that is to say structural features which have survived from a period farther back in time than the contacts with the languages of Type III (dealt with in the preceding sections). The nearest relations of Indo-European-speaking ethnic groups whose languages belong to our Type II are the speakers of Finno-Ugric, occupying an area to the north and east of that of the Indo-European languages. For these languages also a genetic affinity to Indo-European (that is a common origin) has been supposed, more or less directly inspired by theories advanced by Björn Collinder, in *Indouralisches Sprachgut* (Upsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1934.1, §§ 23-50), to which the present writer has made reference in a previous study (HOLMER, 1959, § 8), and where, besides, some additional remarks in the same direction have been proffered. Considerable analogies in vocabulary —although of no account in our present analysis— are found and may be mentioned: Finnish *vesi*, Hungarian *víz*, English 'water'; Finnish *vetää*, Hungarian *vinni, visz, vigy-*, Russian *vesti, ved-* 'lead, bring'; Finnish *jää*, Hungarian *jég*, Welsh *iâ* 'ice', cf. English '-icle' in 'icicle', etc.

Analogies between Indo-European and Finno-Ugric morphology fall, as is well known, within the field of pronominal expression. There can hardly be any doubt as to the identity of the Indo-European formatives **m-*, **t-*, **s-* as exponents of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, respectively, and corresponding homophonous formatives in Finno-Ugric, whether used as basis of independent personal or possessive pronouns or of personal suffixes in the conjugation: compare Latin *me, meus (sum, eram)*, English 'me, mine', Finnish *minä, minun*; Latin *tu, te, tuus*, English 'thou, thee, thine', Finnish *sinä, sinun* (from **t-*); Latin *se, suus*, Finnish *hän* (from **s-*) 'he, she' [39]. Originally, these formatives do not seem restricted to singular number, as seen,

39 Hungarian *mi* 'we', *te* 'thou', *ti* 'you' (plural), *ö* 'he, she' (from **s-*, as in Hungarian *ín*, Finnish *suoni* 'sinew').

for instance, in Finnish and Hungarian (cf. Note 39), but to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd persons, respectively, regardless of number (as shown by a great many languages of «Altaic» type in northern Asia). As mentioned, the same basic elements enter in bound suffixes in the possessive inflection of nouns (Finno-Ugric and «Altaic») as well as in the personal conjugation of verbs (Indo-European, Finno-Ugric, etc.). The latter function is well known, as seen in: Latin *sum, sumus (*-m-), estis, este (*-t-)*; Finnish *olen* (from **-m*) 'I am' *(sum), olemme* 'we are' *(sumus), olet* 'thou art', *olette* 'you are' (plural; Latin *estis*) [40]. The agreement between Indo-European and Finno-Ugric on these points are accompanied by a similar agreement of other pronominal elements: demonstrative pronouns in **te-* and **to-* (English 'this', 'that'), as in Finnish *tä-, tuo-,* etc. [41], interrogative-indefinite pronouns in **k^{u}-, *k- (*q-),* etc. (Latin *quis, quod*, Finnish *ke-,* Hungarian *ki* 'who?'), also with a considerable expansion throughout northern Asia and extending into America (Eskimo forms in *ki-*, Quechua forms in *q-*, etc.)—hence an element characteristically representative of our Type II. The analogies between Indo-European and Finno-Ugric (and in general «Altaic») give evidence of basic contacts pertaining to an earlier stage in the evolution of Indo-European than do those found between the latter languages and Semitic or Hamitic.

5. Features originating in Type I

We have traced the evolution of the typical Western European languages through the stages evincing traits of Types II and III [42]. If we suppose that our Type I represents the earliest surviving linguistic type out of the four (or five) principal structure types according to the author's theory [43], we might ask whether any trace can be found of constructions peculiar to this type in any of the later European languages considered here. First of all, Type I represents languages which from our point of view present generally uncongenial morphological features, not readily adapted within

40 In the 2nd and 3rd persons singular, Indo-European deviates in having **-t-* in the 3rd person and **-s-* in the 2nd. It is interesting, however, to find that in Tokharian the personal suffixes in the singular are not **-m-, *-s-, *-t-*, but *-m-, -t-, -s-*, that is as originally in Finno-Ugric.

