

4 The Basque-Berber connection of Georg von der Gabelentz

Bernhard Hurch and Kathrin Purgay

Abstract

Discussions of Gabelentz's *œuvre* tend to omit the fact that he attempted in some of his later writings to demonstrate a genealogical connection between the Basque and Berber languages. Based on an examination of Gabelentz's texts, unpublished notes and correspondence, as well as several contemporary reviews, this chapter examines Gabelentz's proposal and what it shows about his theoretical views vis-à-vis historical-comparative linguistics and his place in the linguistic community of the time. It shows how Gabelentz's critique of the prevailing historical-comparative approach led him to abandon all established methods and draw wildly implausible conclusions. Even the most vehement critics of the Neogrammarians, such as Hugo Schuchardt (1842–1927), looked on uncomprehendingly at the turn Gabelentz had taken.

Keywords: Basque, Berber, historical-comparative linguistics, Afro-Asiatic languages, Hugo Schuchardt, Neogrammarians

1 Introduction¹

In the last years of his life, Georg von der Gabelentz dealt intensively with the question of a possible genetic relationship between Basque and Berber.

¹ We would like to thank Leopold von der Gabelentz for granting us permission, on behalf of the Gabelentz family, to consult the papers and documents stored in the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg. We are grateful to Doris Schilling of this Archive for her kind help. For providing information to us and for fruitful discussion, we wish to thank Frans Plank, Manfred Ringmacher and Frank Zimmer. Last but not least, we owe a special debt of thanks to James McElvenny for his critical reading of the article.

This resulted in two publications. The first is his lecture at the meeting of the Philosophisch-historische Classe der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Philosophical-Historical Class of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences) on 22 June 1893, which was immediately published in the proceedings of the Academy (Gabelentz, 1893); the second is available in book form, published posthumously one year after his death by his nephew Albrecht von der Schulenburg under the title *Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit den Berbersprachen Nord-Africas* (The genetic relationship between Basque and the North African Berber languages) (Gabelentz, 1894). These two writings were largely ignored at the time and have hardly received any attention in later Gabelentz scholarship, even though the arguments for the Basque-Berber relationship are also taken up in the revised second edition of *Die Sprachwissenschaft* (Gabelentz, 2016 [1901]),² where Gabelentz expounds the implications that, in his opinion, necessarily result for historical linguistic theory.

The different publication dates for the Academy lecture and Basque-Berber book are somewhat deceptive in that there cannot have been much time between the composition of the two works, given that Gabelentz passed away only five months after delivering the lecture. He himself announces in the Academy version a ‘more detailed text’ (*ausführlichere Schrift*) (Gabelentz, 1893, p. 608) and, in a letter of 22 July 1893 to his sister Clementine von Münchhausen (printed in Münchhausen, 2013 [1913], pp. 138-139), he writes somewhat more extensively in this regard:

You’ve never kept me waiting so long for a letter when I sent you something new from me, and I think it was a good thing this time, even if it’s just a report on research results and the precursor of an entire book. [...] In the world of my colleagues, the matter seems at first to be perplexing, partly even shocking,³ like a heretical attack against the dogma of the infallible sound laws. I can’t stand such axioms, which are based on a limited field

2 The first edition of Gabelentz’s *Die Sprachwissenschaft* appeared in 1891 and the second posthumous edition in 1901. Page numbers provided in references in this chapter are to the 2016 critical edition (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891/1901]). The critical edition clearly indicates whether a passage is found in only the first or second edition or is common to both of them. For added clarity, when reference is made in this chapter specifically to the first edition, the citation is given as ‘Gabelentz, 2016 [1891]’. When reference is made specifically to the second edition, the citation is ‘Gabelentz, 2016 [1901]’.

3 Behind these lines stands an untranslatable pun, which builds on the assonance of German *verduzzen* ‘to perplex’ with the quantifier *Dutzend* ‘dozen’, as well as *schockieren* ‘to shock’ with the quantifier *Schock* ‘60 pieces, heap’.

of experience but even there still leave behind a lot of open questions, and if the second edition of my *Sprachwissenschaft* comes about, you will read more about it.⁴

Since the proceedings appeared only on 29 June 1893 and the written critiques, to which we will return in detail later, had not yet been published, Gabelentz can presumably only be referring in his letter to verbal objections given after the lecture.⁵ The fact that in the later ‘more detailed text’ (Gabelentz, 1894) he still does not address the published objections – such as those Schuchardt makes in his review (Schuchardt, 1893), as discussed below – suggests that this text was written in parallel with the lecture.⁶ In this last phase of life, Gabelentz was occupied with other publications (as recorded in Gimm, 2013b, p. 116) and was already in very poor health

4 The passages that Gabelentz refers to in this letter can be found on pp. 179-180, 198-202, 205-207, 293 and 307-308 of the second edition (Gabelentz, 2016 [1901]). Original text of Gabelentz’s letter: ‘Du hast mich noch nie so lange auf einen Brief warten lassen, wenn ich Dir etwas Neues aus meiner Feder geschickt habe, und ich denke, diesmal ist es etwas recht Gutes gewesen, wenn es auch nur ein Bericht über Forschungsergebnisse und der Vorläufer eines ganzen Buches sein soll. [...] In der fachgenössischen Welt scheint die Sache zunächst verdutzend, zum Teil, da ein Schock mehr ist als ein Dutzend, shocking gewirkt zu haben, als ein ketzerischer Angriff gegen das Dogma von den unverbrüchlichen Lautgesetzen. Solche Heischesätze, die sich auf ein beschränktes Erfahrungsgebiet stützen, und selbst da noch vieles unerklärt lassen, kann ich in der Seele nicht leiden, und kommt es zur zweiten Auflage meiner Sprachwissenschaft, so wirst Du davon noch mehr lesen.’

5 In the file with the signature II-V, 157, of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, p. 97 reads, ‘After the reading and approval of the minutes of the session of 8 June, Mr von der Gabelentz held a lecture “on Basque and Berber”, whose inclusion in the proceedings is approved.’ (*Nach der Verlesung und Genehmigung des Protokolls der Sitzung v. 8. Juni hielt Hr. von der Gabelentz einen Vortrag, über Baskisch und Berberisch’, dessen Aufnahme in die Sitzungsberichte genehmigt wird.*) Present at the session were: Heinrich Kiepert (geography, cartography), Albrecht Weber (Indology), Adolf Kirchhoff (classical philology, classical studies), Eduard Zeller (philosophy, history), Johannes Vahlen (classical philology), Alexander Conze (archaeology), Adolf Tobler (Romance studies), Wilhelm Wattenbach (history, auxiliary sciences of history), Hermann Diels (classical philology), Alfred Pernice (law, Roman law), Heinrich Brunner (law), Johannes Schmidt (comparative linguistics), Otto Hirschfeld (ancient history, archaeology), Eduard Sachau (oriental studies), Gustav von Schmoller (political science), Wilhelm Dilthey (philosophy), Ernst Dümmler (medieval history), Adolf von Harnack (history of Christianity, religious history, history of the academy).

6 In the posthumous book (Gabelentz, 1894), there are only two references in reaction to Schuchardt’s criticisms. The first one, on p. 4, is only very selective and does not mention his Academy lecture at all but simply indicates that Schuchardt had drawn his attention in the *Literaturblatt* to a certain Basque word form, *alhargunt(a)*. In the second one, on p. 136, Gabelentz notes in a footnote that Schuchardt derives Basque *zamari* ‘horse’ (*Pferd*) from *sagmarius*, which, however, seems unlikely to him.

and general condition (Münchhausen, 2013 [1913]). In our opinion, it is also conceivable that the book manuscript was begun earlier and that the Academy lecture and its publication should only be understood as an excerpt or snapshot of work in progress, or a short version of the longer text.

The manuscript on which the book is based has been lost. There is no trace of it in the extant *Nachlass* and remaining library collections of Georg and his father Hans Conon von der Gabelentz, which are kept in the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv (Thuringian State Archive) in Altenburg. It has not been possible to locate Albrecht von der Schulenburg's own *Nachlass*, in which the manuscript could lie.⁷

A small comment from the publisher accompanies the publication:

† Professor von der Gabelentz himself described the above work as '**his greatest achievement**'; it will cause the greatest sensation among all linguists and ethnographers, all the more since up to now the Basque language, **the most mysterious language**, has not been the subject of any publication in which its position within the world of languages and peoples has really been determined. – The ready-to-print manuscript was edited by the nephew of the deceased, Dr. phil. Albrecht Graf von der Schulenburg. [emphasis in original]⁸

7 The various branches of the family were unfortunately unable or not prepared to provide oral information concerning papers and left subsequent written enquiries unanswered. We have contacted both the Münchhausen branch of the Gabelentz family and entered into oral and written contact with the Schulenburg branch in Nordsteimke. There seem to be post-World War II remnants of a family library in Nordsteimke, but also here it was not possible to get information on its inventory.

In the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv, however, apart from some reviews of the book, there is also a file with the complete correspondence between the publisher Richard Sattler of Braunschweig, Albrecht von der Schulenburg and Georg's widow, Gertrud (née von Oldershausen, widowed by von Adelebsen). This correspondence is extremely unpleasant and deals almost exclusively with the publisher's unpaid financial claims against the family. Books from the publisher Richard Sattler are only listed in German libraries between 1890 and 1905, after which a few books from Sattler were published in Leipzig. Linguistic literature is virtually non-existent in the publishing programme except for Gabelentz (1894). A publisher's archive, in which the manuscript could possibly be located, could not be found.

8 Original: 'Der † Professor von der Gabelentz hat seine obige Arbeit selbst als, **seine grösste Leistung**' [sic] bezeichnet; dieselbe wird bei allen Sprachforschern und Ethnologen das grösste Aufsehen erregen, umsomehr, als über das Baskische, **dieses seither grössten Sprachräthsels**, bislang keine Publication erschien, welche die Stellung desselben innerhalb der Sprachen- und Völkerwelt auch nur einigermassen richtig näher bestimmt hätte. – Die Herausgabe des druckfertigen Manuscriptes übernahm der Neffe des Verstorbenen, Dr. phil. Albrecht Graf von der Schulenburg.' [emphasis in original]

There are various views on the character of the manuscript. The description above of the manuscript as 'ready to print' is most certainly not true. The first part of the text is much too fragmentary, while the accompanying dictionary section is incomplete and uncommented. At the beginning of the preface, Schulenburg admits that the 'work would certainly have been completed and improved in many parts if the deceased had been able to put the finishing touches on it' (*Arbeit gewiss noch in vielen Teilen vervollständigt und verbessert worden wäre, wenn der Verstorbene die letzte Hand an sie hätte legen dürfen*). Gabelentz's student Wilhelm Grube (1905, p. 554), for his part, described the manuscript as a 'work that was by no means ready to print' (*keineswegs druckreife Arbeit*). In doing so, he may have merely been trying to shield his teacher from criticism, but there is much in favour of his position. There is no discernible development in the argumentation between the Academy lecture and the book; indeed, the Academy lecture has a more explicitly theoretical approach that is completely missing in the book version. In our opinion, it would be most reasonable to emphasize the complementary nature of the two works, as Gabelentz (1893, p. 608) himself suggests: 'It is not the place here to share all my material; this must be done in a more detailed text' (*Es ist hier nicht der Ort, mein ganzes Material mitzutheilen; das muss in einer ausführlicheren Schrift geschehen*). This is also supported by the fact that the tables of the Academy lecture, which are not easily comprehensible in their short presentation, find their equivalent in the lists of the book version. For example, the numbers given in the *u:i*-alternations on p. 14 of the book correlate exactly with table II on p. 598 of the essay. This means that these are different ways of presenting the same facts and that the tabular form is due to the concise presentation of the lecture, while the individual language examples are given in the book.

The two publications have provoked almost exclusively the most negative reactions, from simple rejection to even complete incomprehension at how a linguist of the stature and genius of Georg von der Gabelentz could produce such dubious work. But only some of these reactions contain substantive arguments, and the detailed criticism is often used as an excuse for ignoring the theoretical considerations deliberately foregrounded by Gabelentz. However, it is advisable to discuss the work in detail first.

2 Gabelentz (1893)

From the beginning of his Academy lecture, Gabelentz leaves no doubt that the genetic relationship between Basque and Berber is beyond question for him. He sees his task therefore as simply a matter of illustrating this relationship and developing new methodological principles of historical-reconstructive linguistics to support it. Although Gabelentz emphasizes the importance of this second aspect in many parts of his work, it is often overlooked in later assessments. His final sentence (1893, p. 613) is quite explicit:

In addition, such individual questions are by far less important than the knowledge we have acquired, firstly, that Basque is a Hamitic language related to the Berber family and, secondly, that the Hamitic languages present completely new data to the study of sound change, whose evaluation requires new points of view, whose exploitation demands a new method.⁹

The material he uses in his representation of the languages does not go beyond lexical comparisons. This is sufficient for the purposes of his argument, but Gabelentz is walking on thin ice and seems to be aware of it.

