

THE LEGACY OF ALEXANDRU PHILIPPIDE (1859–1933)

LUMINIȚA BOTOȘINEANU

*Senior Researcher, PhD
“Alexandru Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology,
Iași Branch of the Romanian Academy
Corresponding author: lumi.botosineanu@gmail.com*

Founder of the Linguistic School of Iași, holder of the first university chair of Romanian philology in the country, corresponding member (since 1898), then full member (since 1900) of the Romanian Academy, Alexandru Philippide was also the founder, in 1927, of the Institute of Romanian Philology of Iași, which, since 1933, will bear his name (an event whose 90th anniversary was celebrated at the end of the last year, in 2023).

The paper aims at revealing Philippide’s substantial contribution to the foundation of the scientific study of the Romanian language, which the Institute of Romanian Philology, through its current structure and main philological subfields (linguistics, literary history and ethnology), carries forward in concerns, methods and spirit, covering, albeit in varying proportions, the full diversity of his work.

Keywords: Alexandru Philippide, linguistics, history of Romanian language, Iași, language theory



1. PHILIPPIDE – THE HUMAN, THE PROFESSOR, THE MAN OF CULTURE

The 90th anniversary, celebrated at the end of 2023, since the “Alexandru Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology in Iași (founded in 1927) is bearing the name of its founder, is a good opportunity to bring back to mind the moral obligation assumed from the very beginning by the members of this academic institution to honour the memory of Alexandru Philippide by continuing the research directions that he opened, being permanently guided by his ethical ideal, which receives in the Foreword to the first volume of the *Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română “Alexandru Philippide”* [Bulletin of the Institute of Romanian Philology “Alexandru Philippide”] an eloquent synthetic formula: “osteneala neîncetată de a descoperi adevărul prin mijloace oneste și curajul de a-l spune, chiar atunci când el ar putea supăra pe oameni” [the unceasing endeavour to discover the truth by honest means and the courage to tell it, even when it might upset people] (BIFR 1934, p. 1). In concerns, methods and spirit, the present activity illustrates the continuity in this honourable tradition, if we consider that the current structure of the institute and its main philological subfields (linguistics, literary history and ethnology) carry forward the valid and valuable ideas of Philippide’s work, covering, albeit in varying proportions, the full diversity of his work.

Founder of the Linguistic School of Iași, with essential contributions to the foundation of the scientific study of the Romanian language, holder of the first university chair of Romanian philology in the country, corresponding member (since 1898), then full member (since 1900) of the Romanian Academy, Alexandru Philippide also established himself in the cultural life of his time which, apart from some hypercritical accents, was positively marked by a programmatic effort to build in the cultural field the same ethical model that he promoted in science and which, ultimately, should lead to the emancipation of Romanian culture. In fact, his absolute moral ideal, which generated an extreme rigour first of all towards himself, but extended to all areas of life and activity of the others, governed his entire existence.

Able to provide a background for a proper and accurate reception of the linguist Philippide, the portrait of Philippide the man is best outlined from the descriptions of his former students and collaborators. As Carmen Pamfil (to whom we owe the most recent and most complex monograph dedicated to the professor from Iași – Pamfil, 2008 –, herself a leading exponent of the Linguistic School founded by Philippide) observes, with analytical finesse, that the descriptive perspectives on Alexandru Philippide oscillate between two extremes, essentially conditioned by the different psychological profiles of the authors: on the one hand, for Iorgu Iordan, “liniștit, cumpătat, prevăzător, chiar calculat” [Iorgu Iordan: quiet, sober, prudent, even calculating], Philippide is “o sumă de contradicții” [a sum of

contradictions], among which the most important is the discord between his “vijelios” [tempestuous] temperament and the systematic spirit that governed his work, which would inevitably lead him to scepticism and misanthropy. On the contrary, Gheorghe Ivănescu, himself tumultuous and impulsive, and therefore more similar in structure to Philippide, sees him rather as jovial, generous and capable of holding, especially with people he knows, in conversations that were not only dense but also pleasant. In the same light, Ivănescu also sees the notorious animosities between Philippide and other contemporary linguists (Pușcariu, Densușianu, Weigand), which he justifies as a natural reaction to their hostile attitude towards the professor of Iași (Pamfil, 2008, p. 16–18).