41 In Indo-European, the alternation of the stems **te-* and **to-* does not indicate any appreciable semantic distinction, as in Finno-Ugric (Finnish *tä-* 'this', *tuo-* 'that'), but falls within the range of *ablaut* alternation. However, the existence of differently vocalized stems in Indo-European (**te-*, respectively **to-*) may actually antedate the systemization of Indo-European apophony.

42 Type IV is analogous to Type III, in many respects, but restricted to the eastern part of the world (more precisely southeastern Asia and Oceania) and need not concern us in this connection.

43 Cf. HOLMER, 1970 b, pp. 41-46, especially Note 5.

classical grammatical categories and to corresponding terminology. According to the present author's definition, Type I languages express pronominal relations by bound morphemes prefixed to the concrete word stem, while adnominal relations are expressed by bound morphemes which are suffixed to the same stems. This, however, would not be a sufficient criterion of Type I construction, since several languages might be found, both within Types III and IV, which might claim an analogous construction, yet without being considered by the author as of Type I. The essential point in the morphological structure of a Type I language is the occurrence of so-called *prefix vowels*, that is vocalic elements generally intercalated between the pronominal prefix (usually a single consonant phoneme) and the concrete stem form (usually beginning with a consonant) and having the special function of indicating the particular kind of relation between the pronominal and concrete (nominal or verbal) morpheme [44]. The prefix vowels are, however, not always present or visible, in which case either the different form of the pronominal element or the mere context serves as indication of the kind of relation existing between the mentioned elements [45].

It has generally been supposed that the personal suffixes in the languages of «Altaic» type (our Type II) are to be understood as enclitic possessive pronouns, expressing ownership, in the cases of verbal construction also; hence *-m* renders 'my' rather than 'I' or 'me' (this is, of course, merely a way of making the special relation between stem and formative more easy to grasp, according to the logic of grammatical expression). According to this analysis, the Hungarian *látom* 'I see (him)' would properly mean 'my seeing' (or still closer 'my-see'), just as *házam* means 'my house', etc. (the Hungarian *-k* in *vagyok* 'I am', *megyek* 'I go' would then perhaps rather correspond to 'I'). In the languages belonging to Type I, however, this analysis is hardly satisfactory. Whether or not prefix vowels

44 The nature of the concrete morpheme, when having verbal character, is often supposed to be *passive* (cf. Pedro YRIZAR, *Sobre el carácter pasivo del verbo transitivo o del verbo de acción en el vascuence y en algunas lenguas del Norte de América;* BRSVAP, vol. VII, No. 3. San Sebastián, 1951). This terminology is apt to be misunderstood and does not take into consideration that the construction is basically *nominal*, that is that the prefix functions primarily as a (subjective or objective) possessive pronoun.

45 These relations are, for instance, what the author at one time proposed to call *ergocentric* (or active) and *pathocentric* (or passive) construction (see HOLMER, 1956, pp. 7-8) or else the prefix vowel may indicate whether the pronominal morpheme is to be taken as subject, object, agent (in a passive construction; cf. Note 44) or owner (in a possessive construction), etc. In this way Iroquois (Seneca) distinguishes, by means of the prefix vowels *-a-* and *-u-* (*-o-*), between, for instance: *h-a-tku'tyunyanũ'* 'he is painting his face' and *h-u-tku'tyunyanũ'* 'he has painted his face'; the precise function of the prefix vowel can often be arrived at only through a historic-comparative analysis. It is likely, for instance, that *-a-* (in the above case) indicates a subject or agent relation, while *-u-* expresses ownership (cf. English 'he *has* painted his face').

are used, the joining of the personal formatives to a stem implies a far more diversified process. The exact meaning of the prefix vowels (according to the translation into another language) implicates considerable difficulty [46]. This is perhaps the reason why Type I presents a strange contrast to languages belonging to Types II or III. Although it would be hasty to suggest that constructions with prefix vowels has proven to be cumbersome even to the speakers of a Type I language (Basque, Georgian, Iroquois, etc.), it nevertheless appears that the latter languages are apt to undergo gradual changes in the direction of simplification and that many evident cases are found in which a Type I language has succumbed to neighboring languages of a simpler structure or else adapted its complicated morphology to that of the latter, whence solid blocks of Type II languages are seen in a linguistic map intermingled with scattered patches of Type I languages.