He wangles his way out of explaining the lack of grammatical correspondence between Basque and Berber. Gender, which is the only example he mentions, is an inappropriate object of comparison as it appears very marginally and is present only in some Basque dialects (e.g. Gipuzkoan) as a semantic but not a grammatical category, and it also designates exclusively biological sex. There is no nominal category of gender in Basque. Gabelentz gives examples of non-compatibilities, but in a sense he throws the baby out with the bathwater when he adds:

Faith in the constancy of outer and inner language form is an achievement to which our science clings in the most tenacious way, and the facts that could shake it are new acquisitions themselves and little known, as they lie in the area of Indochinese and Melanesian. (Gabelentz, 1893, p. 594)¹⁰

9 Original: 'Auch sind solche Einzelfragen bei weitem weniger wichtig, als die gewonnene Erkenntniss, erstens, dass das Baskische eine hamitische, der Berberfamilie verwandte Sprache ist, und zweitens, dass die hamitischen Sprachen der lautgeschichtlichen Forschung ganz neue Bilder vorführen, deren Beurtheilung neue Gesichtspunkte, deren Verwerthung eine neue Methode erfordert.'

10 Original: 'Der Glaube an die Beständigkeit der äusseren und inneren Sprachform gehört zu den Errungenschaften, an denen unsere Wissenschaft am zähesten festhält, und die Thatsachen,

This brief statement may be a sideswipe to many of the Neogrammarians, who merely concerned themselves with sound change, but in this context, at the beginning of the 1890s, it is no longer true as a general critique. Moreover, it is not easy to avoid the fact that, by assuming a common genealogy between Basque and Berber, one would have to propose a scenario, for example, for the development of the Basque auxiliary system, of ergativity, and other grammatical characteristics.¹¹ In addition, as Schuchardt (1893, p. 337) correctly points out, it is not necessary to look as far as East Asia or Oceania to call into question belief in the constancy of inner and outer language form. Indications of common grammatical characteristics in related languages are – regardless of whether inner and outer language form is constant or not – always desirable and advantageous for a genealogical argument.

In his own *Sprachwissenschaft*, Gabelentz (2016 [1891]) postulates that historically oriented language comparisons should be based on older or the oldest attested language stages. Especially if

[...] genetically related languages [are] so dissimilar to each other that their relationship is not obvious at first sight, then this relationship is a distant one; that is, a very long time has passed since their former unity. Consequently, one always has to go back to the oldest recognizable sounds and meanings of words and formatives when comparing languages. (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891], p. 164)¹²

Although this remains his first principle in offering a proof of linguistic relationship (cf. *ibid.*, p. 164), he does not follow it in his Basque-Berber comparisons, especially because of the absence of usable evidence. In this case, he argues, it is allowed, for the time being, to select ‘the seemingly best preserved language of the family, especially if it is sufficiently studied’ (*die scheinbar besterhaltene Sprache des Stammes, zumal wenn sie leidlich erforscht ist*) – there is still time for corrections and explanations afterwards (*ibid.*, pp. 184-185).

die ihn erschüttern könnten, sind ihrerseits neuer Erwerb und wenig bekannt, da sie auf indochinesischem und melanesischem Gebiete liegen.’

11 Gabelentz (1894) explained his approach in such a way that it was first of all sufficient to find enough plausible similarities which were neither due to coincidence nor to borrowing; it is only then that we have to seek the explanations for cases of doubt (Gabelentz, 1894, p. 3). See also the discussion of Gabelentz (1894) in section 3.

12 Original: ‘[...] verwandte Sprachen einander so unähnlich [sind], dass ihre Verwandtschaft nicht ohne Weiteres in die Augen fällt, so ist diese Verwandtschaft eine entferntere, also seit der vormaligen Einheit eine sehr lange Zeit verstrichen. Daraus folgt, dass man bei der Vergleichung immer auf die ältesten erkennbaren Lautformen und Bedeutungen der Wörter und Formative zurückzugehen hat.’

Gabelentz is well aware of the problems that the sometimes enormous differences in form between the assumed correspondences cause in his lexical comparisons. Countless examples can be cited – and indeed many were cited in critiques – in which the correspondence is anything but immediately understandable and demands a great deal of imagination on the part of the reader; here, for example, Basque *borroka* ‘fight’ (*Kampf*) to Kabyle *amerzi* or Basque *erraz* ‘easy’ (*leicht*) to Tuareg *elluq* ‘poor’ (*arm*) etc. However, Gabelentz does not see this as a weakness of his proposal for a linguistic relationship, but rather as an attempt to forge a new kind of methodology, to which, interestingly enough, the literature on Gabelentz does not respond. In many places he showed himself to be an open and vehement critic of the Neogrammarians,¹³ and accordingly he is more than sceptical about the concept of sound laws. He only allows sound laws to operate in a restricted way and, if at all, only in recent phases of language development, in so-called ‘more regular times’ (*geordneteren Zeiten*). In his eyes ‘constant sound substitutions [are] the product of regular sound change’ (*constante Lautvertretungen [sind] das Erzeugniss gesetzmässiger Lautverschiebung*) (Gabelentz, 1893, p. 602). As there are hardly any such substitutions between Basque and Berber, he transposes their genetic relations into a ‘prior period of uncertain articulation’ (*Vorperiode unsicherer Artikulation*) (*ibid.*, p. 602), for which he uses expressions such as ‘wildness’ (*Verwilderung*), ‘mixing’ (*Vermischung*), and ‘blurring’ (*Verwischung*) of the sound system, ‘confusion’ (*Wirrsal*), etc. The sound correspondences of the Basque dialects alone

[...] give a picture of phonetic wildness which, to my knowledge, has hardly any equal in the world of languages. Only in a few cases, which he [van Eys] correctly recognized and which I do not need to repeat here, are there fixed laws of sound correspondences between the dialects, alongside which are the strangest variations sometimes in one dialect and sometimes in the other. (*ibid.*, p. 596)¹⁴

As a first step, Gabelentz seeks to create an inventory of sound correspondences in the Basque dialects. He then makes a similar attempt for the Kabylean

13 In the literature there are some excellent works on this subject, such as Plank (1991) and various publications by Ringmacher (e.g. 2011). Cf. passages of Gabelentz quoted here, such as the above letter to his sister Clementine.

14 Original: ‘[...] geben ein Bild lautlicher Verwilderung, das meines Wissens in der Sprachenwelt kaum Seinesgleichen hat. Nur in wenigen Fällen, die er [van Eys] richtig erkannt hat, und die ich hier nicht zu wiederholen brauche, zeigen sich zwischen den Dialekten feste Lautvertretungsgesetze, daneben bald in dem einen, bald in dem anderen die wunderlichsten Varianten.’

language and uses the same procedure in the Basque-Kabyle comparison. Finally, he describes (*ibid.*, pp. 604-606) six types of sound variation and alternation: free variation in the articulatory space, in the perceptive space, through contact and mixing, through fortitive processes, through evolutionary disambiguations, and finally fixation of irregular to regular alternations. This results in a line of development that he describes as follows:

[...] because the result is the same both for later linguistic history and for the method to be applied here: during the time of chaos there was no room for fixed sound laws; it is only a later steadier development that could stand a regular sound shift instead of sound confusion and distortion. This is the thinner, younger layer in our case. Underneath it, however, lies the massive layer of debris, which is still recognizable everywhere by its enormous consequences. (*ibid.*, p. 607)¹⁵

We will leave open to what extent Gabelentz's theory may anticipate aspects of the concept of allophones in later phoneme theories. This is an interesting point in itself but not relevant in this context. The almost unlimited range of variations that Gabelentz sketches on the synchronic plane opens the door to all conceivable lexical correspondences from a historical perspective: these no longer need to be demonstrated because in fact almost every single sound correspondence seems possible.¹⁶ Even if Gabelentz adds quite suggestively that there are three possibilities for dealing with the problem – negating it, ignoring it or facing it (*ibid.*, p. 607) – and insinuates, of course, that he is the only one facing it, his position nevertheless demands a few fundamental observations.¹⁷

15 Original: '[...] denn das Ergebnis für die weitere Sprachgeschichte und für die hier anzuwendende Methode der Forschung ist in beiden Fällen das gleiche: während der Zeit des Chaos war für feste Lautgesetze kein Platz; erst eine spätere ruhigere Entwicklung konnte an Stelle der Lautverwirrung und -verzerrung eine geordnete Lautverschiebung vertragen. Das ist in unserem Falle die dünnere, jüngere Schicht. Darunter aber lagert, noch überall an gewaltigen Nachwirkungen erkennbar, jene mächtige Schicht durcheinander geworfenen Gerölls.'

16 Gabelentz (2016 [1901], p. 307) states: 'It seems to me that where the roots of related languages resemble each other to some extent in sound and meaning, one should assume an inexplicable sound change, the influence of an unrecognized sound law, or uncertain articulation, rather than an inexplicable new creation' (*Mir scheint, wo sich die Wurzeln verwandter Sprachen einigermaßen in Klang und Sinn ähneln, sollte man lieber einen unerklärlichen Lautwandel, das Walten eines noch unerkannten Lautgesetzes oder unsichere Articulation, als eine noch unerklärliche Neuschöpfung vermuthen*).

17 In the same spirit, however, Gabelentz repeatedly provides surprisingly strong judgements about languages and establishes connections between anthropological forms of life or living conditions and types of language. For example, in his inaugural speech to the Preußische

Critical fieldwork on unwritten languages admits to a higher degree of variation than can be found in the comparatively confined space of the written languages of the Indo-European world. However, this does not in any way mean that centrifugal variation in earlier times would have led to open chaos and that order is only a product of more recent epochs, because this would deny from the outset the possibilities of linguistic reconstruction based on regular change. But this is exactly what Gabelentz does: where he cannot discern the system, he theorizes disorder. In his far-reaching work *Fonética Histórica Vasca* (Michelena, 1961), Luis Michelena, the doyen of twentieth century Basque studies, demonstrated systematic principles precisely where Gabelentz saw nothing but chaos and debris; that is, in Basque dialectology and therefore in the historical reconstruction of the Basque language.¹⁸ That this work was only possible 70 years later is not due to any methodological developments, but rather to the quality of the sources.

3 Gabelentz (1894)

This book consists basically of two parts, which are distinguished from one another in their design and layout.¹⁹ There are, in fact, two frontispieces: the first with the title *Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit den Berbersprachen Nord-Africas* (The genetic relationship between Basque and the North African Berber languages), which precedes the first general part of pages 1 to 91, and then the *Wörterbuch zur Vergleichung des Baskischen mit den*

Akademie der Wissenschaften (Prussian Academy of Sciences), he states (Gabelentz, 1890, p. 785): 'A mixed Anglo-Chinese people, however high its level of civilization, would only make its miserable Pidgin-English a suitable medium of its spiritual life after the work of many generations. And if the Cherokee were to reach their goal with their cultural aspirations, we would one day have a people of farmers and citizens who spoke the language of a hunting people. Who knows if there is not already such a people living now – at the Bay of Biscay' (*Ein anglo-chinesisches Mischvolk, so hoch seine Gesittung sein möchte, würde erst nach der Arbeit vieler Geschlechter sein elendes Pitchen-English zu einer tauglichen Trägerin seines Geisteslebens gestalten. Und sollten doch noch die Tscherokee mit ihren Culturbestrebungen an's Ziel gelangen, so hätten wir dereinst ein Volk von Ackerbauern und Bürgern, das die Sprache eines Jägervolkes redete. Wer weiss, ob nicht schon jetzt ein solches lebt, – am biskaischen Meerbusen.*)

18 It is an interesting fact that Michelena does not deal with Gabelentz at any point in his entire work, which is now available in the 15 volumes of the *Obras completas*. This cannot be explained by ignorance or lack of interest in the history of linguistics, nor even by a blindness to linguistic typology. Michelena must have deliberately refused to write more about Gabelentz's Basque excursions than what had already been said in earlier discussions.

19 The copy of the book which is available in the Graz university library carries the library stamp of Hugo Schuchardt and is provided with some critical handwritten notes made by him.

Berbersprachen: Kabylisch, Tuareg, Gadamsi, Šilha, mit Ägyptisch und Koptisch und mit anderen hamitischen Sprachen (Dictionary for comparing Basque with the Berber languages: Kabyle, Tuareg, Ghadamès, Shilha, with Egyptian, Coptic, and other Hamitic languages) from pages 93 to 285. This second part consists exclusively of a comparative dictionary, which is presented without commentary. Gabelentz used its framework – the lexical entries organized according to semantic groups – for the first time in Gabelentz & Meyer (1882) and it reappears in the same form in the *Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen* (Handbook for recording foreign languages) (Gabelentz 1892a).²⁰

Gabelentz himself worked on the handbook for both Basque and the Berber reference languages: research in the Gabelentz collection of the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg has revealed the following copies of the *Handbuch*, all of which have been filled in by Gabelentz in his own handwriting, although not all have been filled in completely:

- the most complete copy is the Basque version; it is discussed in detail in Hurch (2009; 2011);²¹
- for ‘the language of the Kabyle people’ (*die Sprache der Kabysten*), Gabelentz also compiled a relatively complete copy, dated 1893;
- for ‘Tuareg together with Šilha and Gadamsi’ (*Tuareg nebst Šilha und Gadamsi*) (with no handwritten year) there is a copy filled in by him only partially;
- another copy (again without indication of the year) for ‘the language of the Egyptians and Copts’ (*die Sprache der Aegypter und Kopten*) is only very sparsely filled in.

