

Marine Aroshidze  
Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

David Gotsiridze  
Tbilisi State University

Nino Aroshidze  
Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

## Dissidents of Indo-Europeanism: Hugo Schuchardt and Niko Marr<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

The civil processes taking place in the modern world community at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were marked by a new stage: the intensive progress of economic and political globalization triggered to the linguistic and cultural one that led to the realization of need to globalize knowledge. The modern ‘information society as a post-industrial society’<sup>2</sup> faced such problems which can only be solved by joint efforts of the entire mankind, using the full potential of information achieved so far; however, the studies of American and European experts (Yoneji Masuda, Taichi Sakaiya, Valdislav Inozemtsev) demonstrate that the term ‘information’ has become increasingly replaced by the concept *knowledge*. Thus, we are talking about a society that owns knowledge, therefore, the next stage of the globalization process is globalization of knowledge, which has affected all scientific fields, including the humanities, philology<sup>3</sup>.

Within the framework of the EU-funded research project *Knowledge Exchange and Academic Cultures in the Humanities. Europe and the Black Sea Region*, the period from the late 18<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, intensive research is being conducted in the

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was prepared within the framework of the project KEAC-BSR has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 734645.

<sup>2</sup> Masuda 1981.

<sup>3</sup> Aroshidze 2018, 90.

most important areas of knowledge in Humanities: philosophy, history, ethnography, archeology, education, anthropology, visual anthropology, literature, and linguistics. Moreover, the most important objectives of the project is to recognize not just a one-way transfer of knowledge, but the exchange, circulation of knowledge, in this case in Europe and in the countries of the Black Sea region<sup>4</sup>.

Linguistics as a science has evolved over the centuries: a long period of empirical research ended at the beginning of the 19th century with the formation of the first scientific linguistic paradigm: comparative historical linguistics. Linguistic schools and directions replaced one another and ‘seeds of truth’ were born in endless discussions. The rapid development of linguistics in the twenty-first century and its integration in a number of ‘humanistic’ sciences urgently requires an understanding of the way in which the discipline developed. This will enable to imagine how the exchange of linguistic knowledge proceeded in the countries of the Black Sea region, in particular, in the field of German and Russian linguistics, and Caucasian studies at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It was a difficult period for linguistics, when the comparative historical scientific paradigm exhausted its possibilities and numerous discussions with the prevailing Neogrammarian hypothesis at that time were looking for new ways of scientific development that could meet the challenges of our time. It is in this light that the linguistic concepts by Hugo Schuchardt, an Austrian scholar, and Niko Marr, a scholar from the Caucasus (Georgia, Russia), will be studied: those two became the part of linguistic history as ‘dissidents of Indo-europeanism’.

### Theoretical Background

The late 19<sup>th</sup> and the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries turned out to be very complex and contradictory in the history of linguistic thought. Among all the schools, directions, private concepts that existed at that time, German linguistics stood out for being particularly productive. Izmail Sreznevsky noted that when speaking about foreign linguistics, mainly German science is implied. Of course, it did not exhaust the development of linguistic thought even in the 19th century, when, according to the unanimous opinion of the majority of major scientists, it played the leading role. I. Sreznevsky specially emphasized: ‘Wilhelm von Humboldt, Franz Bopp and August F. Pott are the most significant contributors in this branch of philology. All three are Germans; this does not mean that they did not work on this part in France and in England – on the contrary, there, perhaps, more has been done and is being done to develop the materials, but the Germans are better able to systematize, to obtain results from the developed facts’ (Sreznevsky 1959, 95).

In the 1970s and 1980s centuries, one of the most important areas of European linguistics was Neogrammarian hypothesis, whose representatives (G. Paul, G. Osthof, K. Brugman, B. Delbrück, etc.) made great contribution to the development of com-

---

<sup>4</sup> Kaser, Gutmeyr 2018, 9.

parative historical linguistics; however, the activities of the Neogrammarian school did not bring an unambiguous solution to the sociolinguistic problems existing in linguistics. The well-known Manifesto of Osthof and Brugman, with its skepticism towards the ‘inaccurate and unreliable written tradition of ancient languages’, provoked a very negative reaction from philologically oriented scholars (mainly associated with the University of Berlin. At the same time, the main area of the new trend remained the history of language, the lessons of which required the scientists of the Leipzig School to turn to literary texts. As D. Gotsiridze indicates, K. Brugman, therefore, having stipulated a certain specificity of the two approaches to language and emphasized the close relationship between them caused by the nature of the object and the nature of science itself, focuses on the fact that this proximity concerns not only the object itself, but also the methods of its research<sup>5</sup>. We find similar thoughts in G. Paul<sup>6</sup>.

The works of Neogrammarians became one of the important phases for German linguistic thought, but soon the weaknesses of this direction were also revealed: inconsistency of the subjective psychological understanding of the nature of language, underestimation of the study of its relations with society, superficial nature of historicism, without taking into account the real social conditions in which these changes took place. There were linguists for whom the provisions of the Neogrammarians appeared as dogma that hindered the development of linguistics.

### Scientific criticism/debate and knowledge sharing

Each new scientific concept, a new look at the achievements of the past makes its way in disputes and debates. And even if truth is not always born as a result of these disputes, scientific discussions are precisely the mouth of the volcano, in the fire of which the ideas put forward should be tempered.

