

I. Manninen, *Die Finnisch-ugrischen Völker*, Leipzig, 1932; Kai Donner, *Verzeichnis der Etymologisch Behandelten Finnischen Wörter*, Helsinki, 1937; Siegmund Simonyi, *Die Ungarische Sprache*, Strassburg, 1907; Hans Jensen, *Finnische Grammatik I*, Glückstadt, 1934; E. Setälä, *Yhteissuomalainen Äännehistoria I (common Finnish phonology)* Helsinki, 1890.

383.2-8: In the Mysian inscription (if accurately transcribed) are two obviously IE words: *braterais patrizi išk* 'for brothers and fathers'; cf. Lat. *frāter*, etc., + IE ending *-ōis* of the *o*-decl. dat. plur.; and Gk. *παράσι*, Skt. *pitṛṣu*, etc. If *išk* = 'and', cf. Lat. *-que*, etc.; but it may be Lydian *eššk* 'this'. See J. Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* 140-1.

392: To Sino-Tibetan bibliography add W. Simon, *Tibetisch-chinesische Wortvergleichungen*, Berlin, 1930; K. Wulff, *Chinesisch und Tai*, Copenhagen, 1934; S. Wolfenden, *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*, London, 1929; B. Karlgren, *Études sur la Phonologie Chinoise*, Stockholm, 1915.

407 (also 410, 416): To American Indian bibliography add Luis Pericot, *América Indígena I*, Barcelona, 1936.

312 and 457-8: There is no mention of H. H. Bender, *Home of the Indo-Europeans*, Princeton, 1922.

DONALD C. SWANSON
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

URSACHEN DES LAUTWANDELS. By H. L. KOPPELMANN. Pp. 156. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N. V., 1939.

A devastating attack upon van Ginneken's biological (or rather pseudo-biological) theory of phonetic law necessarily wins the sympathy of an American linguist. We Americans have at our doors such a linguistic laboratory as can scarcely be found elsewhere, and, even if we have shamefully neglected our opportunities, we have, with very few exceptions, learned better than to ascribe the articulations of a person or of a group to inherited peculiarities of the vocal organs. Nevertheless Koppelman's refutation of the doctrine is clearly needed in Europe; for this reason the book is to be welcomed.

By way of illustration we may mention one argument (103-7) that by itself would be enough to dispose of van Ginneken. The Ottoman Turks resemble their neighbors in Asia Minor much more closely in physiognomy than they do the Turks of Central Asia, but their language has scarcely diverged at all in sound during some six centuries of

separation from the parent stock. During the same period the English language has suffered an extensive phonetic alteration without any noteworthy influx of foreign blood. Many equally cogent examples could easily be cited from America, but these will probably be more persuasive to European scholars.

The author's own opinion is that phonetic innovations are chiefly due to psychological causes; phonetic laws are analogous to fashions of dress or deportment. This is not a new idea; Jespersen holds essentially the same view, as Koppelman well knows; and I have argued for it in an article¹ that he seems not to have seen. The precise form of the theory presented here is not very attractive; Koppelman realizes that phonetic innovations spread, but he does not clearly recognize that most of the phonetic laws registered in our historical and comparative grammars involve such a spread, so that the important problem before us is: Why do phonetic innovations spread over the whole phonetic material of a region instead of infecting isolated words? The question treated here, as in most books on the subject, is rather: Why do phonetic innovations affect all the applicable material of the speech in the district where they arise? Even if the assumption underlying this question is ever proved to be true, and if the question itself is finally answered, that answer will still be of very limited importance for historical linguistics; the phonetic laws that we have inductively established mostly apply to more speakers than are likely to have been concerned with the origination of the change.

Far more distressing than the meagerness of the positive results is the frequent use in this book of the same loose method that invalidates much of van Ginneken's work, and that exposes too many current books and articles on linguistics to the just scorn of physical and biological scientists. For a time it seemed that linguists had banished the term *euphony* from their treatises, but here we find, not the word, to be sure, but the point of view with all the subjectivity and logical futility that attached to it seventy-five years ago. Koppelman calls certain selected languages 'ästhetisierend': Italian (but not Latin), Spanish, and Greek; and he ascribes some of their phonetic laws to a liking for certain sounds and combinations of sounds and a dislike for others, purely as a matter of aesthetics.

The book is full of far-reaching generalizations based upon a shockingly narrow statistical base. Perhaps the worst instance is the classification (76-96) of all languages as *Diskretionsprache*, *Interieur-*

¹ JAOS 44.38-53 (1924).

sprache, and Rufsprache. The author has observed that in a Javanese city there is a lack of privacy on account of crowded living conditions and thin walls; hence the people habitually speak in low tones so as not to be overheard by the neighbors. It is argued that such a secretive language cannot have a strong stress accent; and, apparently just for this reason, French is put into the same class as Javanese. At the other extreme stand certain languages spoken on small islands, where speech must normally be shouted in rivalry with the roar of the sea; here also a stress accent is out of the question, since all syllables must be as loud as possible. Typical examples are the Polynesian languages and the Ainu of Japan. Between these two groups are the languages of cool climates, whose speakers do much of their talking within doors. Here the neighbors cannot overhear, and there is quiet. Here alone a stress accent is possible. One is surprised to find Arabic reckoned to the *Interieursprachen*; but the author once spent two weeks in an Arabic house in Algiers, and he found there the peculiar characteristics of this group, including the stress accent.

Is this science?

EDGAR H. STURTEVANT
YALE UNIVERSITY

MÉLANGES DE LINGUISTIQUE OFFERTS À CHARLES BALLY. Pp. xii + 511. Genève: Georg et Cie., 1939.

When G. Gougenheim wrote his survey of current tendencies in the field of French syntax he did not attach much importance to the Genevan school of Saussure and Bally; he emphasized rather the disciples of Tobler and Karl Vossler in Germany, and the work of Brunot and Lucien Foulet in France.¹ The Genevan school loomed much larger in 1939, thanks to Charles Bally's *Linguistique Générale et Linguistique Française* (Paris, 1932), the second edition of his *Le Langage et la Vie* (Zurich, 1935), and the association of the school with the linguistic circle of Prague. I do not believe that many Americans—the late Edward Sapir being a prominent exception—have appreciated fully the linguistic theories of this group.

Among Romance linguists these methodologies are recognized today:

1. Diachronic:

(a) historical and positivistic observation, an evolution of the methods of the Neo-grammarians of Leipzig;

¹ *Où en sont les études de français*, publié sous la direction d'Albert Dauzat, 107 (Paris, 1935).