It can be assumed that all these *Handbuch* versions originated in the same period, between 1892 and 1893, and served the same end, namely to be a tool for the comparison of Basque and Berber.

The *Handbuch* copies do not explicitly list their sources. As far as the Basque version is concerned, there is no doubt about the fact that the most important source by far was the dictionary of van Eys (1873), although its dialectologically oriented comparative representation of the Basque dialects is not reproduced by Gabelentz. Nevertheless, the Basque version has a special status, in that he first writes the Basque entries into the *Handbuch*, followed by the forms to

20 The differences between these versions are limited to individual entries in the later versions, which do not receive their own numbers but which are differentiated by letters. There is a critical (linguistic and social) study of the *Handbuch* in Kürschner (2014). Cf. also Hurch (2011). We only know a few copies which were actually used for the *recording of foreign languages*. They are enumerated in Hurch (2011), with acknowledgements to Manfred Ringmacher.

21 The existence of this copy was brought to our attention by Manfred Ringmacher.

be compared from Kabyle and Tuareg. This suggests that the Basque volume was the chronologically oldest part. No sources are mentioned in the Berber handbooks, either. In the essay, Gabelentz (1893) explicitly mentions Newman (1882; 1887), Hanoteau (1858; 1860) and Ben Sedira (1887), but the orthography used by Gabelentz for the language samples and the glossary does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about the origin of the entries.

In all these versions of the *Handbuch*, the focus is not on the recording of the languages, but rather on the editing of existing sources for comparative purposes.²² The template for this task is one that, in Gabelentz's opinion, had already proven successful in another part of the world. Here he obviously hoped that he would be able to discover and establish a linguistic relationship of his own by means of a tried and tested method. However, his justification remains extremely poor and methodologically questionable.

The print version of the comparative dictionary from 1894 is not just the sum of the earlier *Handbuch* versions mentioned above. It follows the same lexicographic pattern in all details and even takes over the numbering of the earlier versions, except that a few entries have been omitted, such as no. 180, *Perlenmuschel* (pearl oyster), which plays no role in either the Basque or the Berber cultural sphere, but also such entries as no. 203, *Bräutigam* (bridegroom). Instead, some numbers that have a few more entries are assigned an additional subdivision with a, b, c, etc. The languages are presented in columns in the order Basque / Kabyle / Tuareg / Shilha / Ghadamès²³ / Egyptian / Coptic. The glossing language is German, the first reference language is Basque. Since this part of the dictionary is largely devoid of commentary, and since some entries are not filled in at all – a few are filled in only for Basque but not for the other languages – it can be assumed that Gabelentz does indeed regard the forms he cites as forms that are related not only semantically but also in their form. He has therefore not included in this final version those forms from the different versions of his *Handbuch* that he could not connect to Basque, although he considers them as having equivalents in different Berber languages as they are Hamitic. On the other hand, the dictionary also contains entries and senses that he has not listed in the handbooks. Some words are marked by Gabelentz with either an exclamation or question mark; we can assume that this is supposed to indicate whether the relationship is certain or questionable – however, Gabelentz employs all of them equally in his sound comparisons.

22 It is not known how it came about that Gabelentz was commissioned to write this *Handbuch* for the Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amtes (Colonial Department of the Foreign Office).

23 The spelling of this language alternates between initial *Gh-* and *ʿ-* in Gabelentz (1894).

The first part of Gabelentz (1894) has to be subdivided once more, because only a short initial section of a few pages deals with the question of possible grammatical correspondences. He lists a number of typologically relevant characteristics that have no equivalents between Basque and Berber (order of grammatical elements, ergative, presence of individual categories, etc.). Solving these questions, he says, 'is the task of the internal history of a language, whose work can only begin once the genetic relationship is proven' (*ist die Sache der inneren Sprachgeschichte, deren Arbeit erst beginnen kann, wenn die Stammverwandtschaft erwiesen ist*) (Gabelentz, 1894, p. 3). The various statements that follow about gender, diminutives, causatives, a Basque prefix *ma-* that is not defined further, case endings, and plural suffixes indicate a lack of detailed knowledge of Basque grammar, and Gabelentz makes no attempt to formulate any serious claims.²⁴ This short section is so fragmentary that one can hardly imagine that the author could have considered it to be ready to print.

The vast majority of this first section, namely pages 9-91, gives lists of words again, arranged according to sound variations, sound alternations, sound correspondences, starting with Basque dialectal alternations, then, if available, internal Berber ones, which are finally put in relation to the Basque ones. According to Gabelentz, they show, on the one hand, the correspondences but, on the other hand, they often simply illustrate the chaotic state of these correspondences, which in fact do not seem conducive to formulating sound laws at either an initial glance or even after a more detailed examination (such examples as Basque *belar* to Kab. *amlagey*, Basque *belarri* to Kab. *amezzug*, Basque *badarik* to Shil. *meqqar*, Basque *undar* to Kab. *anegger* could be multiplied indefinitely). These comparisons also remain largely uncommented from a phonological point of view, although sometimes there are brief comments on the lack of plausibility of certain correspondences. It seems that merely postulating these correspondences is enough to make them real for Gabelentz.

The book ends with four tables of sound correspondences, Table II, 'sound change within the Kabyle language' (*Lautwandel innerhalb des Kabylischen*), and Table IV 'sound change in the Basque language' (*Lautwandel im Baskischen*), which are identical with Tables III and I of the Academy

24 It is therefore not clear to what extent Gabelentz would still have relied on the similarity of formatives, or whether he would have considered them to be deceptive evidence, since 'affixes consist mostly of few, light-weight speech sounds' (*Affixe bestehen ja meist aus wenigen, leichtwiegenden Lauten*), where 'chance [has] easy play' (*Zufall [hat] leichtes Spiel*) (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891], p. 161). It is not entirely clear why they, of all sounds, should show regularity in all the phonetic chaos.

essay.²⁵ Table I, which is missing in Gabelentz (1893), gives a summary of the Basque-Berber sound correspondences according to the same pattern.²⁶ Table III is an evaluation of the consonant permutations according to Campión (1884, p. 116), which deviates in some points from Gabelentz's own results, although he fails to mention this in any way.²⁷

4 Gabelentz (1901)

The intervention of the editor Schulenburg in the second edition of *Die Sprachwissenschaft* is often referred to in the literature; the various changes are highlighted by Ringmacher and McElvenny in their critical edition (Gabelentz, 2016). Among these additions in Schulenburg's second edition is a new and even clearer formulation of Gabelentz's views relating to the putative Basque-Berber relationship, which was probably introduced by Gabelentz himself. In particular, Gabelentz (2016 [1901], pp. 314–316) corresponds to the explanations of 1893 – this 'theoretical' part, as stated above, is missing in the 1894 version – but provides further clarifications. In keeping with the general character of *Die Sprachwissenschaft*, the presentation is now more accessible to a general audience and embellished to a certain extent, but the aim of integrating this account into the model of general linguistics is nevertheless explicitly in the foreground.²⁸ Gabelentz also emphasizes the 'wildness' (*Verwilderung*) as well as the 'uncertain contours of the sound images' (*unsicheren Umrisse der Lautbilder*) and dedicates himself more specifically to the implications for general linguistics.

Confronted with such confusion, however, the tried and tested method of phonetic language comparison fails. [...] Another may try to forge new tools to deal with the new subject; and anyone who wants to extend linguistics as far as human languages reach must dare to try.

25 Minimal differences between the Basque tables suggest inaccurate proof-reading rather than separate evaluation of the data.

26 Table V (Gabelentz, 1893) also shows a much more confusing comparison of the two languages, but here several consonants are grouped together into whole categories and the figures of the two tables do not always agree completely.

27 Perhaps Gabelentz refers here to Campión, whom he quotes nowhere else as a source, since the latter had also categorized the sound correspondences according to the frequency of their occurrence in 'normal, deviant and sporadic' (*normales, anormales* and *esporádicas*), while van Eys (1873, pp. xliii–xlvi) only contains a pure enumeration of the possibilities.

28 We will leave aside here the renewed tabular representations of sound correspondences and their only slightly altered interpretations.

New tools, that means new categories. And in our case this is incredibly difficult: we want to draw with a mop, paint [a picture] with a paint roller, add an 'or something like that' to every sound and every word we write down. In Basque, a small hill is called: *mur*, *murru*, *mora*, *murko*, *burko*, *morroko*, *mulko*, *mulho*, *muillo*, *mulzo*, *muno*, *munho*, or something like that; [...] There are no sound shifts or substitutions, but sound shufflings and blendings, no sound laws but sound possibilities, each of which could be easily demonstrated by a sufficient number of other examples. And that is what matters: the facts must be absolutely compelling before we can sacrifice the most proven rules of research to them. But if we close our eyes to compelling facts we sacrifice even more, for we sacrifice knowledge to our anxiousness or arrogance. (Gabelentz, 2016 [1901], pp. 315-316)²⁹

Gabelentz calls for new categories to describe these supposedly uncertain relations, but he does not explain what they might be. It is clear that he rejects sound laws as a mechanism for explaining the correspondences he mentions. But even here he fails due to a lack of knowledge of Basque, namely the highly productive method of diminution through suffixation and/or palatalization, as well as simple orthographic traditions. This ignorance leads him to accept unexplained correspondences where there is an easily perceived system.

5 Contemporary criticism

It did not take long for a critical examination of the two writings to appear. As early as the beginning of September 1893 – only about two months after the academic lecture – a devastating assessment by Hugo Schuchardt was

29 Original: 'Einem solchen Wirrsale gegenüber versagt freilich die alterprobte Methode der phonetischen Sprachvergleichung ihren Dienst. [...] Ein Anderer mag versuchen, sich neue Werkzeuge zu schmieden, womit er den neuen Stoff bearbeitet; und wer die Sprachwissenschaft soweit erstrecken will, wie menschliche Sprachen reichen, der muss den Versuch wagen. „Neue Werkzeuge“, das heisst neue Kategorien. Und das ist in unserem Falle entsetzlich schwierig: man möchte mit dem Wischer zeichnen, mit dem Vertreiberpinsel malen, zu jedem Laute, jedem Worte, das man niederschreibt, möchte man beifügen: „oder so ähnlich“. Auf Baskisch heisst ein kleiner Hügel: *mur*, *murru*, *mora*, *murko*, *burko*, *morroko*, *mulko*, *mulho*, *muillo*, *mulzo*, *muno*, *munho*, oder so ähnlich; [...] Es handelt sich hier nicht um Lautverschiebungen oder Lautvertretungen, sondern um Lautverwischungen und -vermischungen, nicht um Lautgesetze, sondern um Lautmöglichkeiten, deren jede leicht an einer genügenden Zahl anderer Beispiele nachzuweisen wäre. Und darauf kommt es allerdings an: die Thatsachen müssen geradezu zwingend sein, ehe man ihnen die erprobtesten Regeln der Forschung opfern mag. Aber wer vor zwingenden Thatsachen die Augen verschliesst, opfert noch weit mehr, denn er opfert seiner Ängstlichkeit oder Rechthaberei eine Erkenntnis.'

published in the *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*. His so-called ‘exhibitions’ (*Ausstellungen*) address practically all aspects of the work: Gabelentz does not know the relevant literature; his lack of knowledge of the Basque language and grammar led to erroneous morphological analyses and assumptions; he does not confront his sources critically enough; he makes for the most part unfounded assertions about formal and semantic correspondences that are not at all clear; he is not sufficiently familiar with the history of the Romance and Basque languages and postulates wrong etymological connections or, as the case may be, wrong paths of borrowing; he often does not recognize Arabic loan words whose integration took different routes on the Iberian peninsula from in the rest of Latin Europe; he confines himself to word correspondences and avoids necessary questions which a grammatical comparison would require. In short, Schuchardt shows that Gabelentz’s work has serious defects and contains beginner’s mistakes in practically all respects, and since the book version of 1894 did not bring about any changes in the points mentioned above, critics of the latter in turn refer explicitly to Schuchardt’s detailed criticism (e.g. Stumme, 1895; Unamuno, 1895; Vinson, 1901–1902). The reproaches are of course also addressed to the editor of the posthumous volume, Albrecht von der Schulenburg, who should have taken note of the earlier criticism and who had ‘not given over to the flames’ (*nicht den Flammen überantwortet*) such an obviously unfinished manuscript, which is apparently only able to ‘attach a stain hard to remove’ (*einen schwer tilgbaren Fleck anzuhängen*) to the good name of Gabelentz (Gustav Meyer, 1895, p. 785). The unanimous conclusion is that Schulenburg should not have published the manuscript in this form, and only did so out of a false piety towards his uncle (loc. cit.).³⁰

30 Thus the Orientalist and linguist H[ans] St[umm]e (1895) in the *Literarisches Centralblatt* and the Balkan specialist and Indo-European scholar Gustav Meyer (1895) in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*. The latter discusses Gabelentz’s volume together with Topolovšek’s (1894) *Die basko-slavische Spracheinheit*, which, from a linguistic point of view, is the worst company in which one could be placed. In the file in the Altenburg archive mentioned in note 7 above, there is a letter in which the publisher Sattler sends these two reviews to Schulenburg, accompanied by the accusation of having deceived him before printing.

