

Karl Menges

Most comparative historical research into cognates starts with lexical material and neglects other domains of language. Naturally, it is the entire word with which the explorer of little-known or unknown languages is confronted first; thus, the basic works concerning the relationship of languages are founded upon lexical material. But this approach can be very elusive, as shown by the evidence of New English, Osman-Turkish, Malay, Korean, Japanese, Annamite, and a number of other languages. With the progress of time and research, it has become evident that phonological and grammatical facts are of no lesser significance. In a similar way, with some variation, phonology and syntax are open to influences from outside—although to a lesser degree than the lexical stock.

Most resistant against foreign influences is always morphology. Morphological resistance is recognizable even in languages which have lost their morphology to a considerable degree—e.g. New English—and can probably be considered a language universal. Thus, parallels or even identical features, including *prae-*, *in-*, and suffixes, are the very fundamentals of genetic relationships among languages. The applicability of such features may diminish in instances of greatly disturbed linguistic development caused by migrations, conquests, ethnic mixture or absorption, or political repression, and in instances of temporary makeshift communication such as pidgins, creoles, and the like, which are mostly isolated, local, transient phenomena.

Of the three Outer Altaic language families—Korean, Japanese, and Ryukyu—Korean, in contradistinction to the others, poses a number of problems which must be due to the presence of sub- and adstrata indigenous to the Korean Peninsula. Of the non-Altaic languages still extant in that area, Nivx (Giljak) and Ainu, in their earlier stages, are to



be considered possible and probable substrate (Ainu also of Japanese). But there must have been other languages which exerted an influence on Korean, spoken by some of the then numerous "barbarian" tribes mentioned in Chinese historical sources. Unfortunately, these sources do not mention any of the titles used by native chieftains, as is often done with regard to various Altaic tribes.

The same problems arise in the research of the Tungus languages of East Siberia, where ancient contacts with Chukchi-Kamchadals are to be expected in the entire lower Amur Basin. This area had probably been, before the Altaic expansion to Northeast Asia, the roaming ground of proto-Chukchi-Kamchadals, i.e. the peoples who later receded to extreme Northeast Asia, where they occupied great parts of the Chukchi Peninsula and Kamchatka, in close proximity to the Eskimos. The Chukchi-Kamchadal languages have some features in common with languages of North America, and not only those of the Northwest. Vasiliev and Cincius now and then cite Chukchi lexical parallels, as they had postulated some ancient contacts of Tungus with Chukchi. On the subject of sub- and adstrate in Tungus, one may assume the existence of some pre-Altaic peoples, of unknown origin and affiliations, who had lived in the vast Lena-Aldan Plains. However, their influence upon Altaic (as well as Turkic and Mongolian) cannot be as yet, if ever, clearly determined, for we are still far from any definite classification of non-Altaic elements, lexical or otherwise, in the various Altaic families. We may say the same for Turkic, not to mention historically undocumented Altaic languages. Because of the vast expansion of Altaic over Eurasia, from Northeast Siberia as far west as deep into Eastern Europe, the lexical material of Altaic has been thickly interspersed with non-Altaic elements.

In Dravidian, the situation is very similar to that in Altaic. Of the non-Dravidian elements, only those of Indo-European are clearly recognizable, but, even here, cases occur in which it is not clear whether

the matter is one of borrowing or genetic relationship. The Dravidian languages are, with few exceptions, not considered genetically related to Indo-European, and many Dravidologists give no serious thought to the possibility of genetic relationships with other language families, not even Altaic or Uralic. This attitude persists in spite of the fact that Caldwell, the first great explorer of Dravidian, had, in his "Comparative Grammar," repeatedly drawn parallels with Uralic and Altaic (called by him "Scythian") which are still valid today. Dravidian was later compared with Uralic (by O. Schrader), Hungarian (Hevesy), Uralo-Altaic (Bouda), Besque (Lahovary), African languages (Pol with Telugu, by Homburger), again Uralic (Tyler), Japanese (Tamil and Japanese only, by Ono), and, finally, Elamite (McAlpin).

If one takes into consideration the Dravidian-Altaic relationship, a number of Dravidian problems appear in a different light and become resolved. One is the problem of Brahui and the migration of the proto-Dravidians to the Subcontinent, which leads to certain conclusions concerning the other language families of India, Munde and Sino-Tibetan (Tibeto-Burmese), as well as the distribution of the peoples of western Asia. The participial and gerundial constructions of Dravidian become transparent when compared with their equivalents in Altaic. The Dravidian influence on the morphology, and even more notably the syntax, of Indo-Aryan, is matched by the influence of Altaic on the morphology and syntax of Slavic (probably even of Balto-Slavic), particularly Old Bulgarian and Old Russian. In all of these areas one finds features exhibiting genetic relationship, particularly in the morphology of the noun and the nominal forms of the verb—with etymologically identical suffixes of case and number—and in the pronoun. In the latter, however, possessive suffixation had apparently never developed in Dravidian (as opposed to Uralic and Altaic), or had been lost in Altaic, whose three Outer Languages do not seem ever to have had possessive suffixation.

The East Nostratic unity of Uralic, Altaic, and Dravidian has become clearly recognizable. These languages form a closely bound entity, related in turn to West Nostratic, Indo-European, Kartvelian, and Afro-Asiatic. At the present stage of research, no other languages can be classified with East Nostratic. While Jukagir is probably an ancient offshoot of Uralic, Chukchi-Kamchadal is not a Uralic language, though it shows some related features. It remains to be seen whether it, along with Eskimo-Aleut, might be viewed in terms of a more remote genetic relationship with East Nostratic. On the other hand, Languages such as Ainu, Giljak, Jenisejic, Nehali (in central India) and Burushaski (in the Hunza-Nagar District, W. Himalayas) cannot be included in Nostratic. This conclusion, I think, is likewise valid for Elamite, Sumerian, Northwest and Northeast Caucasian, and the ancient Caucaso-Mediterranean (Paleo-European) languages, of which Basque is the sole survivor.

I do not feel competent to judge the situation of Afro-Asiatic, which has extended far into Central Africa. Within this large family, I am amazed at both the quantity and quality of features of genetic relationship with other families, which would rather warrant the maintenance of Afro-Asiatic within West Nostratic or, at least, Nostratic.