

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Alan S. C. Ross, 'The Subdivision of Philology', *Leeds Studies in English*, 2 (1933), 1-5

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=134471&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

THE SUBDIVISIONS OF PHILOLOGY.

A sixfold classification of the different branches of philology has already been suggested¹, but a somewhat more detailed subdivision of the subject is desirable and in this note I wish tentatively to suggest one.

In addition to defining the philology of a language as descriptive or explanatory, synchronic, diachronic or universal, we may indicate whether it is primarily concerned with the 'significant' differences in the speech-sounds (i.e. those which serve to distinguish the internal features of that language from each other), in which case we may call it *phonology*, with the ideas and thoughts (*semasiology*), or with the types of derivation and relation, the moods and emphatic states (*morphology*). In this way we arrive at a fifteenfold subdivision of the philology of a language:—

1. *Descriptive synchronic phonology*. This consists in describing the significant differences in the speech-sounds of a language. The detailed description of the speech-sounds themselves and of those differences in the speech-sounds which are not significant, belongs to subjects which do not form so much definite branches of philology as important auxiliary subjects, such as *phonetics* (in which the speech-sounds are described from the physiological aspect) or *acoustics* (in which they are described from the physical aspect). Thus the difference between the initial sounds of the words *keep*: *deep* is significant in Mn. E. and its description is a point of the descriptive synchronic phonology of that language, whereas the difference between the initial sounds of *keep*: *cool* is not significant in Mn. E. and its description is not therefore a point of the descriptive synchronic phonology of Mn. E. but rather of subjects such as phonetics and acoustics.

¹ LSE., I, 12.

2. *Descriptive synchronic semasiology.* This consists in describing the expressions of the ideas in a language. Thus the fact that the idea 'dog' is expressed by the sounds [dɔg] in Mn. E., or, stated differently, that the meaning of the word *dog* is 'dog,'² is a point of the descriptive synchronic semasiology of Mn. E.

3. *Descriptive synchronic morphology.* This consists in describing the expressions of the types of derivation and relation, the moods and emphatic states in a language. Thus the facts that a very common expression of the 'plural' type of derivation in Mn. E. consists in the addition of the sound [z] at the end of the word; that an expression of the 'ownership' type of relation in Mn. E. consists in the addition of the sound [z] at the end of the word coupled with a constant relative order; that the 'interrogative mood' is frequently expressed by a certain word-order in Mn. E., are all points of the descriptive synchronic morphology of that language.

4. *Descriptive diachronic phonology.* This consists in describing (i) the proximate origins of the sounds of a language and (ii) the sound-changes which they evidence. Thus the facts (i) that the sound [ou] in Mn. E. is 'descended from' the sound [a:] of O.E. and that (ii) a change of O.E. [a:] > M.E. [ɔ:] > Mn. E. [ou] has taken place, are both points of the descriptive diachronic phonology of English.

5. *Descriptive diachronic semasiology.* This consists in describing (i) the proximate origins of the expressions of the ideas in a language and (ii) the changes which these expressions evidence which are not due solely to sound-change. Thus the facts (i) that Mn. E. *stone* is descended from O.E. *stān*; that Mn. E. *ill* has been borrowed from O.N. *illr*; (ii) that the expression of the idea 'dog' in O.E. (*hund*) has been replaced by a form giving Mn. E. *dog*; that the expression of the idea 'they' in O.E. (*hīe*) has been replaced by a form from O.N.

² Owing to the lack of an adequate system of classifying the ideas themselves the usual method employed in dictionaries of arranging them according to the alphabetic features of the words representing them must still be retained.

giving Mn. E. *they*; that the Mn. E. word *hound*, descended from O.E. *hund* meaning 'dog,' now has a different meaning; that there is no expression of the idea represented by Mn. E. *aeroplane* in O.E. or of that represented by O.E. *gold-wine* in Mn. E., are all points of the descriptive diachronic semasiology of English.³

6. *Descriptive diachronic morphology.* This consists in describing (i) the proximate origins of the expressions of the types of derivation and relation, the moods and emphatic states in a language and (ii) the changes which these expressions evidence which are not due solely to sound-change. Thus the facts (i) that the Mn. E. expression of the plural type of derivation which consists in the addition of one of the sounds [z], [s], [iz] at the end of the word is descended from the O.E. nom. acc. pl. of the masculine *-o*-stems in *-as*; that the Mn. E. expression of the ownership type of relation which consists in the addition of one of these same sounds at the end of the word coupled with a constant relative order is descended from the O.E. gen. sg. of the *-o*-stems in *-es*; that in the English dialects of certain parts of Wales (e.g. Breconshire) the expression of 'genitival' types of relation which consists in mere juxtaposition is due to imitation of the Welsh (thus *Jones Tyn-y-Caeau* 'Jones of Tyn-y-Caeau'); (ii) that the 's-plural' and the 's-genitive' have been extended from a limited number of nouns in O.E. to almost all nouns in Mn. E.; that the expression of the 'potential' mood in O.E. (*mæg*) has been replaced by a form giving Mn. E. *can*; that the Mn. E. expression of mood *may*, descended from O.E. *mæg* expressing potentiality, now expresses permission, are all points of the descriptive diachronic morphology of English.⁴