Friedrich Müller (1895) also links Gabelentz and Topolovšek because of the lack of grammatical correlations. Passages from Schuchardt and Müller are translated into Spanish by Aranzadi (1902) without further commentary.

Again and again the critics reproach Gabelentz for making, in these two works, the same methodological mistake he criticized in Bopp’s discussion of the putative relationship between Indo-European and Austronesian languages (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891], pp. 152, 163, 280): he sacrificed the grammatical comparison to superficial phonetic similarities.

One serious objection Schuchardt raises is that Gabelentz claimed he was breaking new ground with his proposal, while in reality he had not taken note of the existing literature. In particular, Schuchardt refers to the works of Louis Gèze (1883–1885)³¹ and Claudio Giacomino (1892).³² In those years, however, the problem of Basque–Berber was apparently the subject of publications in various countries and from different perspectives. Brinton (1894, p. 43) mentions in his brief review in *Science* that ‘so far back as 1876 Dr. Tubino [Tubino, 1876], of Madrid, in his “Aborigenes Ibericos,” compared the two idioms for the same purpose’. The Iberian perspective was also taken up by Taylor (1893, p. 77), but using arguments based on physical anthropology: Broca’s measurements of the skull had shown a similarity between the southern Basques and the Iberians, while the northern Basques belonged to an independent type. Basque as a language had thus spread from the northern to the southern Basque country, which created the contact situation with Iberian (and therefore presumably with Berber). However, it seems doubtful to us that Taylor correctly understood Gabelentz’s text in this essay.

It would be all too easy to demonstrate further errors on the part of Gabelentz – methodological, historical, linguistic, in his understanding of Basque and Berber and in his treatment of the sources – apart from those already discussed.³³ But this has already been done in the literature. What

31 Louis Gèze was a specialist of Basque studies who wrote a Souletin grammar with a famous dictionary in 1873. In a letter from Gabelentz to Schuchardt, which follows Schuchardt (1893), Gabelentz asks for more detailed information on the works on Basque and Berber Schuchardt mentioned in his review. Schuchardt’s answer is not preserved, but apparently he sent the aforementioned text by Gèze to his colleague in Berlin. This can be inferred from a letter from Schulenburg, which is kept in Schuchardt’s *Nachlass* in Graz (available electronically at: <http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/letter/2780>, accessed 2 August 2018). Schuchardt had apparently tried to get this publication back after the death of Gabelentz, but it no longer appears in Schuchardt’s library holdings.

32 Claudio Giacomino was an Italian grammar school teacher and linguist. He later succeeded Ascoli, who had supported him for many years. With regard to the present topic, he wrote two studies: a shorter work from 1892, which was more focused on Old Egyptian and which could only be the base of the criticism in question, and a later, much longer one, which was published in 1895. Schuchardt could in fact also have known the latter, because Giacomino had submitted it in 1890 for the *Premio Reale* of the *Accademia dei Lincei* (without success). In 1896, however, he received the award for this work (the award was shared equally with Pio Rajna). Although Schuchardt was not a member of the Commission, he was probably informed as a member of the Academy; the manuscript is now in the archives of the *Lincei* in Rome.

33 The latter criticism was not mentioned in the reviews. But there are quite a lot of passages where Gabelentz did not handle his primary Basque source (van Eys, 1873) properly. For example, he neither looked at the alternation width of *m* already shown by van Eys in his foreword (1873, p. xliv) – or at least he did not take note of it in his presentation (Gabelentz, 1883, p. 597) – nor did

is surprising is that his mistakes are partly those of a beginner, which one would not have expected of Georg von der Gabelentz. Rather, it is important for us to find out why Gabelentz was so enthusiastic about an undertaking for which he simply lacked the specialist competence.

Vinson (1901–1902) continues his commentaries on new publications in Basque studies, which he started in his *Essai* (1891) and the *Additions* (1898), two standard works that are still used today. It is within this context that Vinson (1901–1902, pp. 145–146) deals with Gabelentz and criticizes his bold assumptions about lexical correspondences from a formal and semantic point of view. But he also finds that the book has missed several opportunities to establish grammatical correlations. In his article *Les Aryens*, Vinson (1904a, p. 183), who was known for his polemical directness, is merciless with the researchers on the Basque-Berber approach:

[...] he [de Michelis] sees, for example, the relation between Basque and Berber, Coptic and Egyptian as established, due to the works of Gèze, Gabelentz and Giacomino; and yet nothing is more open to dispute, and among the works on Basque of these past years there is none more insufficient than those of Gèze, none more absurd than those of Gabelentz and none more far-fetched than those of Giacomino: risky comparisons and adventurous etymologies have never proven anything.³⁴

He also comments on these theories, which lack methodological coherence, in a similar way in Vinson (1904b) in the *Journal Asiatique*. Miguel de Unamuno (1895) takes a gentler approach, which is, however, still just as damning: on the one hand, the criticism of Schulenburg's premature

he take into consideration van Eys's Romance etymologies. A correspondence between Tuareg *tablelt* and Basque *berun* 'lead' (*Blei*), also questioned by Basset (1896, p. 90) because of the strong dissimilarity, would find a much simpler and more plausible explanation in the Romance stem *plumb-*, especially if one takes into account the simplification of Latin-Romance onset clusters by epenthetic vowels and the change from *m* to *n* in final position, which Gabelentz himself emphasizes very prominently, on the second page of his Academy essay, as being characteristic. It is incomprehensible why he decided against this extremely obvious etymology, which was also suggested by van Eys (1873, p. 64), and preferred a barely tenable alternative. He does not give any reasons himself.

34 Original: '[...] il [de Michelis] regarde, par exemple, comme établie, grâce aux travaux de MM. Gèze, Gabelentz et Giacomino, la parenté du basque et du berbère, du copte, de l'égyptien; or rien n'est plus contestable, et parmi les travaux dont le basque a été l'objet depuis ces dernières années, il n'en est pas de plus insuffisants que ceux de M. Gèze, de plus absurdes que ceux de M. Gabelentz et de plus fantaisistes que ceux de M. Giacomino: des rapprochements hasardés et des étymologies aventureuses n'ont jamais rien prouvé.'

publishing activity is cutting, but, like Schuchardt (1893), he focuses on concrete word forms and their erroneous or questionable semantic and grammatical analyses. Unamuno, however, sharply criticizes Gabelentz's sources: he questions the reliability of van Eys's *Grammaire comparée* and especially of his *Dictionnaire*, claiming that they are too philological and therefore linguistically rather useless. But Unamuno is also much more conciliatory than Vinson, as he leaves open the possibility that some progress could be achieved in this domain with more precise work and more reliable knowledge. He also admits that Gabelentz could have obtained other results if he had used his materials more carefully.

It remains open whether this positive assessment is correct or not. Because of his early death, Gabelentz could not participate in the critical discussion of his publication of 1893. There is only one letter – that is, the letter to Schuchardt dated 5 September 1893 –³⁵ in which Gabelentz responds to the criticisms in the review. His answer is more defensive than understanding. He admits being unaware of the earlier works (Gèze and Giacomino) as well as the fact that Schuchardt himself had published on Basque,³⁶ but points out that his colleagues in Berlin – he obviously means those present at his Academy lecture – did not direct him to the missing literature. However, Gabelentz remains unwilling to admit methodological failings in other regards: he only wants to accept words of Romance origin ‘for the smallest part’ (*zum kleinsten Theile*); that is, if they are of Indo-European origin themselves. He appeals to folk etymology to justify this approach: words can be transferred to a new etymon by means of a similar sound structure. By doing so he tries to get around the criticism that he often takes erroneous analyses of morpheme as a basis. He does not react to other criticisms (e.g. that Arabic loan words may have entered Basque via another route, such as Spanish).

Schuchardt expresses his astonishment at Gabelentz's unwillingness to see reason less than a week after the death of Gabelentz in a letter to Otto

35 This letter is printed in Hurch (2011, pp. 251-252) and is available electronically at <http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/letter/2981>, accessed 2 August 2018.

36 This statement is not very credible. Schuchardt (1892) discussed Giacomino's study in the *Literaturblatt* of Leipzig. Gabelentz himself did not publish anything there (Gabelentz sent almost all reviews to the *Literarisches Centralblatt*), but it can be assumed that he received the *Literaturblatt*, because he was reviewed there in 1892 by Otto Behagel (pp. 257-58); Schuchardt's above-mentioned discussion of Giacomino can be found there on pp. 426-430. Schuchardt's (1888) review of Gerland, which is indeed listed in the card catalogue in Poschwitz (see Appendix 2), also appeared in the *Literaturblatt* (it remains an open question as to when it was added to the bibliography).

Jespersen of 16 December 1893,³⁷ in the context of a discussion on ‘*anmeldelser*’ (review essays – for I now write mere reviews only in exceptional cases) and *smasafhandlinger*’ (anmeldelser (*Rezensionsabhandlungen* – denn *blosse Rezensionen schreibe ich jetzt nur ausnahmsweise*) und *smasafhandlinger*) (Schuchardt):

Take a work such as that of Gabelentz on linguistics [*Die Sprachwissenschaft*]; how stimulating that is! and all the problems are only *touched on*, many of them barely mentioned. I deplore the death of this researcher all the more because I inevitably subjected his last paper on *Berber* and *Basque* to a very negative review. He wrote me a very kind letter afterwards, but I was surprised that my arguments and proofs did not impress him much at all. I had very much been looking forward to an amicable discussion of one and the other of the thousand points touched on in his book, and now he can’t even reply to what I’ve just said against him in a *smaaafhandling* [short essay].³⁸

Contemporary reactions from specialists on Berber languages are no less vehement. In an appendix to his article, Basset (1896, pp. 90–91), after a few general remarks about the subject of Gabelentz’s study, examines his treatment of the names for metals as representative of Gabelentz’s approach. First of all, Basset criticizes Gabelentz for limiting himself to too few dialects/languages of Berber and the fact that his sources (Newman, 1882) are ‘absolutely incomplete and often faulty’ (*absolument incomplet et souvent fautif*) and continues:

But the same is true for the dialects: the author [Gabelentz] lacks thorough knowledge [of them]. He undertakes his comparison of Basque not only with *Arabic* (!) words but also with *French* (!!) words borrowed into Kabyle.

37 The whole letter is available electronically at <http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/letter/144>, accessed 2 August 2018.

38 Original: ‘Nehmen Sie ein Werk wie das von Gabelentz über die Sprachwissenschaft; welche ungeheure Fülle von Anregungen! und alle Probleme sind nur *gestreift*, ja viele kaum erwähnt. Ich beklage den Tod dieses Forschers um so mehr als ich seine letzte Schrift über *Berberisch* und *Baskisch* nothgedrungen einer sehr absprechenden Beurtheilung unterzog. Er schrieb mir darauf einen sehr liebenswürdigen Brief, aus dem ich aber doch mit einiger Verwunderung ersah dass meine Argumente und Nachweise keinen besondern Eindruck auf ihn gemacht hatten. Wie sehr hatte ich mich darauf gefreut, einen und den anderen von den tausend Punkten die in seinem Buche berührt werden, freundschaftlich mit ihm zu diskutieren, und nun kann er mir nicht einmal darauf mehr erwidern was ich eben in einer *smaaafhandling* gegen ihn vorgebracht habe.’