The change in each of the linguistic paradigms (comparative-historical, structuralist, anthropocentric), in accordance with the teachings of Thomas Kuhn about scientific paradigms and scientific revolutions, was characterized by a crisis and the inability of the previous paradigm to respond to new challenges of society, and the desire to find the necessary answers within the new paradigm, thus developing a new research toolkit<sup>7</sup>. It is the heated scientific debates in which a new paradigm is formed; such debates promote the exchange of knowledge, it is not just a translation of a certain amount of knowledge from one region to another, but a clash of ideas, their mutual enrichment, the birth of new knowledge.

Criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis allowed its opponents not only to reveal the shortcomings of this direction in linguistics, but also to argue a number of inter-

<sup>5</sup> Gotsiridze 2003, 47.

<sup>6</sup> Paul 1966, 54.

<sup>7</sup> Kuhn 1970.

esting ideas that are still relevant to this day. The wave of criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis united such different people as Hugo Schuchardt, an Austrian scientist and one of the first founders of the sociological direction in linguistics, and Nikolai Marr, the linguist, historian and archaeologist, who have been called ‘dissidents of Indo-Europeanism’ by historians of linguistics.

An interesting similarity of historical destinies can be traced in the lives and scientific activities of these great scientists. Hard to disagree how gravely this might affect: change is always tough. Both Schuchardt and Marr lived and worked at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. They were united not only by a very critical approach to the shortcomings of Indo-Europeanism and, in particular, Neogrammarian hypothesis, but also by the fact that this was a period of great changes: H. Schuchardt’s scientific activity proceeded under the conditions of a transitional period in science, the European scientific community transitioned from biological theories of language to Neogrammarian hypothesis, and from it further to the search for new ways of developing linguistics. Whereas the scientific activity of N. Marr proceeded under the conditions of the transition from capitalism to socialism, that is, under the conditions of a change in the socio-political paradigm, which triggered additional obstacles to his creative activity.

### **Linguistic heritage of Hugo Schuchardt**

Hugo Schuchardt (1842-1927) was born in Gotha (Thuringia, Central Germany) to a German lawyer and a French-speaking mother from Switzerland. He studied in Jena with August Schleicher, mentor of neo-grammarians, also in Bonn with Friedrich Dietz, founder of Romance linguistics in Germany, and with Friedrich Wilhelm Rietzsch, professor of classical philology (Latin), who was also Schleicher’s teacher. Schuchardt’s doctoral dissertation, presented to the University of Bonn in 1862, became the basis of the famous book on the vocalism of Vulgar Latin (3 volumes 1866-1868), which builds a bridge between classical and Roman philology. In 1870, Schuchardt qualified as a lecturer at the University (Dozent) in Leipzig, submitting his doctoral dissertation on the significant change in the Romance dialect in Switzerland. In 1873 he became Professor of Romance Philology in Halle, Central Germany and later in Graz, Austria (1876-1900)<sup>8</sup>.

The scope of Schuchardt’s scientific interests was so wide that his numerous studies covered the most important problems of the science of language:

1. the question of the origin of the language and the related problem of linguistic confusion and language families;
2. criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis and ‘phonetic laws’;

<sup>8</sup> *Encyclopedia of Linguistics* 2006, 28 – is printed according to the article by W.H. Veith, University of Mainz, Mainz, Germany.

3. the relation of a thing to the word and the history of language to the history of culture;
4. Caucasian studies.

### **The question of the origin of language and the problem of language families**

Being a philologist of a very wide profile, a specialist in Romance and Paleo-Hispanic languages, Schuchardt was one of the first in Western European linguistics to theoretically and practically prove the need to introduce the science of language to the category of sociological sciences, to link the history of language with the history of material culture, to study the question of the origin of language in connection with the history of human society. He studied the contacts of Slavic dialects with German and Italian, and conveniently the city of Graz where he worked most of his life was just at the junction of Germanic, Romanic and Slavic languages. Schuchardt was the first among the theorists of linguistics who drew attention to the Creole languages: *Creole Studies* (*Kreolische Studien*, 1882-1890). He made an in-depth study of the so called phenomenon of the substrate, which is associated with the fact that many nations either changed their language in the course of their history, or mingled with other nations, or adopted a language that turned out to be more prestigious; at the same time, some features of the old language are preserved. In his rethinking of the biological direction in linguistics (A. Schleicher's *Stammbaum theorie*), Schuchardt creates a theory of linguistic mixing, and interconnecting (*Sprachmischung*). Refuting the idea of A. Schleicher's family tree, Schuchardt pointed to numerous cases of linguistic contacts, borrowings, provided the examples of changing languages with the preservation of the substrate and, as a result, put forward the concept of 'interconnecting languages', stating: 'There is not a single language that is free from crossing'<sup>9</sup>. H. Schuchardt considered language to be the product of the speaking individual; position, living conditions of the individual, his character, culture, age, etc., in his opinion, have a direct impact on the language, create a certain individual 'style'. H. Schuchardt saw the main reason for linguistic change in continuous linguistic crossings.

### **Criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis and 'phonetic laws'**

All Schuchardt's scientific work is full of harsh criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis. As D. Gotsiridze notes, although Neogrammarian hypothesis had to face very serious criticism from the very first days of its existence, one of its earliest and most irreconcilable opponents was H. Schuchardt<sup>10</sup>. Especially sharp criticism from Schuchardt covered phonetic laws. His article 'On phonetic laws (against the Neo-

<sup>9</sup> Zvegintsev 1960, 315.