The first step in this kind of simplification would consist in the loss of the prefix vowels and a second step would be the use of independent forms of personal pronouns, according to the common tendency to use an analytic construction in lieu of the primitive synthetic construction, in cases where the latter happens to become less transparent. This occurs in Basque *dagigu* 'we do (it)', *dagizu* 'you do (it)' (for which see further below); notice the use of the stem forms *gu* 'we', *zu* 'you' for the ergatives *guk, zuk* in these constructions, in which the pronoun has ultimately become a suffix (cf. Note 49). In a similar way the suffix *-mu* in the Sumerian *adamu* 'my father' may be related to the independent pronoun *mae* 'I' (originally perhaps an ergative in *-e*, not however used in the possessive construction, where an ergative would not be justified) [47]. An interesting feature hence arises in Type I languages, according to which an intermediate construction results, in such a way that personal prefixes (the primary state of things) occur along with personal suffixes (cf. above); this latter case seems as a matter of fact the more common one in Type I languages.

In the Basque verbal paradigm such a form as *dagi* ('makes him, it', etc.) formally expresses a 3rd person singular object pronoun *(d-)*, joined to the verbal stem *-gi-* ('make') by means of the prefix vowel *-a-*, whereas the subject (or agent) pronoun ('he, she', etc.) finds no formal expression. For the sake of clarity, an agent may in other forms be expressed by a postfixed element, probably corresponding to an old nominative (or stem) form (1st person singular *-t, -da-,* 2nd person singular *-k, -n,* 1st person plural *-gu,*

46 Cf. HOLMER, 1966, § 17.5 (pp. 88-89), 1970 a, p. [31], 35.

47 Sumerian, if basically of Type I (which, however, may not be quite certain), has consequently in the adoption of this construction *(adamu)* made a step in the direction of Type II.

2nd person plural *-zu*; cf. the independent forms *gu* 'we', *zu* 'you') [48]. If such constructions should be translated literally into English, the form *dagit* ('I make it'), for instance, would render 'his (its) maker, I' (cf. HOLMER, 1970 a, pp. 30-31, Note 89); alternatively, the form *-t* (or **da*) could be given an ergative force ('his making by me'), as a distinction of such functions would hardly have existed in the period when the construction in question arose [49].

The same kind of analysis of finite verb forms (that is such as involve personal prefixes or suffixes) would apply to Indo-European and Finno-Ugric languages as well. It consequently does not matter whether we translate the Indo-European **esmi* (Greek *eimi* 'I am') as 'be-I' or 'being-my' (whereas the Hungarian *látom* ('I see him, it') would be analyzed as 'my see(ing)' (cf. above). The only important thing is that a verbal stem is combined with a person-indicating pronominal morpheme, which both in Indo-European and Finno-Ugric happens to be of a twofold kind: one with a 1st person singular in *-m, -m-* (Greek *eimi, elegon*, Latin *sum*, Hittite *ešmi*, Hungarian *látom*, etc.) and one with a 1st person singular ending in a different sound (Greek *legō*, Latin *lego*, Hittite *šaggaxxi (-ahhi)* 'I know', Greek *oida*, idem, Hungarian *megyek* 'I go', *vagyok* 'I am'). The reason for this dichotomy escapes us at the moment, just as the reason for there being two sets of independent pronominal forms (Latin *ego* and *me, me-*, corresponding to Hittite *uk, ugga* and *ammuk*) in the 1st person singular in Indo-European [50].