In this way, Basque *burdi* ‘carriage’ is compared to Kabyle *ḡabruedt* (an inexact form for *ḡabruet* = *thabrouet*, from French *brouette* ‘wheelbarrow’!). [...] It is, I believe, useless to insist on the value of results obtained in this way.³⁹

Subsequently Basset deals in detail with Gabelentz (1894, pp. 116-117); that is, the designations for metals. Basset (1899, p. 43) notes tersely a few years later: ‘The attempts of Gabelentz to connect Basque to Berber do not deserve to be dwelt upon. The author’s knowledge – and I only talk about Berber – does not permit him to undertake such work’ (*Les tentatives de M. von der Gabelentz pour rapprocher le basque du berbère ne méritent pas qu’on s’y arrête. Les connaissances de l’auteur, je ne parle que du berbère, ne lui permettent pas d’entreprendre un pareil travail [...]*).⁴⁰

6 On Gabelentz’s sources

6.1 Gabelentz’s sources and knowledge of Basque

The study of Basque is a rather marginal topic in Gabelentz’s research up until the last years of his life and he did not leave a great deal of written evidence behind of his engagement with this topic. Even in his *Sprachwissenschaft* (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891]), Basque hardly receives any mention. It is questionable how deeply he familiarized himself with the Basque language and existing research on it. It is therefore all the more astonishing that in his final works – although he could not have known that they would be his final works – Basque occupies such a central place, and was dealt with so incompetently. There are no extant independent manuscripts or publications on Basque by Gabelentz and only two reviews out of 235 that he wrote in

39 Original: ‘Mais même pour ce qui concerne ces dialectes, une connaissance approfondie manquait à l’auteur; aussi fait-il porter sa comparaison du basque, non pas seulement sur des mots *arabes* (!), mais même sur des mots *français* (!!) passés en Kabyle; c’est ainsi que le basque *burdi*, voiture, est comparé au kabyle *ḡabruedt* (forme inexacte pour *ḡabruet* = *thabrouet*, du français *brouette* !). [...] Il est, je crois, inutile d’insister sur la valeur des résultats ainsi obtenus.’

40 Gabelentz’s theories on the Hamitic (Austroasiatic) character of Basque seldom appear in recent literature on the subject. Only Mukarovsky (1963–1964) attempted to resume the discussion, although with incorrect premises regarding the literature; his approach has remained without further resonance. At the time, Schuchardt (1907; 1913) tried to establish the North African link of Basque via Iberian, but his attempts were questioned by progress at the time in reading of Iberian and Celtiberian texts. Finally, Zyhlarz (1932) dealt with this subject, once more in detail and negatively. See also Michelena (1964, pp. 171-175) for discussion.

the course of his life are devoted to Basque works: Gabelentz (1883b; 1885) discuss W. van Eys's *Outlines of Basque Grammar* and Arno Grimm's *Über die baskische Sprache und Sprachforschung*. In 1888 he also wrote a review of the 1886 *Glosario* by Eguilaz y Yanguas. The latter, however, is little more than a brief discussion and does not go into the details of Basque research at all, even though it is precisely the *Glosario* that could and should be relevant for his two later publications. It is indeed surprising that it does not reappear in Gabelentz's work on Basque and Berber.⁴¹

The language library of Poschwitz is only partially preserved and the remnants are kept in the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg. We know little about how many volumes were originally in the library; current descriptions are largely based on guesses or indirect and less concrete anecdotal evidence, much of it stemming from an oral tradition within the Gabelentz family.⁴² Various catalogue lists and, above all, the card catalogue itself provide information on those works on Basque which might have been available to Gabelentz.⁴³ Appendix 2 to this chapter lists the various relevant inventories. However, Gabelentz used only a small portion of these works for his Basque-Berber writings and materials.⁴⁴ In his two publications he mentions several times that his most important and almost exclusive source was the Basque-French dictionary and comparative grammar of Willem van

41 However, in his library in Poschwitz, which is described in detail below, Gabelentz actually lists Eguilaz y Yanguas among the Basque books and writings relevant for Basque studies.

42 Emig (2013, p. 312) summarizes this 'state of knowledge'.

43 The card catalogue in Altenburg is kept in a few meticulous hands with the same ink. Since the library grew over decades, and also based on the type of index cards used, it is reasonable to assume that the now existing catalogue was not kept continuously, but was (newly) created at a later date. However, there is no doubt about its being original and in our opinion it is not clear why Vogel (2013, p. 200) speaks of the 'few, still remaining card index boxes' (*wenigen, noch erhaltenen Karteikästen*). The completeness of the alphabet in the nominal catalogue does not suggest that there is anything missing; the subject catalogue also includes, for example, those works on Basque which can be assumed to have been available to Gabelentz for his research, and Gabelentz does not mention any works which are not also represented in the file boxes. In addition, in the old photograph of his study (*ibid.*, p. 198) there are 8 boxes, which correspond in appearance and extent exactly to the ones available today.

In the appendix to this chapter, comparisons have also been made between the card boxes and handwritten book lists referring to Basque and Berber, which have been preserved in Gabelentz's *Nachlass* in the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg; these do not indicate either that the card index boxes are now only roughly incomplete.

44 These lists hold some surprises. Gabelentz mentions, for example, Humboldt (1821), but not Humboldt's contribution to *Mithridates* (1817). As other contemporaries (such as A.F. Pott) state, *Mithridates* was still the main reference work on the Basque language in the German-speaking area in the second half of the century. Gabelentz's interest in the Vasco-Iberian or Celtiberian discourse of Humboldt (1821) does not go beyond the mere mentioning of it, however.

Eys (1873; 1879), but he also refers to the works of Louis-Lucien Bonaparte (without pointing to any concrete passage). Campi3n's *Gram3tica de los cuatro dialectos literarios* (1884) appears only in the appendix to the book of 1894, in connection with the above-mentioned table of the 'permutations of consonants' (*permutaciones de consonantes*).

A recurring mistake on the part of Gabelentz shows how slight his knowledge of Basque really was: he does not consider the internal structures of Basque and Berber words in his comparison. This means that he simply compares word structures without worrying about the question whether a (supposedly) corresponding sound belongs to the stem or to an affix. Such a systematic methodological error is surprising and, being committed by the author of *Die Sprachwissenschaft*, demands to be understood rather than simply rebuked. Gabelentz responds somewhat unconvincingly to criticism of this approach by saying that in folk etymology such examples are explained without being decomposed into their constituents.⁴⁵ Basque scholars of the Basque language, however, only comment on Gabelentz's obvious lack of understanding of the language, language history and grammar. Gabelentz's Basque studies were the product of a rather peculiar approach: there were two literary overviews of the Basque language in German, an older one (Humboldt, 1817 [1816]) and a relatively recent and more extensive one (Pott, 1887), which Gabelentz does not seem to have considered either.

6.2 Gabelentz's sources and knowledge of Berber

On 16 January 1885, Gabelentz wrote to his sister that he had studied Kabyle 'more or less during the past years' (*innerhalb der letzten Jahre mehr oder minder*) (M3nchhausen, 2013 [1913], p. 121). His activities date back to 1882 at least, when his entry 'Kabyle (linguistic)' (*Kabylen (sprachlich)*) appears in the *Allgemeine Encyclop3die der Wissenschaften und K3nste* (General Encyclopaedia of the sciences and arts) of Ersch and Gruber.⁴⁶ It is a short

45 An example for illustration: *et(h)orki* 'clan, family' (*Sippe, Familie*), according to Gabelentz, is therefore more likely to belong to Berber than to be a completely regular derivation of Basque *etor* 'come' (*kommen*) and the nominal suffix *ki(n)*. Such Basque words would thus have their origin in the Berber *ɣerga* or *ɗerga* and the phonetic similarity would have caused their ascription to another etymon (that of *etorri*). Gabelentz does not give any justification for this from a scientific point of view, which opens the door to methodical arbitrariness.

46 Between 1882 and 1889, Gabelentz wrote a total of 26 articles beginning with the letter K and three beginning with L for the *Allgemeine Encyclop3die*. Primarily, these are language portraits (e.g. 'Kamilaroi language' [*Kamilaroi Sprache*], 'Khamti', 'Kuki', 'Lepcha') and contributions on East Asian literature and philosophy (e.g. 'Laozi' [*Lao-tse*]), but Gabelentz also contributed a short biography of Julius Klaproth.

and as such simplified representation of the most important grammatical phenomena, based on Adolphe Hanoteau's grammar of Kabyle (1858). Gabelentz also cites two dictionaries, Delaporte (1844)⁴⁷ and 'Creuzat' (i.e. Creusat, 1873), which are not mentioned in his later works. Here already, he characterizes the sounds as fluctuating and speaks of uncertain articulation.

Later Gabelentz reviewed Newman's *Lybian* and *Kabail vocabulary* (Gabelentz, 1883a; 1889), which would be important sources for his later comparison to the Basque language.⁴⁸ In between, he confines himself to the proof the genetic relationship between Hamitic and Semitic languages by first citing similar grammatical constructions and only secondarily giving lexical examples in *Die Sprachwissenschaft* (Gabelentz, 2016 [1891], p. 169).

As already mentioned, it is not possible to clearly determine his actual sources on the basis of the spellings he uses for examples. The works he explicitly cites are either in French or English and not only reproduce individual phonemes by different letters, but also partly diverge in the vowel systems used. In his article in the *Encyclopädie* Gabelentz still follows Hanoteau (1858) to a great extent, but for his later studies he adapts the spelling to his German-speaking audience. He does not say so at any point, but he may have used Lepsius's standard alphabet for *Tamašeq* (Lepsius, 1863, pp. 205-206) as his starting point.

7 An assessment

Proving that Basque is a 'Hamitic language, related to the Berber family' (*hamitische, der Berberfamilie verwandte Sprache*) and developing proposals for sound correspondences in prehistoric times that contradict the regularity of sound change are perhaps the two main goals of Gabelentz's final project. This work has, however, been completely disregarded by later research on Gabelentz. Ignoring this aspect of his work is consistent with the fact that it does not fit with the idealized picture of Gabelentz that is cultivated in the history of linguistics. But ignoring this work and leaving the relevant texts (Gabelentz, 1893; 1894) out of anthologies such as Ezawa, Hundsnurscher & Vogel (2013) eschews scholarly responsibility.⁴⁹ In this ideal conception,

47 The dictionary was compiled by J.D. Delaporte, E. de Nully, Ch. Brosselard and Sidi Ahmed ben el Hadj Ali under the direction of Amédée Jaubert. It is therefore known as Jaubert (1844) in the literature.

48 Basset's critique (1896) was discussed here earlier.

49 With the exception of the list of his publications, which does mention the two works, this statement applies to all essays assembled in the anthology.

the master's works end with the publication of *Die Sprachwissenschaft* in 1891, after which he seems to have devoted himself only to the preparation of a second edition of this book.⁵⁰

After almost 125 years it is still difficult to assess the place of these works. Gabelentz (1894) only partially corresponds to the picture the history of linguistics has made of him. It is true that there are similarities, a same basic tendency and cross-references between the posthumous book and Gabelentz (1893), the text he published himself. Substantial parts are not formulated in words, however, but mainly contain uncommented material. This suggests that it was by no means a 'ready-to-print manuscript' (*druckfertiges Manuskript*), as the accompanying text states. Gabelentz refers in various places to a longer work on the subject, but it is unlikely that he would have wanted to see it published in this form. The editor, Schulenburg, was perhaps reckless and lacking in sufficient respect in simply putting Gabelentz's notes into print.⁵¹ Ringmacher and McElvenny (Gabelentz, 2016) have already complained when comparing the two editions of *Die Sprachwissenschaft* that Schulenburg intervened in a not insignificant and often incompetent way. In the present case, we do not assume that Schulenburg interfered textually with the posthumous book version of 1894, because it contains hardly any continuous running text.⁵² Nevertheless, the fact remains that Gabelentz published the Academy lecture of 1893, in which he puts forward his bold theories and questionable linguistic correspondences, and that he reacted quite uncomprehendingly to the criticism he faced before his death. He used unreliable sources for all languages involved and did not acquire sufficient linguistic knowledge of the languages, available sources, grammars, and lexical works to start an undertaking of this kind. However, such an enormous misjudgement can of course occur in exceptional situations – and perhaps this was the case for Gabelentz, who found himself in a difficult period both in terms of his family life and his health (see Vogel & McElvenny, this volume). In those decades, other linguists also proposed bold theories about genetic relationships, and the Basque language has

50 Gabelentz's Basque-Berber theory was still praised by Münchhausen (2013 [1913], pp. 135, 138); she does not seem to have noticed its dubious nature at the time of writing and publishing of her memoirs.

51 This circumstance is also regrettable because Gabelentz appreciated his nephew very much and 'was pleased by him' (*[hat s]eine Freude an ihm*) (letter of 30 April 1891, printed in Münchhausen, 2013 [1913], p. 126). He also gave a positive review (1892b) of Schulenburg's grammar of the language of Murray Island (1891).

52 For this, he was clearly lacking in professional competence. However, textual interventions would hardly be detectable today.

always stimulated not only scientific activity but also – and above all – the imagination of many researchers. But it is hardly excusable in the history of science and of linguistics that *this Gabelentz* is simply ignored and that the secondary literature ends with *Die Sprachwissenschaft*.