<sup>10</sup> Gotsiridze 2003, 47.

grammarians)’ (1885) led to a heated discussion, after which the Neogrammarians were forced to impose restrictions on the actions of these laws<sup>11</sup>.

As V.A. Zvegintsev notes, H. Schuchardt denied regularity in sound changes, the possibility of dividing the history of a language into clearly delineated chronological periods, the presence of boundaries between separate dialects and languages (‘Local dialects, subdialects, dialects and languages are absolutely conditional concepts’). This last statement is directed against phonetic laws (there are no spatial boundaries of their action), and is also against the genealogical classification of languages on the basis of their relationship. Instead of a genealogical classification of languages, he put forward the theory of ‘geographical alignment’ – the continuity of transitions from one language to another in accordance with their geographical location – and the doctrine of the ‘elementary’ kinship of languages, built on the common mental nature of people. V.A. Zvegintsev highlights that H. Schuchardt paid considerable attention to etymological, semasiological and numerous specific questions in linguistics<sup>12</sup>.

In debates with K. Brugman about the relationship between linguistics and philology, Schuchardt asserts:

My point of view is completely opposite to his views... Why do we hesitate to talk about linguistics, literary criticism or history as separate sciences? As for the essence of the matter, I believe that languages, no matter how far they are from one another, in the scientific sense are much more closely related than language and literature, even when they belong to the same people. The identity of the research method is much more important than the unification of heterogeneous research objects. Let the interchange between linguistics and literary criticism be as lively as it is desirable and necessary; one in relation to the other is only an auxiliary science and only (...). If anyone wanted to consider any of the many philologies as a practical subject, as a kind of ‘domestic studies’, then I had nothing against it. But I cannot agree with Brugman, for example, that Indo-European linguistics is not a section of general linguistics, but is a part of Indo-European philology<sup>13</sup>.

The scientist, whose concept marked the end of Neogrammarian hypothesis and the beginning of a new stage in the development of linguistic science – Ferdinand de Saussure was in solidarity with him on this issue: ‘as for philology, then... it differs sharply from linguistics, despite the presence of points of contact between the two sciences and the mutual services that they render to each other’<sup>14</sup>. However, there is another, no less passionate opponent of the Neogrammarian doctrine, K. Fossler who thinks differently. In his opinion, ‘the history of linguistic development is nothing more than the history of spiritual forms of expression’<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Schuchardt H., *Selected articles on linguistics*, M: URSS, 203, p. 23-55.

<sup>12</sup> Zvegintsev 1964, 302.

<sup>13</sup> Schuchardt 1950, 51-52.

<sup>14</sup> Saussure 1977, 44.

<sup>15</sup> Zvegintsev 1964, 329.

### School of *Wörter und Sachen*

In 1909, H. Schuchardt and his Austrian colleague Rudolf Mehringer founded the journal *Wörter und Sachen* (*Words and Things*), which gave its name to the new linguistic trend. Schuchardt proposed not to limit the study of words to the analysis of their sound form and a similar meaning, but to complete this approach with the study of the objects designated by these words and, in general, all cultural data that can illuminate the facts of the language in some way. Moreover, he classified ‘things’ not only the objects of the material world, although it turned out that it was precisely such words and things that were mainly studied by linguists. The program settings of the school of words and things were outlined in Schuchardt’s article ‘Things and Words’<sup>16</sup>.

The main task of the new linguistic school as Schuchardt proclaimed it was need to study the history of words in close connection with the history of the corresponding things, for ‘a thing exists entirely and completely for itself; the word exists only depending on the thing, otherwise it is a void sound’<sup>17</sup>. Recognizing the close ties that exist between the word and the thing, the Austrian scientist considered it very important for linguistics to create a ‘history of words and things’, which led him to the problems of historical lexicology. Continuing to polemicize with the Neogrammarians about the causes of linguistic changes, Schuchardt did not agree with their assertion that linguistic changes are explained mainly by biological and psychological causes, in his opinion, they should be sought not only in the world of things, but in the world of objective reality. As V.P. Danilenko indicates, the world of words in the concept of H. Schuchardt appears as a superstructure over the world of things. Moreover, changes in the latter cause changes in the former. Since the connection between the outside world and language is especially tangible in the field of vocabulary, H. Schuchardt places historical lexicology in the center of his concept. It was not words that were considered as a starting point, but things. In other words, the dominant direction in his theory was the onomasiological direction<sup>18</sup>. The main thesis of the founder of the new school was very short and at the same time capacious: ‘the thing is primary in relation to the word’<sup>19</sup>.

According to G.P. Serdyuchenko, the undoubted accomplishment of Schuchardt is that he combined the study of words with the study of things and, thus, the history of language with the history of culture. Of course, Schuchardt does not solve all the questions related to the relationship ‘Sachen und Wörter’, but he first outlines in linguistics the correct relationship between things and words and returns linguistics from the natural cycle to the social sciences cycle. A number of linguists (Leo Spitzer) followed the path outlined by Schuchardt<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Schuchardt, 1950.

<sup>17</sup> Zvegintsev 1960, 277.

<sup>18</sup> Danilenko 2009, 208.

<sup>19</sup> Zvegintsev 1960, 281.