In connection with the complicated structure involving various personal prefixes and suffixes, prefix vowels and suffixed elements indicating what from the Indo-European point of view would be called «modal» forms (especially subordinated verb forms), the nucleus of the complex, or the concrete stem of the word (especially verbal stems), is often quite short

48 In the singular the independent and suffixed formatives show no clear phonetic correspondence; in the 1st person an old nominative might be found in **da* (hence = Latin *ego*; cf. HOLMER, 1970 a, p. 30, Note 87).

49 In the similarly structured Georgian the pronominal forms *me* (1st person singular), etc. function as either *nominative, ergative* or *dative*. This tripartite function is mirrored in the corresponding Basque forms (including our reconstructed **da* 'I'), as seen in: nominative (Basque **da, gu, zu;* Georgian *me, čven, t'k'ven* 'I, we, you'), ergative (Basque *dagit, dagigu, dagizu* 'I, we, you do (it)'), dative (Basque *zait (zaida-), zaigu, zaizu* 'is for me, us, you'). The Basque *ni, ni-* (as in *nire*, etc.) would be an original oblique form, corresponding to Latin *me, me-* (as in *meus*), Georgian *čem-* (as in *čemi* 'my'), whereas **da* would equal Latin *ego*, Georgian *me;* in the 1st and 2nd persons plural, no formal difference is made between nominative and oblique forms either in Basque *(gu, zu)*, Georgian *(čven, t'k'ven)* or Latin *(nos, no-, vos, vo-*, as in *noster, nobis, vester, vobis)*.

50 For the analogous difference between the 1st person singular forms *me* and *čem-* in Georgian, see above (Note 49). It is, however, interesting to notice that although the Georgian *me* answers formally to Indo-European **me*, yet the respective functions have an opposite character and distribution.

(generally monosyllabic) and of simple structure. It may perhaps be said that in our Type I (and II ?) two basic consonant sounds supported by one vowel sound are normal, whereas in Type III and IV three consonants with intervening vowel phonemes tend to become regular. Still even here it appears that the three-consonant pattern is arrived at secondarily and gradually, as it is evident in many cases that out of the three consonants two only are *basic* (or *radical*, in the sense of establishing a «root»). In Semitic, for instance, the last of the three consonant elements often makes the impression of having been added merely for the purpose of creating a triconsonantal stem, namely (1) in cases such as that of Arabic $\sqrt{q\text{-}l\text{-}l}$ 'diminish (in *qalîl* 'little', etc.) and (2) in cases such as Arabic $\sqrt{j\text{-}m\text{-}}$ 'collect' (e.g. *jamî'* 'entire'), $\sqrt{j\text{-}m\text{-}l}$ 'add together' (e.g. *jumlah* 'total, sum'), $\sqrt{j\text{-}m\text{-}h\text{-}r}$ 'throng, gather' (e.g. *jumhûr* 'multitude'), in which one may presume, from the presence of various enlargements of the same primitive root $\sqrt{j\text{-}m\text{-}}$, that the latter is a basic biconsonantal root. In the same way the Austronesian primitive biconsonantal root **p-t* 'nip, press, squeeze' appears in various enlarged forms, such as Malay *sĕpit, kĕpit, apit* (all of a similar or related meaning).

In Indo-European languages the structure of nominal or verbal stems (or «roots») evidence no fixed pattern, as they range form one-consonant stems to those of several, more or less basic consonants. Common verbal stems may perhaps be said to be shorter and of a simpler structure: **es-* 'to be', **do-* 'to give' (as in Latin *donum*, Greek *doron*), **ei-* 'to go' (Latin *ire*), **dhe-* 'set, put' (English 'to do'), **bhu-* 'be become' (Latin *fui*, Greek *phusis*, English 'be'), **ed-* 'eat' (Latin *edere*, English 'eat'), **p-* (from **b-*) 'drink' (Latin *bibere, potare*, Russian *pit'*) [51].