³ But the fact that the expression of the idea 'stone,' O.E. *stān*, has become *stone* in Mn. E. is not, since the matter is solely one of sound-change.

⁴ But the fact that the plural type of derivation for the idea 'foot' was expressed by means of the variation [fo:t]: [fe:t] in O.E. whereas in Mn. E. it is expressed by means of a different variation, [fut]: [fɪt] is not, since the matter is solely one of sound-change.

7. *Descriptive universal semasiology.* This consists in describing the ideas which can be expressed in a language. Thus the fact that Lappish is particularly rich in names for the reindeer is a point of the descriptive universal semasiology of Lappish.

8. *Descriptive universal morphology.* This consists in describing the types of derivation and relation, the moods and emphatic states which can be expressed in a language. Thus the fact that the dual is a type of derivation in Nama (but not, for example, in Mn. E.) is a point of the descriptive universal morphology of Nama.

9. *Explanatory synchronic semasiology.* This consists in explaining why the expressions of the ideas in a language (described in its descriptive synchronic semasiology, No. 2) are what they are, without reference to what they have been. Thus the fact that Mn. E. *miaow* does approximately represent the sound made by a cat is a point of the explanatory synchronic semasiology of English.

10. *Explanatory synchronic morphology.* This consists in explaining why the expressions of the types of derivation and relation, the moods and emphatic states in a language (described in its descriptive synchronic morphology, No. 3) are what they are, without reference to what they have been. Thus the fact that an expression of the 'frequentative' type of derivation in Rarotongan consists in mere reduplication is a point of the explanatory synchronic morphology of Rarotongan.

11. *Explanatory diachronic phonology.* This consists in explaining why the changes described in the descriptive diachronic phonology (No. 4) of a language took place.

12. *Explanatory diachronic semasiology.* This consists in explaining why the changes described in the descriptive diachronic semasiology (No. 5) of a language took place.

13. *Explanatory diachronic morphology.* This consists in explaining why the changes described in the descriptive diachronic morphology (No. 6) of a language took place.

14. *Explanatory universal semasiology.* This consists in

explaining why it is precisely the ideas described in its descriptive universal semasiology (No. 7) which can be expressed in a language. Thus, if we say that the reason why Lappish is so rich in names for the reindeer is that the Lapps are so interested in reindeer, this will be a point of the explanatory universal semasiology of Lappish.

15. *Explanatory universal morphology.* This consists in explaining why it is precisely the types of derivation and relation, moods and emphatic states described in its descriptive universal morphology (No. 8) which can be expressed in a language. Thus the question why Nama has a dual (whereas Mn. E., for example, has not) is a point of the explanatory universal morphology of Nama.⁵

ALAN S. C. ROSS.

PHILOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY.

CASE-SYNECTISM and CASE-FISSION to render the German *Kasussynekretismus* 'the replacement of several case-endings with various functions by one case-ending with these functions' (examples afforded by the Germanic dative which corresponds to the Ind. E. dative, locative, instrumental and, in part, the ablative); *Kasusabspaltung* 'the formation of a new case-ending with some of the various functions of an earlier case-ending which is then left with only a part of its original

⁵ The fifteenfold subdivision of the philology of a language suggested here may profitably be compared with older systems. It should be remembered that there is considerable variation in the meanings attached to certain terms (particularly *semasiology* and *morphology*) by different authors. (1) Descriptive synchronic phonology corresponds approximately to phonetics; the acoustics of speech-sounds, a subject exactly as important as phonetics as a philological auxiliary, has been grossly neglected, probably owing to the considerable amount of mathematics and physics involved. (2) Descriptive synchronic semasiology corresponds to lexicography. (3) Descriptive synchronic morphology corresponds in part to accident and in part to syntax. (4) Descriptive diachronic phonology corresponds to phonology. (5) Descriptive diachronic semasiology (i) corresponds to etymology; most of the changes described in (ii) would be included in the semasiology of the majority of authors (e.g. A. Noreen, *Vårt Språk*; Z. Gombocz, *A magyar történeti*