<sup>20</sup> Serdyuchenko 1930, 174-175.

## **Schuchardt and Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics**

Despite the fact that the foundations of Kartvelology originated in ancient times, the formation of modern Iberian-Caucasian linguistics is associated with European linguistics and, in particular, with the development of comparative historical linguistics. As A.I. Khalidov notes, in the middle of the 19th century, the pioneers in the study of Caucasian languages were European and Russian linguists of European origin (Marie Brosse, Max Müller, Friedrich Müller, Peter von Uslar, etc.), and Georgian linguists also actively got involved in the process (D. Bagrationi, I. Bagrationi, P. Ioseliani, S. Dodashvili, D. Chubinishvili, etc.). Representatives of other nations also contributed to the development of Iberian-Caucasian linguistics<sup>21</sup>.

An important place among these remarkable scientists belongs to the ‘dissidents of Indo-Europeanism’ that are Hugo Schuchardt and Niko Marr. Especially remarkable are Schuchardt’s works on the Georgian verb, the ergative structure of the Caucasian languages. Malkhaz Ebralidze, author of the article “Historical Contacts of Georgia with Austria’ (‘Tbilisskaya Nedelya’ newspaper, October 17, 2017) writes that

the languages and literature of the Caucasian peoples, in particular, Georgian and Armenian, were studied in Austria. The merit of the German-Austrian scientist, renowned professor at the University of Graz in Austria, Hugo Schuchardt, is immeasurable. He spoke Germanic languages, knew Celtic, Romance, Slavic, Hungarian, Arabic, Basque, thoroughly studied the Caucasian languages. He was fluent in ancient and new Georgian languages. He paved the way in linguistics for the term ‘Kartvelian languages’<sup>22</sup>.

## **Schuchardt and the development of European, Russian and Georgian linguistics**

In the conditions of intense scientific controversy, in which Hugo Schuchardt took the most active part, the formation of the first scientific comparative historical linguistic paradigm took place. It is not surprising that the influence of Schuchardt’s original ideas on the development of linguistic thought was enormous; his sharp debates over the linguistic theories prevailing at that time provoked response in the works of linguists both in the West, in the Caucasus, and in Russia.

Arguing the role of Hugo Schuchardt in the development of linguistic thought of that time, Academician F.F. Fortunatov highlighted the following:

1. being a brilliant educated scholar, Schuchardt argumentatively criticized Neogrammarian hypothesis, although he did not offer another holistic concept;

<sup>21</sup> Khalidov 2006, 10.

<sup>22</sup> Ebralidze 2017.

2. Schuchardt went beyond the limits of traditional scientific problems and was one of the first in the world linguistics to study the phenomenon of the substrate;
3. his study of the problems of the ergativity of the Caucasian languages is of great importance<sup>23</sup>.

The role of Schuchardt's ideas in the creation and formation of Neolinguistics in the twenties of the 19<sup>th</sup> century is argued in detail by V.A. Zvegintsev who stressed that the new direction, called Neolinguistics, was also in opposition to the Neogrammarians. Its representatives are Matteo Bartoli, Giulio Bertoni, Vittore Pisani. The principles and methods of the new school were first outlined in *A Brief Essay on Neolinguistics* (1925), in which the first part (General Principles) was written by J. Bertoni, and the second (Technical Criteria) by M. Bartoli. The latter also belongs to the *Introduction to Neolinguistics* (1925). A summary and at the same time a clear statement of the general theoretical provisions of Neolinguistics is given in *The Neolinguistic Position* (1947) by Giuliano Bonfante. The principles of Neolinguistics are based on the ideas of W. Humboldt, H. Schuchardt, Karl Vossler, which are combined with the observations and conclusions of the linguistic geography of Jules Gillieron. Their critical argumentation directed against Neogrammarians was also largely borrowed from H. Schuchardt and K. Vossler<sup>24</sup>. This point of view on the role of H. Schuchardt in the development of neolinguistics is also shared by V.A. Kondrashov, who believes that the influence of Schuchardt's ideas on the development of European linguistic thought is confirmed by the fact that in France, Jules Gillieron (1854-1926) creates linguistic geography based on the principles of 'geographical variation' by Schuchardt and 'wave theory' by I. Schmidt, further developed by Italian Neolinguists as *areal linguistics*<sup>25</sup>.

A very precise definition of the merits of H. Schuchardt was given by V.A. Zvegintsev, who considered that the great Austrian was characterized by 'dissatisfaction with what has been achieved and constant search for new solutions', which did not contribute to the creation of a special school for him. 'Hugo Schuchardt remained virtually alone in the history of linguistics, although some of his conclusions were widely used and are used by linguists, often belonging to the most diverse areas'<sup>26</sup>.

V.M. Alpatov highly appreciated the contribution of the Austrian scientist to the development of world linguistics, who believed that Schuchardt combined a brilliant education and a sharp critical mind and was exceptional at noticing the weaknesses of contemporary science<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> Alpatov 2001, 138.

<sup>24</sup> Zvegintsev 1964, 304.

<sup>25</sup> Kondrashov 2004, 105.

<sup>26</sup> Zvegintsev 1956, 301.

<sup>27</sup> Alpatov 2001, 136.