CONCLUDING REMARKS

What does English or French morphology present of surviving remnants inherited from a former, very remote Type I structure, assuming all the time that the latter type represents the earliest of the four or five suggested by the author? From what one may infer from a perusal of the preceding sections of our analysis, remnants of this kind would appear extremely limited. The existence of a double series of basic forms underlying certain personal pronouns (English 'I' ~ 'me', 'we' ~ 'us'; French *je* ~ *moi*, etc.), whereby the system of pronominal inflection breaks with the more regular

51 Longer phonetic complexes are not necessarily secondary in relation to shorter ones. It is quite likely that ancient forms of the type (English) 'papa' or 'mama' are more primitive than 'pa' or 'ma' (in reality the roots of English 'father', Latin *pater*, English 'mother', Latin *pater*, respectively).

system of nominal inflection, along with the existence of a number of one-phoneme verbal (and perhaps some few nominal) word stems (English 'be', 'do', 'eat'; French *être, irai,* etc.) [52], generally accompanied by irregularities in the conjugation—all of little consequence in describing the morphological structure of these languages.

Our ideas of primitive Indo-European (or the Indo-European *Ursprache*), as well as of primitive Semitic, Hamitic or Finno-Ugric, have possibly been more erroneous than incomplete. Most words and forms entering into the vocabulary and grammar of any known language belonging to any of these families may certainly be logically derived from reconstructed primary forms, supposed to have existed at a fixed period in the early history of the language. But have they actually existed? The common tendency for a long time in Comparative Linguistics has been to disregard the possibility of a secondary origin in many cases of lexical and morphological forms, which might actually have arisen either through borrowing, various kinds of hybridism or metaplasm as well as by analogy-in short, due to new creation of forms [53]. One may wonder what sense it makes to trace an affinity through forms supposed to have had a remote common origin, while in the meantime the entire morphological and lexical structure has had ample opportunity to undergo a substantial transformation, according to the above principles, in a process of continuous renewal.

Since this process —even in languages basically cognate— do not follow parallel trends, gradual differences arise between the members of a linguistic family. This is one aspect of the course of evolution; another is the gradual assimilation produced by later contact of languages and peoples. Recognizing that this kind of differentiation, on the one hand, and assimilation, on the other, must of necessity take place during the history of a language or linguistic group, it will never be certain whether identical or similar forms in two related languages are both derivable from one basic form or one proceeds through borrowing from the other [54]. The process of linguistic evolution

52 In French the shorter stems often do not survive and are replaced by extended (or parallel unrelated) forms: *donner* (for Latin *dare*), *aller* (for *ire*), *manger* (for *esse* or *edere*), etc.

53 Points of semantic change have to be taken into account. The Lapp and Hungarian plural suffix *-k* is not (through a rather peculiar sound shift) to be identified with the Finnish plural *-t*, but rather with an original dual **-k*, generalized for either number in Lapp and Hungarian (as is *-t* in Finnish). Incidentally, the dual suffix *-k* and the plural suffix *-t* extend through Siberia all the way into the American continent, occurring both in Eskimo and Aleut.

54 Does, for instance, English 'right' (Gothic *raihts*) represent, along with Latin *rectus*, a proto-Indo-European form or is it borrowed from either Italic or Gaulish (cf. Old Irish *recht* 'law') in the same way as the Teutonic numerals 'four' (Gothic *fidwor*) and 'five' (Gothic *fimf*) derive from Celtic **petwor-* (cf. Gaulish *petorritum* 'fourwheeled carriage'), **pempe* (cf. Gaulish *pempedoula* 'cinquefoil').

hence moves in a constant circle. But it is equally clear, considering the close interaction of culture and language, that as the one continues to develop so does the other. Distinctive forms, whether phonemes or morphemes, may increase in number within the phonological and morphological system of a language, in the same way as does the vocabulary [55].

Languages are consequently not related to an equal extent or in an equal degree throughout their history. This is a matter of great importance in any attempt at classification of languages. As a matter of fact, linguistic behavior definitely discourages classification. Comparative linguistics should perhaps rather concentrate on an analysis of morphological forms in different languages in relation to each other, whether basically akin or not. Some kind of relationship or similarity, along with cases of parallel construction, is bound to exist in all languages, in brief, points of a universal common thinking [56].