If the erudition, scrupulousness and critical spirit demonstrated in the university courses delivered by Alexandru Philippide along 40 years are well known, a less known aspect of his teaching activity is the model of interaction with his students, considered by his disciples to be exemplary. Concordant with this point of view is Sextil Pușcariu’s mention of the fascination exerted by Alexandru Philippide on his students, who “ îl adorau și erau [...] subjuțați de felul lui original și spiritual de a se impune cu temeinica lui erudiție” [adored him and were ... subjugated by his original and spiritual way of imposing himself with his thorough erudition] (Pușcariu, 1968, p. 339–340), which confirms the image of a captivating orator, as it emerges from the narratives of his disciples, all the more so as the appreciation comes from a contemporary with whom the professor from Iași was not on cordial terms.

Therefore – concludes Carmen Pamfil, following in the footsteps of G. Ivănescu, who rejects the widespread idea that his professor was surly and misanthropic – Philippide was “un om cu principii morale și profesionale ferme, foarte sever, la fel de exigent cu semenii ca și cu sine. Era și sceptic, atât cât este orice spirit lucid și cultivat.” [a man of firm moral and professional principles, very severe, as demanding with the others as with himself. He was also a sceptic, as much as any lucid and cultivated spirit is.] (Pamfil, 2008, p. 21).

2. THE SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY OF ALEXANDRU PHILIPPIDE

2.1. FOLKLORE AS A SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORY

Following in the footsteps of Dimitrie Philippide (cf. Arvinte, 2006) and applying a method that later gained ground and confirmation through the Annales School, Alexandru Philippide believes that, sometimes, for researching the history of a people, more conclusive than the classical studies focused exclusively on the leaders, are the aspects concerning the life of the peasantry, approached mainly from the perspective of cultural or social anthropology. His first printed text, *Încercări asupra stărei sociale a poporului român în trecut* [Essays on the Social

Status of the Romanian People in the Past], his bachelor's thesis defended in 1881, convincingly illustrates this orientation, as well as Philippide's observation that, in order to obtain valid data, historical sources, which are insufficient, must be supplemented with information extracted, with due caution, from popular literature, especially from epic poetry (ballads), which is able to reflect the social relations (horizontal or vertical) in traditional Romanian society, the strategies for resolving conflicts, the ways of regulating and symbolizing laws and norms, etc.

2.2. LITERARY HISTORY AND THEORY

In the very comprehensive vision characteristic for his time, A. Philippide integrated into the philological sciences, especially in the first stage of his linguistic conception¹, the study of human life in all its manifestations (political and social history, history of arts, literary history and history of language), considering the approach to literary history (which cannot dispense with the contribution of the science of language, stylistics, aesthetics, history, etc.) a constituent element of philologist's work. If literary history, associated with objectivity and positivism, is appreciated by professor Philippide, who also practised it, in the strictest sense of the term, in *Introducere în istoria limbii și literaturii române* [Introduction to the History of Romanian Language and Literature]², literary criticism is treated with irony or even hostility, because of its subjective and unethical nature. The literary critic is not regarded with any more indulgence. Without a method and truly scientific criteria, he would act only on impulse and by chance, by virtue of his adherence to a particular direction, or on the basis of his own inevitably subjective grid of values. This is evidenced by the very different, sometimes diametrically opposed, conclusions that two critics can have on the same work (Philippide, 1906, p. 41).

The same extreme severity is also applied to artistic beauty in general, which it rejects out of the conviction of the scholar from Iași, once it – and particularly poetry³ – risks distorting the lucid spirit and rigour indispensable in scientific research (cf. Petrovici, 1935, p. 12–13).

As for Philippide's relation with certain literary ideologies of the time, his apparent inconsistency is at least partially refuted by the fact that his joining, first to Junimea, later to "Romanian Life" [„Viața Românească”], is due to elective affinities with some – aesthetic and especially ethical – elements characteristic to

¹ After 1914, Philippide limited the field of philological sciences to the research of (ancient) language and literature (Pamfil, 2008, p. 48–49).

² The work includes, among other things, an extensive bibliography of Romanian literature from its origins to 1830 (Philippide, 1888).