## Linguistic heritage of Niko (Nikolai) Marr

**Niko Marr** (Georgia, Russia) was a dissident of Indo-Europeanism (1864-1934), a very interesting and controversial figure in the Russian and then in the Soviet scientific community: a historian, ethnographer, archaeologist, philologist; academician of the Imperial Academy of Sciences (1912); academician and vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; who made a big contribution to the history, archeology and ethnography of Georgia and Armenia; author of grammars of ancient Armenian and ancient Georgian languages; a follower of H. Schuchardt in criticism of Neogrammarian hypothesis; the author of a new teaching about language – Yaphetic Theory; the only member of the pre-revolutionary Imperial Academy of Sciences who joined the Communist Party and was accepted without a candidate's experience.

Nikolai Yakovlevich Marr was born in Kutaisi, a small Georgian town. His mother was Georgian and his father was Scottish, he died when N. Marr was only eight years old. Marr entered the local school, and at that time he almost did not know the Russian language and at the entrance exams impressed the teachers with his illiteracy. Later, in the school, he mastered seven languages: Russian, German, French, Italian, Latin, Ancient Greek and Turkish; read fluently in these languages and did translations from foreign languages into Georgian. It is peculiar that later, his answer to the question 'What languages do you speak fluently?' in the questionnaires persistently remained 'Russian and Georgian', and concerning other languages (including Armenian) he limited himself to the note 'I use it in scientific work'<sup>28</sup>.

After graduating from the Kutaisi gymnasium, N. Marr continued to study oriental languages in St. Petersburg, including the Turkic, Semitic and Indo-Iranian languages. In 1891, he received an appointment to the university, and in 1912, was elected an academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Professorial activity of N. Marr was not limited to St. Petersburg/Leningrad University. At various times, he read courses in the universities in Paris, Berlin, Bonn, Leipzig, delivered lectures in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and Turkey<sup>29</sup>.

Being a student, N. Marr published his first work in the newspaper *Iveria* in 1888 under the title *The Nature and Properties of the Georgian Language*. Since then, N. Marr has published about 600 scientific works, among them large-format books, confirming the amazing creative productivity and inexhaustible energy of the author. Ivane Javakhishvili noted: 'Only those people who were close to him know that the stock of Marr's works is not only not limited to the already published works, but he has three times as many unpublished works'<sup>30</sup>.

The influence of H. Schuchardt's ideas on the linguistic views of N. Marr is first of all revealed in the rejection of the concept of A. Schleicher's family tree, which was

<sup>28</sup> Mikhankova 1949, 14.

<sup>29</sup> Golubeva 2002, 43.

<sup>30</sup> Ebralidze 2017.

shared by Neogrammarians. It was under the influence of the aforementioned well-known thesis of H. Schuchardt ('There is not a single language free from crossing') that N. Marr put forward the idea of the so-called 'stage-wise theory' of the development of languages. He singled out a special Japhetic family of languages, the modern representatives of which he considered to be Georgian and some other languages in the Caucasus. He classified many languages of the ancient Mediterranean with unclear family ties as Japhetic languages, including those that left no trace for us. His main idea was based on the fact that, although all languages develop independently of each other, they obey the same laws and go through the same stages, albeit at different speeds. In the course of stage development, languages become more complex and improve, starting from the stage of 'diffuse cries' and ending with the inflectional stage, which N. Marr, like the linguists of the 19th century, considered the highest point. The transition from one stage to another occurs through a revolutionary leap that changes the language beyond recognition, each such leap reflects revolutionary leaps in the development of society. The area of special scientific interests of N. Marr was *linguistic paleontology*, the identification in languages of relics of previous stages, primarily Japhetic.

It should be noted that N. Marr was well acquainted with the works by H. Schuchardt and European linguists, which he as a multilingual read in the original. This is a crucial moment, considering that the formation of Soviet science was marked by making works by the leading European scientists to remain in obscurity and active propaganda of the works of Soviet scientists. There were also objective reasons for this: if the generation of linguists, contemporaries of N. Marr, Baudouin de Courtenay and other scientists had a classical education and spoke two or three European languages, then subsequent generations of young Soviet scientists had to read the works of foreign colleagues translated into Russian language. *Selected Articles on Linguistics* by H. Schuchardt appeared in Russian only in 1950. Translation from German was done by A.S. Bobovich, and the edition, preface and notes belonged to the famous philologist, Professor R.A. Budagov (1950).

### **Japhetic theory of languages: confrontation between bourgeois and Soviet science**

It is interesting to note that N. Marr's Japhetic theory of languages arose as a scientist's response to 'racial discrimination of languages' (Indo-European languages were an experimental platform for comparative historical linguistics). By this time, two sciences were clearly opposed to each other: 'Soviet' and 'bourgeois'. In contrast to 'bourgeois science', Marr created a new theory about the language and tried to prove the relationship of the Georgian language with the Semitic languages, referring to this group all languages that were of vague etymology for scientists: Basque, the undeciphered language of the Etruscans, the little-known Pelagian language, etc. Choice of

---

a name for this group of languages – Japhetic languages – was not accidental. 'Since the names of Shem and Ham were assigned to certain groups of languages, Ham for the Hamitic languages, whose kinship with the Semitic in science was already recognized even then, then of the three brothers, Shem, Ham and Japhet, there was only one left to call the new Caucasian relatives the Semitic families, and they were named after Japhet'<sup>31</sup>.