The appearance of identical, similar or analogous morphemes, or morpheme categories, in different languages may either be of the kind where similar functions accompany a parallel course of evolution, as in the case of the Indo-European and Semitic nominative forms (in **-s,* probably akin to the demonstrative pronoun **so* 'that, he', and *-u,* probably akin to the personal pronoun **hu* 'he', respectively) or of the kind in which similar functions are accompanied by similar forms, as in the case of the Indo-European and Finno-Ugric accusative form (in either language in **-m*; cf. above) or, finally, cases where similar functions are accompanied by both a common form and a parallel etymology, as in the case of the Indo-European and Finno-Ugric nominative forms in **-s* (cf. Mordve (Mordvine) *tolgaś* 'the feather', along with the accusative *tolgañ*, from **-m*) [57]. Cases may also arise in wich words having a similar form along with a parallel semantic range (and hence less unlikely a common origin as well), as is the case of Japanese *umi* (1) 'sea', (2) 'pus, matter' (written characters, being different, indicate that this semantic range does not extend to Chinese) and

55 The author does not use the term "distinctive" in its strictly logical sense, based on "meaning". It is evident that any linguistic form of which the speaker of a language is conscious has its particular shade of meaning. The term "allomorph" (in certain usaage) —as incidentally "allophone" as well— is based on the idea that meaning exists independent of linguistic form or may be determined by distinctive traits in a different language.

56 To account for such similarities, or parallel thinking, by assuming a common psychological background, is dangerous insofar as psychology involves thinking and thinking in a high degree depends on language.

57 In Mordve (Mordvine) the demonstrative pronoun corresponding to Indo-European **so* (cf. above) is *śe* 'that', hence originally in determined forms. The Indo-European *-s*, Mordve *-ś* is *not* to be considered an article, but a morpheme of its own (for which a name is not invented, neither perhaps needed).

Eskimo *imaq* (1) 'sea' and 'pus' (cf. Greenlandic *imeq* 'water' and the common Amerindian stem **mən-*, in Dakota *mini* 'water' and Ojibway *mini* 'pus, matter'). Other more intriguing relations between words of equal meaning, paralleled in different languages (Russian *svet* (1) 'light', (2) 'world' and *cvet* 'flower', paralleled by Hungarian *világ* (1) 'light', (2) 'world' and *virág* 'flower') may, although curiously suggestive, in reality depend on an unusual kind of coincidence.

Leaving at this point in our discussion an analysis of the concrete morphological material, we may turn again to the more abstract aspect of different ways of speaking (what the present author has understood by the term «metasyntax»), which, although quite independent of any form of universal logic are yet perhaps subject to the same kind of universality. When, however, these ways of speaking disagree, it will be understood that idiomatic translation —into another language or into another way of speaking— is possible in a limited sense only [58]. Literal translation, however, whether of a word, a phrase, a syntagm or a metasyntagm, arises through cultural contacts [59] and in this way similarly structured phrases or expressions spread over large areas in the same way as do words. These assimilatory processes have happened from the very beginning of the use of language, as essential to communication between people and peoples. While it is not clear in detail *how* a word element is actually being adopted from one language into another, yet once this takes place it is in the manner of an adaptation to a current phonetic and morphological pattern in the receiving language. Further, homophonous elements within languages in contact may assume an identical meaning and function (this may have been the case of the pronominal elements **m-*, **t-*, **s-*, etc., in Indo-European and Finno-Ugric; cf. above) [60].

58 Samuel Noah KRAMER (in *Sumerian Mythology;* see Note 1) in speaking of the difficulty in understanding a Sumerian mythological text, or poem, attributes this to the fect that "we still have little insight into their overtones, into their connotations and implications" (pp. 51-52).