8 Annexes

8.1 Appendix 1: materials for the time in Berlin

Klaus Kaden (1993)⁵³ has written a very well-researched article based on the files concerning the appointment of Georg von der Gabelentz to the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin. Understanding Gabelentz's last years in Berlin and his activities there provides a key to understanding his Basque-Berber works. For this, Kaden evaluates the documents that lie in the archives in Berlin, in particular in those of the present-day Humboldt-Universität and the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences), as well as today's Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Secret State Archive of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation). Gabelentz's chief mentors in the Berlin faculty were the Indo-Europeanist Johannes Schmidt⁵⁴ and the geographer Ferdinand von Richthofen.⁵⁵ Schmidt was responsible for assessing and recommending Gabelentz to the faculty on the basis of his linguistic work, while Richthofen wrote a detailed letter of recommendation to the ministry, supported by some faculty members and the dean.⁵⁶ At that time, Gabelentz was already a member of the Academy of Berlin, succeeding Wilhelm Schott. In 1889 he also succeeded Schott as professor at the university, but his position was upgraded from Schott's extraordinary professorship to a full professorship, a step taken to expand Sinology as a subject in Berlin and thus respond to new scientific and social perspectives. But in these years Gabelentz's own interests shifted: in teaching (see Kaden,

53 This essay is now available in an easily accessible form in Ezawa & Vogel (2013, pp. 271–288).

54 A few years earlier, it was precisely Johannes Schmidt, at that time professor of comparative and Indo-European linguistics in Graz, who had led Schuchardt's call to Graz, with great ambition and, ultimately, success for the faculty. See the relevant documents in the electronic *Hugo Schuchardt Archiv* (<http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/home>, accessed 2 August 2018) or in the publication of the correspondence Schmidt-Schuchardt contained in the archive.

55 Ferdinand Frhr. von Richthofen (1833–1905) is considered the founder of geomorphology and gave lectures in Berlin from 1886.

56 Thankfully, all these documents were edited by Kaden (2013 [1993]).

2013 [1993], p. 287, for the list of lectures held by Gabelentz in Berlin), Sinology and East Asia-related lectures clearly dominate, but his publications are increasingly devoted to general linguistic and typological topics, as well as to the field of Basque and Berber. In 1891 Gabelentz published a – or perhaps *the* – magnum opus, namely *Die Sprachwissenschaft*, in 1892 the aforementioned *Handbuch*, and in 1893, the year of his death, he devoted himself to the Basque-Berber studies. These are altogether very extensive works on non-Sinological topics. The Berlin faculty did not seem to be very pleased by these developments.

Below are two documents, which originate from Schuchardt's *Nachlass*, who was visibly affected by the death of Gabelentz. Both of them are letters from Adolf Tobler, a Romance scholar and linguist as well as a member of the Academy, who therefore took part in Gabelentz's appointment to Berlin and who certainly sympathized with him. Unfortunately, Schuchardt's letters have not been preserved in Tobler's papers.⁵⁷

Lib. no. 11715

Berlin, 18 Dec. 1893.

Dear colleague,

I regret to say that I am not able to provide you with any further information about the life and nature of my late colleague v. d. Gabelentz. As far as I am aware, he was not in close contact with any of his colleagues, except for example with the geographer v. Richthofen, whom he knew from Leipzig, to whom he was probably drawn by their shared interest in China, and perhaps also by their shared social status [i.e. they were both aristocrats], which is less important among men, but which sometimes comes into consideration for the social intercourse of those who are married. G. was probably not of unsociable nature, he also liked to talk in a lively way about non-specialist subjects, but he remained quite lonely here. In the beginning, he was unmarried, several times on leave for a longer period of time, which he spent on a small estate near Altenburg, where his books had remained. When he remarried about a year and a half ago (a young aristocratic widow, who seemed to me to be very kind), he probably stayed in his four walls even more than before. He leaves behind some children of his first marriage, which I believe have never been here,

57 The two letters are kept in Schuchardt's *Nachlass* in the special collections of the Graz university library. They can be accessed electronically at <http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/letter/4046>, accessed 2 August 2018, and <http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/letter/4045>, accessed 2 August 2018.

a child of his second wife, & she expects the birth of a second, I am told.⁵⁸ The huge, seemingly strong man suffered from kidney stones; he died of nephritis accompanied by pneumonia. His academic effectiveness was minimal, not only as far as it concerned Chinese, Manchu etc. but also general linguistics. I do not know why. He stuttered quite a lot, which, in connection with his being quite cross-eyed, did not make conversation with him pleasant;⁵⁹ but in Leipzig he is said to have been very successful as a lecturer, as it is called. It seemed to me as if he was not really able, even with a bit of willpower, to make the effort to connect with his audience. But I don't know whether this was the cause or effect of the low participation on the part of the students. I met him every 14 days during the winter in a company of 15 men of scholarship,⁶⁰ where – every time a lecture was given – I heard a lot of stimulating things and spoke myself with joy when it was my turn. Here too, he did not understand the appropriate way to do so; one did not get the impression of the certainty that comes from methodical work, but rather that of a certain inconstant amateurism. He was certainly a man of great talent & varied knowledge; but it seems to me that he lacked a thorough education. You know that he had actually studied law & had been working in government administration for a long time (in Alsace); the weakness of his work may be explained by the fact that he took up his father's studies only later, I believe, and entirely on his own initiative & that he perhaps started teaching a little too early in a discipline where we work largely unmonitored. A great deal of effort was made to get him to Berlin back then, but in general there was a certain disappointment & I should not be surprised if, after this experience, it would be a while before the deceased's chair is reoccupied. For Chinese we have the proficient *extraordinarius*,⁶¹ to whom G. himself gladly referred those students he was not inclined to teach. That's all I can tell you about G. What I have read about him in local newspapers is the useless bilge to which we poor devils regularly fall victim when we die. Richthofen (Geh.

58 Gabelentz's widow, however, suffered a miscarriage after his death. The two sons Albrecht and Wolf were born from his first marriage, Hanns-Conon from his second marriage (cf. Münchhausen, 2013 [1913], esp. p. 140; Vogel & McElvenny, this volume).

59 Gabelentz's sister Clementine writes that since childhood his 'left eye would tend to leer outwards' (*mit dem linken Auge nach außen zu schielen*) when he felt attacked, and that he would stutter 'when he had the impression that someone listened to him without sympathy' (*wenn er den Eindruck hatte, daß ihm ohne Wohlwollen zugehört wurde*) (Münchhausen, 2013 [1913], p. 90).

60 This is the *Berliner Mittwochsgesellschaft*, which was founded on 19 January 1863 and was limited to sixteen persons. A series of lectures was held in turn and recorded.

61 Carl Arendt (1838–1902).

Rat Freiherr Ferdinand von Richth., Kurfürstenstr. 117) would most likely be able to send you more detailed information.⁶²

I thank you very much for your kind regards on the occasion of my silver wedding anniversary.

Yours devotedly

A. Tobler

Berlin d. 18. Dez. 1893.

Verehrter Herr Kollege,

irgend welche genauere Auskunft über Leben & Wesen meines verstorbenen Amtsgenossen v. d. Gabelntz Ihnen zu geben oder zu verschaffen bin ich zu meinem Bedauern nicht in der Lage. Er hat, so weit ich weiß, mit keinem seiner Kollegen in vertrauterem Verkehr gestanden außer etwa mit dem Geographen v. Richthofen, den er von Leipzig her kannte, mit dem ihn wohl auch das beiderseitige Interesse für China zusammenbrachte, vielleicht auch die Standesgemeinschaft, die unter Männern zwar weniger zu bedeuten pflegt, für den geselligen Verkehr Verheirateter jedoch manchmal in Betracht kommt. G. war wohl nicht ungeselliger Natur, sprach gern & lebendig auch über andere als Fachgegenstände; aber er ist hier doch ziemlich einsam geblieben. Anfangs war er noch unverheiratet, mehrfach auch auf längere Zeit beurlaubt, die er auf einem kleinen Besitztum bei Altenburg, wo seine Bücher geblieben waren, verbrachte. Als er dann vor etwa 1½ Jahren sich wieder verheiratete (mit einer, wie mir schien, liebenswürdigen jungen Wittwe von Adel), blieb er wohl noch mehr als zuvor in seinen vier Wänden. Er hinterläßt außer mehreren Kindern erster Ehe, die glaub ich nie hier gewesen sind, ein Kind seiner zweiten Frau, & diese erwartet, wie ich höre, die Geburt eines zweiten. Der riesengroße, anscheinend kräftige Mann litt an Steinbeschwerden, gestorben ist er an Nieren- verbunden mit Lungenentzündung. Seine akademische Wirksamkeit war ganz gering & zwar nicht allein, soweit sie Chinesisch, Mandschuh u. dgl. galt, sondern auch wenn sie allg. Sprachwissenschaft zum Gegenstand hatte. Woran das gelegen haben mag, weiß ich nicht. Er stotterte allerdings ziemlich stark, was in Verbindung mit sehr auffälligem Schielen die Unterhaltung mit ihm nicht eben angenehm machte; aber in Leipzig soll er trotzdem als Dozent, was man so nennt, großen Erfolg gehabt haben. Mir kam es so vor, als ob er sich nicht hinlänglich dazu verstehen könne, sich um eine ernstliche Förderung seiner Zuhörer auch mit einiger Selbstüberwindung zu bemühen. Aber ob das Ursache oder Wirkung der geringen Teilnahme von Seite der Studenten

62 There is no answer of Richthofen in Schuchardt's *Nachlass* in the Graz university library.

war, weiß ich nicht. Ich bin den Winter über alle 14 Tage mit ihm in einer Gesellschaft von 15 Männern des Gelehrtenstandes zusammengekommen, wo jedesmal ein Vortrag gehalten wurde, ich viel Anregendes gehört & mit Freude auch selbst gesprochen habe, wenn an mir die Reihe war. Auch da hat er die angemessene Art nicht zu treffen verstanden; den Eindruck der Sicherheit, die ein methodisches Arbeiten giebt, bekam man nicht, viel eher den eines gewissen unsteten Dilettantismus. Er war gewiß ein Mann von großem Talent & mannigfaltigem Wissen; aber mir scheint, es habe ihm eine gründliche Schulung gefehlt. Sie wissen, daß er eigentlich die Rechte studiert hat & auf lange Zeit (im Elsaß) in der Verwaltung thätig gewesen ist; daß er erst später, wie ich glaube, ganz auf eigene Faust die Studien seines Vaters aufgenommen hat & vielleicht etwas zu früh auf einem Gebiete lehrend aufgetreten ist, wo man unter spärlicher Kontrolle arbeitet, mag die Gebrechen seiner Thätigkeit erklären. Man hat seiner Zeit große Anstrengungen gemacht, um ihn für Berlin zu gewinnen; aber allgemein ist doch eine gewisse Enttäuschung gewesen, & es sollte mich nicht wundern, wenn nach der gemachten Erfahrung man sich längere Zeit dazu nähme den Lehrstuhl des Verstorbenen wieder zu besetzen. Für Chinesisch haben wir den tüchtigen Extraordinarius, an den G. selbst die Studenten gerne wies, die er zu unterrichten keine Neigung empfand. Das ist, was ich Ihnen über G. zu sagen weiß. Was ich in hiesigen Zeitungen über ihn gelesen habe, waren die ganz nichtsnutzigen Elaborate, denen wir arme Teufel, wenn wir sterben, regelmäßig verfallen. Zu genaueren Daten würde Ihnen wohl am ehesten Richthofen (Geh. Rat Freiherr Ferdinand v. Richth., Kurfürstenstr. 117) verhelfen können.

Für Ihren freundlichen Gruß zu meiner silb. Hochzeit sage ich Ihnen herzlichen Dank.

Ihr ganz ergebener

A. Tobler.

Lib. no. 11716

Berlin, 30 March 1894

Dear colleague,

it is very surprising to me that Richthofen has not sent you an answer; usually he is not one of those who give reason to complain of impoliteness. When I see him again, I will remind him of the matter. Fortunately, I can tell you myself what will happen to Gab.'s library. Gabelentz has disposed by will that it will remain in Goßnitz,⁶³ where it had always been, until

63 Tobler should have written *Poschwitz*.

the son of his second marriage, who is still quite young, comes of age. If he should not turn to linguistic studies, it should be sold, & namely Gabelentz's nephew & student, the Count Schulenburg, should have the first right to acquire it for 250,000 Mark. Well, I hear, Sch. already wants to take it over under the condition that it will have to be returned to the young Gabelentz if and when he claims it. [...]

Berlin, d. 30. Mz 1894

Verehrter Herr Kollege,

es ist mir sehr überraschend, daß Richthofen Sie ohne Antwort gelassen hat; er ist sonst nicht von denen, die Anlaß zu Klagen über Unhöflichkeit geben. Wenn ich ihn wieder sehe, will ich ihn an die Sache erinnern. Die Frage nach dem Schicksale von Gab.s Bibliothek kann ich zum Glück selbst beantworten. Gabelentz hat letztwillig bestimmt, daß sie in Goßnitz, wo sie bisher immer sich befunden hat, auch weiter bleibe, bis sein noch ganz junger Sohn zweiter Ehe volljährig sei. Sollte dieser sich nicht linguistischen Studien zuwenden, so soll sie verkauft werden, & zwar soll Gabelentz' Neffe & Schüler der Graf Schulenburg das erste Recht haben sie für 250000 M. zu erwerben. Nun, höre ich, soll Sch. sie jetzt schon übernehmen wollen mit dem Vorbehalt, daß sie seiner Zeit dem jungen Gabelentz zurückzugeben sei, wofern er Anspruch darauf erhebe. [...]