N. Marr identified 4 diffuse complexes by their group names – phonetic and semantic primary elements. The task of paleontological analysis was to reduce the composition of any word to these initial elements. N. Marr believes that Japhetic languages are a special stage in the development of all languages of the world. With such a stage-wise approach and the belief that the history of languages is determined by their overlapping (Schuchardt's idea), the relations between languages arises in the process of convergence, crossing and mixing of initially dissimilar languages. The fate of the new teaching about language largely depended on the socio-political situation in the USSR at that time. The fact is, when this doctrine entered into polemics with traditional 'bourgeois' science in the 1920s, it was perceived as an innovative scientific idea, therefore in the 1930-40s, this doctrine was imposed administratively as 'the only correct one'. During his life, thanks to the brilliant talent of an orator, N. Marr still retained like-minded people, but after the death of the great scientist, former supporters began to deviate from this doctrine. In 1950, criticism of this doctrine by Stalin marked the final rejection of Marr's ideas: N. Marr really wanted to be and tried to be a Marxist, but he failed to become a Marxist' (Marxism and Questions of Linguistics). According to N.A. Kondrashov, the position of Marx and Engels: 'Language is a practical, real consciousness' was interpreted by N. Marr straightforwardly. Language as the most important means of human communication receded into the background. Other erroneous conclusions followed from the identification of language with an ideological superstructure: language is a class language that it develops in stages, that is, it reflects in its development a change in socio-economic formations. This change takes place in the language in a revolutionary way with leaps and even explosions. N. Marr wrote: 'The so-called language families... represent different systems that correspond to different types of economy and society, and in the process of changing one culture to another, one system of languages was transformed into another'<sup>32</sup>.

In fact, relying on Hugo Schuchardt's idea of the interconnection of languages, Marr further developed it and shaped it into the theoretical concept which was immediately adopted by Soviet science, for ideological reasons, without going through the much-needed trial in scientific debates over it. N. Marr's ideas about language and thinking were also very reflective of the ideas of H. Schuchardt, he believed that 'language in all its composition is... a reflection of not only his (collective) thinking,

---

<sup>31</sup> Marr 1936, 82.

<sup>32</sup> Ibidem, 70.

but also its social structure and economy<sup>33</sup>. N. Marr's concept was a reaction to the crisis of Neogrammarian hypothesis-based linguistics and the comparative historical linguistic paradigm, but at the same time it reflected the ideological attitudes of the dominant socio-political paradigm.

### Niko Marr and Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics

Another common area of interest for Schuchardt and Marr was research in the field of languages and culture of the Georgian and other peoples of the Caucasus. Marr was engaged in this activity throughout his life. Working tirelessly on the study of the Georgian language and literature, Marr wrote such valuable works as *The Grammar of the Chan (Laz) Language with Reader and Dictionary* (1910), *The Grammar of the Old Literary Georgian Language* (1925). His works cover scientific publications and interpretations of monuments of the ancient Georgian hagiographic and secular literature, as well as works of outstanding representatives of Georgian social and philosophical thought from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> centuries such as Shota Rustaveli, Ioann Petritsi, Georgie Merchule, etc. Ivane Javakhishvili wrote: 'with his research, N. Marr immediately raised the level of Georgian philology to the level at which modern philology of Western Europe is'<sup>34</sup>.

N. Marr's achievements in the study of the language and culture of Armenian people are significant, as E. Kazaryan notes, it was Marr who did a long-term fundamental study of the medieval capital of Armenia, the city of Ani, and wrote the grammar of the ancient Armenian language: *Grabar*<sup>35</sup>. He authored the essay *Armenian Culture: its Roots and Prehistoric Connections According to Linguistic Data*<sup>36</sup>.

As the authors of the Linguistic Encyclopedia note, 'his (Marra's) great service to Armenian and Georgian linguistics consisted in a series of texts and research reports published between 1900 and 1915'<sup>37</sup>. The most important ideas of N. Marr's concept are: awareness of the need for an integrated approach to solving linguistic problems; an attempt to link the stages of language development with the stages of social and economic structure; the statement that languages develop not only through divergence (fragmentation), but also through convergence (mixing); linguistic paleontology and, of course, criticism of the weak points of the concept of Neogrammarians.

<sup>33</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>34</sup> Ebralidze 2017.

<sup>35</sup> 'Novoye Vremya' 03/28/2015.

<sup>36</sup> 'Hayastan' 1990.

<sup>37</sup> *Encyclopedia of Linguistic* 2006, 520.

---

## N. Marr's contribution to linguistic science

Having evaluated Marr's contribution to linguistic science, F.P. Filin believed that in his works:

Many problems were posed, without which it is impossible to build a general theory of linguistics. The language was recognized as a socially conditioned category, generated by society, which is no longer in doubt. In this regard, the question was raised of reconstructing the entire picture of the development of language, from the time of its origin to the present day. As human society developed, went through (and is going through) different stages of its formation, there was also a progress of language. This is also certain. There were and are a lot of languages, each of them has its own characteristic features, but all languages in their progressive development must have something in common which, even indirectly, must somehow correspond to the changes that have taken place over many millennia in society. This is how the stage theory of language shaped<sup>38</sup>.

The talented linguist and versatile scientist N. Marr had a lot of students; it should be noted though that their memories and assessment of their teacher's contribution to the development of linguistic science are very contradictory:

K.D. Dondua: He 'never had frozen courses, one could always feel a thrill of life and creative science in his lectures'<sup>39</sup>.