59 A good example of a borrowed metasyntagm is the current formula in Arabic (*bismillâhi* 'in the name of Allah') and Latin (*in nomine Patris*, etc.); it may be hard to analyze this phrase in a concrete way, but it is evident that it has passed from one people or language to another, faithfully keeping the word-for-word rendering.

60 More concrete instances of this interesting, though neglected, phase of linguistic evolution are found in: Cuna (Central America) *pin(a)sa(a)-* 'take to heart' *(pina;* cf. Latin *credere)*, used in the sense of Spanish *pensar;* Old Irish *cosnam* 'contention', used in Modern Irish inthe alternative sense of 'costing' (cf. English 'to cost' —the new concept, or semanteme, borrowed from a commercial society); Scottish Gaelic *saighdear* (from Latin *sagittarius*), used in the alternative and more common sense of 'soldier' (cf. Scots 'sodger', idem— the new semanteme borrowed from a military society). In Old Irish *ailén* means a 'rock' or 'cliff', but in Modern Irish *(oileán)* as well as Scottish Gaelic *(eilean)* it means an 'island'. In Scottish Gaelic the relative 'where' is *far*, which comes quite near in sound to Old Norse *huar*, idem (incidentally, it has been supposed to be a Norse borrowing, while its origin is quite different; cf. Old Irish *fail* '(in the) place (where)') and in the same way Gaelic *nuair (nar)* 'when' approaches in

As indicated in previous contexts in this paper, languages may be considered mutually related in many ways, as they will ever be found to have points in common. The presence of similar or identical formative elements in any two languages may indicate a relationship in one or another sense. To speak of «genetic» affinity is, however, definitely misleading, as no genesis whatever is involved. The establishment of points of agreement between languages, whether phonetically, morphologically, lexically or «metasyntactically» may still be the aim of comparative linguistics, although along other and different lines. The mechanical method is to some extent a means, but not and end, as long as further progress, by building on previous findings, is an ultimate purpose of all science.

RESUMEN EN ESPAÑOL

El autor de este estudio, cuyo título *(Las capas más antiguas dentro de la lengua)* indica un supuesto orden de estratificación en el conjunto de elementos lingüísticos o bien la presencia de distintas capas cronológicas en la estructura de cualquier lengua, hace referencia, en forma de prólogo, a los principios según los cuales ciertos elementos (que pueden ser o palabras o morfemas o fonemas, inclusive hasta giros sintácticos y elementos de fraseología —quiere decir el vasto y algo vago sistema de «metasintaxis») forman, según la teoría del autor, conjuntos de adquisiciones lingüísticas procediendo de épocas distintas, implicándose en efecto un método de análisis no tenido en cuenta por la «neolingüística» clásica (escuela de Brugmann, etcétera), pero justificado por un examen riguroso y más realista de hechos directamente perceptibles en cualquier idioma en la actualidad. Se dirige especialmente la atención a la existencia de préstamos lingüísticos, en todos los niveles de la estructura de una lengua y originados en diversos períodos de su historia, infiriéndose por esto mismo una heterogeneidad universal del conjunto entero de los varios elementos que componen un lenguaje.

A pesar de que la evolución fonológica a la que está sujeta cada lengua durante las varias épocas de su historia, no constituye el tema central de este análisis de cambios estructurales que suceden en ella, el autor incluye en la entrada a esta disquisición ciertos puntos de vista que tocan al carácter general de la dicha *ley fonética,* que el autor considera menos un proceso

sound Old Norse *naer,* idem (in reality it is the Latin *hora(m)* 'the hour when'). In the Gaelic *b'fheudar dhomh* 'I must, I had *better*' the pronunciation of the first word comes very close to English 'better'; as the orthography shows, however, the etymology is entirely different. As a matter of fact, innumerable Gaelic words and phrases suggest corresponding English ones, yet without having the slightest etymological connection with the latter.

mecánico afectando fonemas individuales que un proceso de asimilación o adaptación general a cierta estructura concreta y típica de cada lengua, siendo así afectados en este proceso no fonemas sueltos sino conjuntos fonéticos enteros.