These two letters draw – certainly without any ulterior motives – a picture that contrasts with the consistently optimistic assessment that is widespread in biographies of Gabelentz (see, e.g., Gimm, 2013a, in particular pp. 58-70). It is only for this reason that they are introduced here without further comment. Some of the criticisms that emerge in the contemporary and later Basque-Berber discussions can easily be understood in light of Tobler's statements here.

8.2 Appendix 2: On the Basque and Berber collections in Poschwitz

8.2.1 *About Basque*

As mentioned above, there is a lack of clarity as to the extent of the holdings of the language library in Poschwitz.⁶⁴ In all the library inventories that have come to us the Basque collections are of such a size that they can easily be surveyed. In the following we deal with all three sources that are available.

64 See 6.1 and note 43 above.

Together with the assessment of his Basque studies, this results in an overall picture which seems to reflect what was available to Gabelentz for his work.

First, a bibliographic catalogue of Basque literature in Gabelentz's own handwriting is reproduced. In Gimm (2013b, p. 118), this is referred to as the 'catalogue of the Poschwitz Library' (*Katalog der Poschwitzer Bibliothek*) under no. 333 on the list of publications.⁶⁵ It is less extensive than the card catalogue of the Poschwitz language library, whose cards are then reproduced below. The third source is a single keyword index card for Basque (from the same catalogue). We assume that, on the whole, this represents the complete range of Basque literature that was available in Poschwitz.

A.) From the handwritten list of Gabelentz (Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg, no. 1061):⁶⁶

IV., *Baskische Sprache*

<i>M. de Larramendi</i> El imposible vencido. Arte de la lengua Bascongada. Salamanca 1729. 8 ^o .	3153
<i>F. Lécuse</i> Grammaire basque. Toulouse & Bayonne 1826. 8 ^o .	3148
<i>Abbadie & Chaho</i> Etudes grammaticales sur la langue Euskarienne. Paris 1836. 8 ^o .	3150
<i>F.J. de Lardizaval</i> Gramatica Vascongada. S. Sebastian 1856. 4 ^o .	
<i>Yrizar y Moya</i> de l'Eusquere & de ses Erderes, ou de la langue basque. Paris 1841-45. IV. 8 ^o .	3143-45
<i>F. Lécuse</i> Dissertation sur la langue basque. Toulouse 1826. 8 ^o .	3142
<i>Le même</i> Sermon sur la montagne, en Grec et en Basque, précédé du Paradigme de la conjugaison basque. Toulouse 1831. 8 ^o .	3149
<i>Inchauspe</i> le verbe basque. Paris 1858. 4 ^o .	
<i>S.H. Blanc</i> Grammaire de la langue basque. Lyon 1854. 12 ^o .	3157
<i>W.G. [sic] van Eys</i> Outlines of Basque Grammar. Lond. 1883. 8 ^o .	3152
<i>K. Hannemann</i> Prolegomena zur baskischen oder kantabrischen Sprache. Leipzig 1884, 8 ^o .	3156

65 Unfortunately, this entry has several mistakes: firstly, Gimm assigned the number 333 twice, secondly it is a *manuscript* but not a *typescript*. In addition, this entry is questionable on the whole, since the document indicated is not a publication, but simply an ordered list of books in handwritten form left behind by Gabelentz. The exact date of its creation cannot be determined. In any case, it was laid out in such a way that Gabelentz could always add new literature, which he did indeed do.

66 The entries Hannemann, Grimm and Gabelentz are written in *Kurrent*, all others in Latin script. The numbers added on the side and in another ink and writing appear to refer to a specific location.

- A. Grimm* Die baskische Sprache und Sprachforschung. Allgemeiner Theil. Breslau 1884, 8^o. 3155
- A. Chaho* Dictionnaire basque, français, espagnol et latin. Bayonne 1856.s. 4^o. 3166
- M. de Larramendi* Diccionario trilingue, Castellano, Bascuence y Latin. Nueva ed. p. Pio de Zuazua. San Sebastian 1854. 4^o. 3163
- G.v.d. Gabelentz* Baskisch und Berberisch. Berlin. 1893, 8^o.
- W.J. van Eys* Grammaire comparée des dialectes basques. Paris 1879, 8^o. 3162

B.) In the card catalogue of the Poschwitz language library there are additional index cards to the following Basque writings (only works not mentioned under A above are listed):

Astarloa, Pablo Pedro. 1883. Discursos filosóficos sobre la lengua primitiva ó Gramática y análisis razonada de la euskara ó bascuence. Bilbao: Pedro Velasco.

Camiñón, Arturo. 1884. Gramática de los cuatro dialectos literarios de la lengua euskara. Toulouse [sic]: Eusebio Lopez.

Chaho, Augustin. 1856. La guerre des alphabets. Règles d'orthographe euskarienne, adoptées pour la publication du dictionnaire basque, français, espagnol et latin. Bayonne: P. Lespés.

D.A.P.I.P. [Pascual Iturriaga, Agustín]. 1842. Dialogos basco-castellanos. Para las escuelas de primeras letras de Guipúzcoa. Hernani.

Eys, Willem Jan van. 1873. Dictionnaire basque-français. Paris – London: Maisonneuve – Williams u. Norgate.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1821. Prüfung der Untersuchungen über die Urbewohner Hispaniens vermittelt der Vaskischen Sprache. Berlin: Dümmler.

Mahn, C.A.F. 1857. Denkmaeler der baskischen Sprache. Berlin: Dümmler.

Pott, August Friedrich. 1875. Über vaskische Familiennamen. Zur Erinnerung an den glücklichen Schluß des durch Otto Böhtlingk und Rudolph Roth 1852 begonnenen und 1875 vollendeten Sanskrit-Wörterbuchs. Detmold: Meyersche Hofbuchhandlung.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1888. Besprechung von Gerland, Georg, die Basken und die Iberer. Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie 9: 225-234.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1893. Baskische Studien I. Über die Entstehung der Beziehungen des baskischen Zeitwortes. Wien: Tempsky (Denkschriften der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften).

C). Single index card for the keyword *Baskisch* (Basque) (also part of the card catalogue of the Poschwitz language library, Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg)

Schlagwort: Baskisch (Versch. alte Spr. III c)

- Siehe: 1. Gesner, C... 'Mithridates' L.Ib,1
 2. 'Orient u. occident. *Sprachmeister...*' L.Ib./8.
 3. Hervás, L. 'Catálogo de las lenguas...' L.Ib./9c+d
 Einzelne Stämme: Elgua = Alava, Eldue = Guipuzcoa,
 Elgriva = Eliberri = Biscainisch
 4.) Rüdiger, J.C.C. 'Grundriss ... Sprache' L.Ib15
 5.) Erro y Azpiroz, J.B.d. 'Alfabeto de la lengua...' L.IV.d.5./1.
 Andre Namen: Euskarisch, Guipuzcoa, Vaskisch, Biscai(-y)
 nisch
 6.) C.; A.J. 'Censura crítica del Alfabeto...' L.IVd.5/2.
 7.) Schnakenburg, J.F. 'Tableau ... Patois de la France...' L.IV.d.8/25.
 8.) Vallancey, C. 'An Essay ... of the Irish Language...' L.IV.e.5/1.
 Fortsetz. s. Einz. Stämme. Labourdin; Nieder-Navarra;
 Ober-Navarra; Souletin.
 9.) Eguilas y Yanguas., L. Glossario etymológico [sic] 4LIVd5/4
 10.) Verschiedene Bibelteile ½ B.II.a/1-7.
 11.) Catechismus ½ B.II.a/8
 12.) Gebetbuch. ½ B.II.a/9.
 13.) Oihenhart [sic], A: 'Proverbes basques; poésies basques.' E.V.b.1./1.
 14.) Oriental. Archiv: Winkler: 'Die mongol. Völk... u. d. 4K.XXVI.a./3,4.
 Basken.'

This card is written in two different hands, neither of which is Gabelentz's. It contains entries that are of no or of only very peripheral interest for Basque, and also lists works that are rarely found in the German-speaking world, like Oihenart's collection of proverbs. However, Gabelentz definitely did not use it for his studies.⁶⁷ It is also strange that the last work mentioned on this card was published about twenty years after Gabelentz's death.⁶⁸

67 In contrast to Humboldt, who worked on them in great detail; for example, in his contribution to *Mithridates* of 1816–1817, but also on dozens of other unpublished papers.

68 And also nearly ten years after Schulenburg's death.

8.2.2 *About Berber*⁶⁹

A.) The catalogue of the language library contains among other things the following index cards for Kabyle:

Ben Sedira, Belkassam. 1887. Cours de langue kabyle. Grammaire et versions. Alger: Adolphe Jourdan.

Hanoteau, Adolphe. 1858. Essai de grammaire kabyle renfermant les principes du langage parlé par les populations du versant nord du Jurjura et spécialement par les Igaouaouen ou Zouaoua suivi de notes et d'une notice sur quelques inscriptions en caractères dits Tifinar' et en langue Tamacher't. Alger – Constantine – Paris: Bastide – Bastide et Amavet – Challamel & Duprat.

Newman, Francis William. 1887. Kabail Vocabulary. Supplemented by Aid of a New Source. London: Trübner & Co.

Sierakowski, Adam. 1871. Das Schaüi. Ein Beitrag zur berberischen Sprachen- und Völkerkunde. Dresden: Kraszewski.

B.) Card for the keyword *Hamitische Sprachen, allgemein* (Hamitic languages, general)

Newman, Francis William. 1882. Lybian [sic] Vocabulary. An Essay towards Reproducing the Ancient Numidian Language out of Four Modern Tongues.

C.) Card with the keyword *Berberisch* (Berber)

Schlagwort: Berberisch (Lybisch, Hamitisch XVI.c.1.)

Siehe: 1.) Adelung, J.Chr. 'Mithridates'	L.I.b./2c.
2.) Cust, R. 'The ... of Africa'	L.I.b./36a.
3.) Duret, Cl. 'Thrésor de l'histoire des langues ...'	L.I.b./6.
4.) Orient. u. Occident. Sprachmeister	L I b/8
5.) Rüdiger, J.C.C. 'Grundriss ... Sprache'	L I b/15
6.) <i>Lybische Sprachen</i>	
7.) Sierakowski, Graf A. 'Das Schaüi'	L.XVI.c.2/4.
8.) 12 Chapitres de. S. Luc. (London 1833)	B.XIV b.1/1.
Dialecte: 1.) Marocco-B. 2.) Sahára. 3.) Algeria. 4.) Tunisia-B.	

69 The following three sources are part of the card catalogue of the Gabelentz language library in the Thüringisches Staatsarchiv in Altenburg.

D.) Card with the keyword *Kabylish* (*Lybisch, Hamitisch*) (Kabyle (Libyan, Hamitic)) (only works not mentioned under A.) to C.) above are listed)

Lepsius, Richard. 1880. *Nubische Grammatik mit einer Einleitung über die Völker und Sprachen Afrika's.*

Pharaon, Joanny. 1835. *Les Cabiles et Boudgie.*

Works cited

Aranzadi, Telesforo de. 1902. 'El supuesto parentesco del euskera y el berberisco. [trad. de F. Müller y H. Schuchardt]'. *Euskal-Erria* XLVI, pp. 38-40.

Basset, René. 1896. 'Les noms des métaux et des couleurs en berbère'. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* IX, pp. 58-91.

Basset, René. 1899. 'Rapport sur les études berbères et haoussa'. *Actes du Oncième Congrès International des Orientalistes. Paris 1897. Cinquième, sixième et septième sections*, pp. 39-70.

Behagel, Otto. 1892. Review of Georg von der Gabelentz, *Die Sprachwissenschaft. Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 13, pp. 257-258.

Ben Sedira, Belkasssem. 1887. *Cours de langue kabyle. Grammaire et versions.* Alger: Adolphe Jourdan.

Brinton, Daniel G. 1894. 'Basque and Berber' *Science* 23 (26 January 1894), p. 43. (Current Notes on Anthropology No. XXXVIII).

Campión, Arturo. 1884. *Gramática de los cuatro dialectos literarios de la lengua euskara.* Tolosa: Eusebio Lopez.

Creusat, Jean-Baptiste. 1873. *Essai de dictionnaire français-kabyle (Zouaoua) précédé des éléments de cette langue.* Alger: Jourdan.

Eguilaz y Yanguas, Leopoldo de. 1886. *Glosario etimológico de las palabras españolas (castellanas, catalanas, gallegas, mallorquinas, portuguesas, valencianas y bascongadas) de origen oriental (árabe, hebreo, malayo, persa y turco).* Granada: La Lealtad.

Emig, Joachim. 'Das Familienarchiv v.d. Gabelentz im Thüringischen Staatsarchiv Altenburg'. In: Ezawa & Vogel (2013), pp. 311-321.

Eys, Willem J. van. 1873. *Dictionnaire basque - français.* Paris - London: Maisonneuve - Williams & Norgate.