V.I. Abaev: 'Probably, cautious scientists who do not make mistakes are also needed by science, like ballast for a balloon rapidly flying upward, but in the prospect, rebellious creative natures, like Marr, with all their mistakes, will take their place in history science'<sup>40</sup>.

T.V. Gamkrelidze: 'Marr's glotogonic theory has no rational basis. It contradicts both the logic of modern theoretical linguistics and linguistic empiricism, and in this sense it is irrational. But this theory is a kind of structural model of a semiotic system, very close to the genetic code'<sup>41</sup>.

Analyzing the creative heritage of N. Marr, N.A. Kondrashov notes that for all the hostility towards foreign linguistics that Marr showed, for the sake of objectivity it should be noted that he borrowed many elements of his theories from the West. Some of its provisions are reflective of the views of Alfredo Trombetti (unity of the linguistic process), H. Schuchardt (the role of linguistic intercorrelation), Graziadio A. Ascoli (the role of substrate), Lucien Levy-Bruhl (interpretation of primitive thinking)<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>38</sup> Filin 1977, No. 5, 6.

<sup>39</sup> Imnaishvili 2006, 326.

<sup>40</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>42</sup> Kondrashov 2004, 195.

---

## Conclusion

In conclusion, it shall be noted that the history of the development of linguistics illustrates the fact that science in its development does not know nationality, borders and religions, it is international and multifunctional: on the one hand, it divides and opposes, and on the other, it brings together and unites. Thus, German linguistics of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries found itself on the opposite sides of the barricades, and at the same time, scientists, separated by time, distance and even the socio-political system, appeared to be close to each other.

The outstanding representatives of Western European linguistics (August Schleich-er, W. von Humboldt, etc.) had a tremendous influence on the development of Rus-sian and Georgian linguistic thought, but the influence of H. Schuchardt's theories on the linguistic concept of N. Marr was especially significant. This is also recognized by the authors of the most authoritative publication in the Soviet scientific commu-nity, the Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Recognizing Marr's contribution as a scholarly encyclopedist who successfully studied the Caucasian languages (Kartvelian, Abkha-zian, etc.), history, archeology and ethnography of the Caucasus and who made an important contribution to science in the field of Armenian-Georgian philology, the authors stipulate that 'from a general linguistic point of view, Marr's views have much in common with the views of the Austrian linguist H. Schuchardt and some ideas of the French sociological school'<sup>43</sup>.

It can be said that the opinion of authoritative scientists in the history of linguis-tics, that Hugo Schuchardt was more a scientist-critic than a scientist-creator, is fun-damentally wrong, because Schuchardt, being a subtle analyst, not only convincingly argued the inconsistency of existing linguistic theories, but also generated ideas that formed the basis of important branches of linguistics, which have not lost their rel-evance today. Moreover, Schuchardt's ideas about the quality of translation, teaching a non-native language and certain issues of lexicology are already being actively ap-plied in modern lexicography, translation studies and didactics (but these issues un-doubtedly deserve separate research and coverage). Summing up the question of the influence of Schuchardt's ideas on Russian and Georgian linguistic science, it has to be noted that there were both a direct and indirect influence (the development of Schucha-ardt's ideas in the linguistic concept of Nico Marr), and indirect, because a number of remarkable Georgian, Armenian, and Russian scientists were educated on the basis of Marr's lectures: Ivan Meshchaninov, Shota Dzidziguri, Nicholas Adontz, Joseph. Orbeli, S. Ter-Avetisyan, etc. to a certain extent, his 'new theory' was created under the influence of the ideological attitudes of that time, just as the attitude of scientists to his works changed in accordance with the same attitudes.

The turning points in the history of science and the turning points in the history of societies are a springboard for comprehending the path traveled and creating new theories. To a certain extent, science is subject to the influence of the dominant ideol-

---

<sup>43</sup> *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* 1958, v. 51.