En la primera parte del análisis que sigue, el autor hace referencia a varias bases de clasificación morfológico-estructural de las lenguas, empezando con los bien conocidos conceptos de Humboldt, que sirven de base para una agrupación universal, comprendiendo tipos «aglutinante», «flexionante», «aislante», etc. Ya que esta clasificación descansa en el emplazamiento de partes determinante y determinada en formas morfológicas o grupos sintácticos, el autor compara el valor de estos términos en relación con los alternativos de «parte de sujeto» (elemento formativo) y «parte de predicado» (base concreta o bien tema o «raíz» de las palabras), según una teoría propuesta por el mismo autor en otro lugar (HOLMER, 1966, §§ 2.1-10). Se concluye esta sección por una discusión de los principios de una clasificación tipológica abrazando —aunque por motivos evidentes en forma mucho más restringida— hasta el vocabulario y fraseología; en este contexto se refiere a la noción de una «metasintaxis»' asimismo ideada por el autor y dada a luz en otras publicaciones (a las que se refiere en el lugar respectivo del texto).

La siguiente o segunda parte del ensayo trata de los principios básicos de la evolución morfológica de los idiomas modernos del occidente de Europa (incluso el inglés, que en este respecto se considera como típico) en relación con un nuevo tipo lingüístico hasta la fecha algo rudimentario (tipo V del autor), que además parece servir de modelo para las construidas «lenguas universales» (o mundiales), desde el esperanto y occidental. Se analiza esta evolución en cinco niveles, empezando con las etapas más recientes: 1) analogías en las estructuras morfológicas del francés e inglés; 2) analogías sintácticas surgiendo debido a la influencia africana en las lenguas de la Europa occidental; 3) analogías morfológicas debidas a contactos en un nivel inferior (época anterior) entre lenguas indoeuropeas y las de tipo semítico-camítico (tipo III); 4) elementos básicos del tipo II del autor (al que pertenecen v. gr. las lenguas fino-ugrianas), sobreviviendo en los idiomas de la actualidad; y por fin 5) elementos análogos originados en períodos más remotos y pertenecientes al tipo I del autor (representado v. gr. por el euskera).

Los últimos párrafos, que forman una conclusión a este estudio, explican las nociones del presente autor acerca del parentesco de idiomas pertenecientes a varios grupos o tipos lingüísticos. Se defiende a las teorías de contacto cultural en contra las de un parentesco «genético», punto de vista que implica la teoría de la heterogeneidad primitiva de la estructura de cualquier lengua, contrastando con la de una unidad básica. La uniformidad,

pues, de una lengua sólo se crea sucesivamente por tendencias de sistematizar tanto la fonología como la morfología (posiblemente también —aun cuando en grado reducido— la sintaxis y el léxico).

Nils M. HOLMER

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Frequent reference is made in this article to the following previous works by the author on this subject:
HOLMER, Nils M.

1956 *Amerindian Structure Types* (Contributions from the Linguistic Seminars, vol. 2, No. 8). Lund.

1959 *On the Indo-European Optative* (Contributions from the Linguistic Seminars, vol. 3, No. 13). Lund.

1963 *On the History and Structure of the Australian Languages* (Australian Essays and Studies, vol. 3). Upsala.

1965 *How Does Language Change?* (Arsbok 1961/62, Slavic Seminar). Lund.

1966 *The General Structure of Language* (Contributions from the Linguistic Seminars, vol. 5, No. 23). Lund.

1969 *On Diachronic Classification within Austronesian and Austroasiatic (A Study in Typological Evolution;* Slavic Seminar, Arsbok). Lund.

1970 a *A Historic-Comparative Analysis of the Structure of the Basque Language* (Fontes Linguae Vasconum, No. 4). Pamplona.

1970 b *The Principal Linguistic Types* (Fontes Linguae Vasconum, No. 4). Pamplona.

1977 *Linguistic Relationship on Thee Levels* (Fontes Linguae Vasconum, No. 26). Pamplona.