Eys, Willem J. van. 1879. *Grammaire comparée des dialectes basques.* Paris - London - Amsterdam: Maisonneuve - Williams & Norgate - Frederik Muller.

Eys, Willem J. van. 1883. *Outlines of Basque Grammar.* London: Trübner & Co.

Ezawa, Kennosuke & Annemete von Vogel (eds.). 2013. *Georg von der Gabelentz. Ein biographisches Lesebuch.* Tübingen: Narr Verlag.

- Ezawa, Kennosuke, Franz Hundsnurscher & Annemete von Vogel (eds.). 2014. *Beiträge zur Gabelentz-Forschung*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1881. 'Sur la possibilité de prouver l'existence d'une affinité généalogique entre les langues dites indochinoises'. In: *Atti IV Congresso Internazionale Orientalisti tenuto in Firenze nel settembre 1878*, vol. II, pp. 283-293. Firenze: Successori Le Monnier.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1882. 'Kabylen (sprachlich)'. In: *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Johann Samuel Ersch & Johann Gottfried Gruber (eds.), 2. Sect. 32. Theil, pp. 28-29. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1883a. Review of Francis William Newman, *Libyan vocabulary. An essay towards reproducing the ancient numidian language, out of four modern tongues*. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, p. 330.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1883b. Review of Willem van Eys, *Outlines of Basque Grammar*. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, pp. 1314-1315.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1885. Review of Arno Grimm, *Über die Baskische Sprache und Sprachforschung*. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, pp. 24-25.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1888. Review of Leopoldo de Eguilaz y Yanguas, *Glosario etimológico* etc. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, p. 924.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1889. Review of Francis William Newman, *Kabail vocabulary. Supplemented by aid of a new source*. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, pp. 824-825.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1890. 'Antrittsrede [zur Aufnahme in die Berliner Akademie]'. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* II, pp. 782-785.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 2016 [¹1891, ²1901]. *Die Sprachwissenschaft, ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. First edition: Leipzig: T.O. Weigel Nachfolger. Second edition: Albrecht von der Schulenburg (ed.). Leipzig: Tauchnitz. Critical edition: Manfred Ringmacher & James McElvenny (eds.). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1892a. *Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen. Im Auftrage der Kolonial-Abtheilung des Auswärtigen Amts*. Berlin: Mittler.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1892b. Review of Albrecht von der Schulenburg, *Grammatik, Vocabularium u. Sprachproben der Sprache von Murray Island*. *Literarisches Centralblatt*, pp. 410-411.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1893. 'Baskisch und Berberisch'. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Phil.-hist. Cl. vom 22. Juni 1893*, pp. 593-613.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1894. *Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit den Berbersprachen Nord-Africas nachgewiesen von ___*, Albrecht C. Graf von der Schulenburg (ed.). Braunschweig: Sattler.

- Gabelentz, Georg von der. *Katalog der Poschwitzer Bibliothek*, started by H. Conon von der Gabelentz, unprinted manuscript, Thüringisches Staatsarchiv Altenburg, Legat Gabelentz, Nr. 1061 (s.d.).
- Gabelentz, Georg von der & Adolf Bernhard Meyer. 1882. 'Beiträge zur Kenntnis der melanesischen, mikronesischen und papuanischen Sprachen. Ein erster Nachtrag zu Hans Conon's von der Gabelentz Werke "Die melanesischen Sprachen"'. *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* VIII, pp. 373-490.
- Gèze, Louis. 1873. *Éléments de grammaire basque, dialecte souletin, suivis d'un vocabulaire basque-français & français-basque*. Bayonne: Veuve Lamaignère.
- Gèze, Louis. 1883–1885. 'De quelques rapports entre les langues berbères et basques'. *Mémoires de la Société archéologique du Midi de la France*, Seconde Série, Tome XIII, pp. 30-36.
- Giacomino, Claudio. 1892. 'Delle relazioni tra il Basco e l'Antico Egizio'. *Rendiconti*, Serie II, Vol. XXV, Adunanza del 14 luglio 1892, pp. 1063-1077.
- Giacomino, Claudio. 1895. 'Delle relazioni tra il Basco e l'Egizio'. In: *Supplementi periodici all'Archivio Glottologico Italiano* II, pp. 15-96 [original manuscript, Archivio dell'Accademia die Lincei, 1890].
- Gimm, Martin. 2013a. *Georg von der Gabelentz zum Gedenken. Materialien zu Leben und Werk*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gimm, Martin. 2013b. 'Schriftenverzeichnis (in chronologischer Folge nach Erscheinungsjahren)'. In: Gimm (2013a), pp. 79-118.
- Grimm, Arno. 1884. *Ueber die baskische Sprache und Sprachforschung. Allgemeiner Teil*. Breslau: Hirt.
- Grube, Wilhelm. 1905. 'Gabelentz: Hans Georg Conon von der'. In: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 50. (Harkort – v. Kalchberg), Historische Commission bei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (ed.), pp. 548-555. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- Hanoteau, Adolphe. 1858. *Essai de grammaire kabyle renfermant les principes du langage parlé par les populations du versant nord du Jurjura et spécialement par les Igaouaouen ou Zouaoua suivi de notes et d'une notice sur quelques inscriptions en caractères dits Tifinar' et en langue Tamacher't*. Alger – Constantine – Paris: Bastide – Bastide et Amavet – Challamel & Duprat.
- Hanoteau, Adolphe. 1860. *Essai de grammaire de la langue Tamachek', renfermant les principes du langage parlé par les Imouchar' ou Touareg, des conversations en Tamashek', des fac-simile d'écriture en caractères Tifinar', et une carte indiquant les parties de l'Algérie où la langue berbère est encore en usage*. Paris: Imprimerie impériale.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1817 [1816]. 'Berichtigungen und Zusätze zum ersten Abschnitte des zweyten Bandes des Mithridates über die Cantabrische oder

- Baskische Sprache'. In: *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, J.C. Adelung & J.S. Vater (eds.), vol. 4, pp. 275-360. Berlin: Voss.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1821. *Prüfung der Untersuchungen über die Urbewohner Hispaniens vermittelt der Vaskischen Sprache*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Hurch, Bernhard. 2009. "Emakume-bahitzea" eta lege fonetikoak. Georg von der Gabelentzen *Hizkuntza arrotzak jasotzeko esuliburua*-ren ingurukoak'. In: *Beñat Oihartzabali Gorazarre – Festschrift for Bernard Oyharçabal*, Ricardo Etxepare, Ricardo Gómez & Joseba Lakarra (eds.), *ASJU – International Journal of Basque Linguistics* XLIII, 1-2, pp. 503-516.
- Hurch, Bernhard. 2011. 'Über "Weiberraub" und Lautgesetze. Anmerkungen zu Georg von der Gabelentz' *Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen* in baskischer Version'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, 21, pp. 239-262.
- Jaubert, Amédée et al. 1844. *Dictionnaire français-berbère*. Paris: Imprimerie royale.
- Kaden, Klaus. 1993. 'Die Berufung Georg von der Gabelentz' an die Berliner Universität'. In: *Sinologische Traditionen im Spiegel neuer Forschungen*, Ralf Moritz (ed.), pp. 57-90. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag [repr. in Ezawa & Vogel (2013), pp. 271-288].
- Kürschner, Wilfried. 2014. 'Georg von der Gabelentz' "Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen" (1892) – Entstehung, Ziele, Arbeitsweise. Wirkung'. In: Ezawa, Hundsnurscher & Vogel (2014), pp. 239-259.
- Lepsius, Carl Richard. 1863. *Standard Alphabet for Reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters*. London – Berlin: Williams & Norgate – Hertz.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1895. Review of Johann Topolovšek, *Die basko-slavische Spracheinheit und Georg von der Gabelentz, Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen* etc. *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 15 (15 June 1895), pp. 783-785.
- Michelena, Luis. 1961. *Fonética Histórica Vasca*. San Sebastián: Publicaciones del Seminario 'Julio de Urquijo' de la Excma. Diputación Foral de Guipuzcoa. [repr. in Luis Michelena. 2011. *Obras completas*, J.A. Lakarra and I.R. Arzalluz (eds.), VI: *Fonética Histórica Vasca* (Anejos del ASJU, 59). San Sebastián – Donostia / Vitoria – Gasteiz: UPV – EHU].
- Michelena, Luis. 1964. *Sobre el pasado de la lengua vasca*. San Sebastián: Auñamendi. (Colección Auñamendi, 36). [repr. in Luis Michelena. 2011. *Obras completas*, J.A. Lakarra and I.R. Arzalluz (eds.), V: *Historia y geografía de la lengua vasca* (Anejos del ASJU, 58), pp. 1-115. San Sebastián – Donostia / Vitoria – Gasteiz: UPV – EHU].
- Mukarovsky, Hans G. 1963–1964. 'Baskisch und Berberisch'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 59/60, pp. 52-94.
- Müller, Friedrich. 1895. 'Die neuesten Arbeiten über das Baskische'. *Globus* 68, p. 14.
- Münchhausen, Clementine von. 2013 [1913]. 'H. Georg v. d. Gabelentz. Biographie und Charakteristik. zusammengestellt von ____'. In: Ezawa & Vogel (2013), pp. 85-171.

- Newman, Francis William. 1882. *Libyan Vocabulary. An Essay towards Reproducing the Ancient Numidian Language out of Four Modern Tongues*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Newman, Francis William. 1887. *Kabail Vocabulary. Supplemented by Aid of a New Source*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Plank, Frans. 1991. 'Hypology, Typology: the Gabelentz Puzzle'. *Folia Linguistica* 25, pp. 421-458.
- Pott, August Friedrich. 1887. *Zur Literatur der Sprachkunde Europas*. Leipzig: Barth. (*Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, Supplement 1).
- Ringmacher, Manfred. 2011. 'Der Humboldtianismus von Georg von der Gabelentz'. In: *Miscellanea Linguistica. Arbeiten zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Wilfried Kürschner (ed.), pp. 321-334. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1888. Review of Georg Gerland, *Die Basken und die Iberer*. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 9, pp. 225-234.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1892. Review of Cl. Giacomino, *Delle relazioni tra il basco e l'antico egizio*. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 13, pp. 426-430.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1893. Review of G. von der Gabelentz, *Baskisch und Berberisch*. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 14, pp. 334-338.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1907. 'Die iberische Deklination'. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 157, pp. 1-90.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1913. 'Baskisch-hamitische Wortvergleiche'. *Revista Internacional de Estudios Vascos* 7, pp. 289-340.
- Schulenburg, Albrecht von der. 1891. *Grammatik, Vocabularium und Sprachproben der Sprache von Murray Island*. Leipzig: Friedrich.
- St[umm]e, H[ans]. 1895. Review of von der Gabelentz, *Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen etc.* *Literarisches Centralblatt*, p. 581.
- Topolovšek, Johann. 1894. *Die basko-slavische Spracheinheit*, Bd.1: *Vergleichende Lautlehre*. Wien: Gerold.
- Taylor, Canon Isaac. 1893. 'The Affinities of Basque and Berger [sic]'. *Science* 22 (11 August 1893), p. 77.
- Tubino, Francisco M.. 1876. *Los aborígenes ibéricos ó Los berèberes en la península*. Madrid: Secretaría de la Sociedad Antropológica.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. 1895. Review of Gabelentz, Georg von der (1894). *Revista crítica de historia y literatura españolas* 1.2, pp. 40-41.
- Vinson, Julien. 1891. *Essai d'une bibliographie de la langue Basque*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Vinson, Julien. 1898. *Essai d'une bibliographie de la langue Basque. Additions et corrections*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

- Vinson, Julien. 1901–1902. ‘Revue des études basques (1891–1899)’. *L’Année linguistique* I, pp. 135–197.
- Vinson, Julien. 1903–1904. ‘Les études basques de 1901–1904’. *L’Année linguistique* II, pp. 81–104.
- Vinson, Julien. 1904a. ‘Les langues indo-européennes. Les Aryens’. *Revue de l’École d’Anthropologie de Paris* XIV, pp. 169–184.
- Vinson, Julien. 1904b. Review of E. de Michelis, *L’origine degli Indo-Europei*. *Journal Asiatique*, Dixième Série, Tome II, pp. 543–544.
- Vogel, Annetete von. 2013. ‘Aus der Gabelentz-Ausstellung 2010 in Berlin’. In: Ezawa & Vogel (2013), pp. 185–222.
- Zyhlarz, Ernst. 1932. ‘Zur angeblichen Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit afrikanischen Sprachen’. *Praehistorische Zeitschrift* 23, pp. 69–77.

About the authors

Bernhard Hurch is Professor of General Linguistics at the University of Graz. His areas of expertise include the history of linguistics, history of science, Basque studies, Mesoamerican languages, as well as phonology, morphology and typology.

bernhard.hurch@uni-graz.at

Katrin Purgay is a master’s student in General Linguistics at the University of Graz, specializing in the study of language typology and history of linguistics (19th and early 20th century).

katrin.purgay@edu.uni-graz.at