ogy in society, might be subject to manipulation by the agents holding the power, but politicians come and go, and scientists remain, and their ideas find new development in modern scientific paradigms.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Абаев В. И., Марр Н. Я. [*Abaev V.I, Marr N.I*] (1864—1934). К 25-летию со дня смерти, «Вопросы языкознания», Москва, 1960.
2. Алпатов В. М. [*Alpatov V.M.*] История лингвистических учений. Москва, 2001.
3. Арошидзе М.В. [*Aroshidze M.V.*] Филология в условиях всеобщей глобализации знаний. Лики русистики в информационном виртуальном пространстве. Данкук университет. Чхонан, Республика Корея. 2018.
4. Березин Ф. М. [*Berezin F.M.*] История лингвистических учений. Москва, Высшая школа, 1984.
5. Большая советская энциклопедия. [*Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopedia*] Москва, 2-ое издание. Т.51, 1958, с. 459.
6. Будагов Р.А. [*Budagov R.A.*], Г. Шухардт как лингвист, «Русский язык в школе», 1940, № 3.
7. Винокур Г.О. [*Vinokur G.O.*], Введение в изучение филологических наук // Проблемы структурной лингвистики. Москва, 1981.
8. Голубева О.Д. [*Golubeva O.D.*], Н.Я.Марр. Санкт-Петербург, Российская национальная библиотека, 2002, с. 280.
9. Гоциридзе Д.З. [*Gotsiridze D.Z.*], «Конюшня лингвистики как стойло литературных пегасов» или языкознание и филология в трактовке русских лингвистов классического периода // Президиум МАПРЯЛ 2003-2007. Сборник научных трудов. Издат. дом «МИРС». Санкт-Петербург, 2007.
10. Даниленко В. П. [*Danilenko V.P.*], Общее языкознание и история языкознания. Москва. Издательство «Флинта», издательство «Наука». 2009.
11. Звегинцев В.А. [*Zvegintsev V.A.*], Хрестоматия по истории языкознания XIX-XX веков. Гос-ое учебно-педаг-ое издательство Министерства просвещения РСФСР. 1956.
12. [*Imnaisvhili*], *Ardavitskeba mokvrisa*, Tbilisi, 2006, 326
13. Казарян Е. [*Kazaryan*], Николай Марр – человек, раскопавший Ани, и фаворит Сталина.
14. Газета «Новое время» 28.03.2015.
15. <http://nv.am/nikolaj-marr-chelovek-raskopavshij-ani-i-favorit-stalina/> - date of access 15.11.2018.
18. Kaser K., Gutmeyr D. // Introduction: Europe and the Black Sea Region. A History of Early Knowledge Exchange (1750–1850) // Studies on South East Europe. LIT VERLAG GmbH & Co. KG Wien. 2018.
19. Кондрашов Н.А. [*Kondrashov N.A.*], История лингвистических учений. Изд.2-ое. Москва. Едиториал УРСС, 2004. – 224 с.
20. Kuhn T., 1970. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2ed., Vol. II, No. 2, 1, Chicago.

21. Марр Н.Я. [*Marr N.I.*], Избранные работы, т. II. Ленинград, 1936.
22. Марр Н. [*Marr N.I.*], Армянская культура: ее корни и доисторические связи по данным языкознания. Газета «Айастан», 1990. <http://www.iatp.am/culture/articles/marr.html>, date of access 15.11.2018.
23. Masuda Y. *The Information Society as Post-Industrial Society*. Wash., 1981.
24. Миханкова В. А. [*Mikhankova V.A.*], Николай Яковлевич Марр. Очерк его жизни и научной деятельности, 3 изд., Москва — Ленинград, 1949.
25. Пауль Г. [*Paul H.*], Принципы истории языка. Москва, 1966.
26. Сердюченко Г. П. [*Serduchenko G.P.*], Лингвистическая теория Гуго Шухардта. *Известия северо-кавказского государственного университета*, Ростов на Дону, 1930, том I (XIV), стр. 174-194.
27. Соссюр Ф. де [*Saussure, F. de.*], Общая лингвистика. Москва, 1977.
28. Срезневский И.И. [*Sreznevskiy I.I.*], Мысли об истории русского языка. Москва, 1959.
29. Томсен В. [*Tomsen V.*], История языковедения до конца XIX в. Москва, 1938.
30. Филин Ф.П. [*Filin F.P.*], Советское языкознание: теория и практика. – Вопросы языкознания, 1977, №5.
31. Халидов В.А. [*Khalidov V.A.*], Введение в изучение кавказских языков. Грозный, 2006.
32. Чикобава А.С. [*Chikobava A.S.*], Проблема языка как предмета языкознания, Учпедгиз, Москва, 1959.
33. Шухардт Г. [*Schuchardt H.*], Избранные статьи по языкознанию. Москва, 1950.
34. Эбралидзе М. [*Ebralidze M.*], Исторические контакты Грузии с Австрией. Газета «Тбилисская неделя». 17.10.2017. <https://tbilisi.media/cultures/68158-istoricheskie-kontakty-gruzii-s-avstriej/> - date of access 10.10.2018.
35. Эбралидзе М. [*Ebralidze M.*], Гениальный ученый Нико Марр. Газета «Тбилисская неделя». 20.06.2017. <https://tbilisi.media/cultures/64931-genialnyj-uchenyj-niko-marr/> - date of access 10.10.2018.
36. Encyclopedia of Linguistic. 2006, date of access 15.11.2018.

### **Dissidents of Indo-Europeanism: Hugo Schuchardt and Niko Marr<sup>44</sup>**

**Summary:** The globalization of knowledge which has affected all scientific fields, including Humanities, stimulated research into the exchange of knowledge in the field of German, Russian, Caucasian linguistics. One of the most interesting and important pages of Kartvelology is the scientific dialogue of Hugo Schuhardt, a famous Austrian philologist, with scientists, writers and public figures of Georgia on the issues of the Georgian language and culture at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. It was a difficult period for linguistics when the compara-

<sup>44</sup> This article was prepared within the framework of the project KEAC-BSR has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 734645.

tive historical scientific paradigm exhausted its possibilities, and numerous discussions with the neogrammatic hypothesis prevailing at that time were looking for new ways of scientific development that could meet the challenges of the time. Intensive exchange of ideas and scientific controversy contributed to the exchange of knowledge. The article considers the linguistic concepts of the Austrian scientist Hugo Schuchardt and the Caucasian scientist Niko Marr (Georgia, Russia) who entered the history of linguistics as ‘dissidents of Indo-Europeanism’.

**Keywords:** knowledge exchange, Neogrammarians, Schuchardt, Marr, Dissidents of Indo-Europeanism

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34864/heteroglossia.issn.2084-1302.nr11.art16>