³ With whom he was reconciled only towards the end of his life, when he began to appreciate, even explicitly, his son's talent (see Petrovici, 1935, p. 19).

these doctrines. Carmen Pamfil (2008: 59), quoting I. Opreșan⁴, makes a special mention, with a role of moral reparation, of Philippide's considerable contribution (overlooked by literary historians) as a “mentor din umbră” [shadow mentor] of the “Viața Românească” group: on the one hand, the influence on Ibrăileanu's spiritual formation, through “înclinația spre realismul de sorginte naturalistă, realismul, spiritul critic etc.” [the inclination towards a realism of naturalistic origin, realism, critical spirit, etc.], on the other hand, the orthography he proposes for the journal, based on the phonetic principle (Pamfil 2008: 59).

2.3. DICTIONARY OF THE ROMANIAN LANGUAGE OF THE ACADEMY

Started on the initiative of the Romanian Academy, which had proposed a totally unrealistic work plan, consisting of two years of documentation and four years of writing, which was to end with four volumes of 1,000 pages each, the dictionary designed entirely by Philippide was supposed to be exhaustive, both in terms of content⁵ and structure⁶ (including lexicographical entry, phonetic transcription, grammatical category, morphological indications, definition, translation into Latin and French, etymology and “isolations”, *i.e.* syntagms, phrases, expressions). Of course, in the portion elaborated by Philippide and his collaborators during 1897–1904 (*A-dăzvăț*), there are a number of errors or obsolete elements, but the analysis of the manuscript of the *Dicționarul limbii române* [Dictionary of the Romanian Language]⁷ allows Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil to identify the real contribution that this work, even unfinished, has brought to the evolution

⁴ This contribution, entitled *Un mentor din umbră al „Vieții Românești”: Alexandru I. Philippide* [A Shadow Mentor of “Romanian Life”: Alexandru I. Philippide], was published as a preface to the vol. *Alexandru I. Philippide în dialog cu contemporanii* [Alexandru I. Philippide in dialogue with his contemporaries], Bucharest, Minerva Publishing House, vol. II, 1986, p. 10, *apud* Pamfil, 2008, p. 59.

⁵ Despite the constant opposition of the committee set up to monitor the work on the Academic Dictionary, Philippide stubbornly retained, for example, some neologisms of French origin, and the subsequent evolution of the lexicon of the Romanian language often proved him right.

⁶ In this respect too, Philippide committed to his original project, refusing to drastically reduce quotations, to eliminate the Latin translation of the lexicographical entry, or to shorten the very extensive etymological explanations, as the Academy required, very interested in obtaining a tangible result as quickly as possible, even if it was quantitatively (and, inevitably, qualitatively) inferior. In fact, in a letter addressed to Philippide in 1902, Titu Maiorescu proposed him a much reduced version, consisting of one volume (compared to the four that had been mentioned at the beginning), which Maiorescu compared, skilfully, with the “summary” of the *Origin of Species*, published by Darwin in 1859, before the issue of “patru alte, cu cele mai multe amănunte” [four others, with most details] (G. Ivănescu, *Viața și opera lui Alexandru Philippide* [Life and Works of Alexandru Philippide], ms., Romanian Academy Library, Iași Branch, “G. Ivănescu” Fund, *apud* Pamfil, 2008, p. 72–75).

⁷ As we learn from the monograph *Alexandru Philippide* (Pamfil, 2008, p. 65), the manuscript was discovered in a box of manuscripts stored in the attic of Alexandru A. Philippide's house – the linguist's son – and is currently stored in the Library of the Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, “A. Philippide” Fund.

of Romanian lexicography, among the most important aspects being, first of all, the very rich word list, covering both the old and the neological lexicon, to which some valid etymological solutions, similar to those currently practiced in the DLR, were added (Pamfil, 2001, p. 9).

2.4. LANGUAGE THEORY

In Philippide's linguistic conception, which has two distinct stages, reflecting radically different positions (the first until the beginning of the 20th century, the second after 1914), one cannot discern a single direction even for the first stage, which coincided with the height of the neogrammatical era⁸, so that his doctrine absorbs influences from several directions: associationist (Hermann Paul and Karl Brugmann), naturalist (August Schleicher), psychologist (ethnopsychologist) (Wilhelm von Humboldt, Georg von der Gabelentz, Heymann Steinthal), materialist (Ludwig Feuerbach), positivist (Auguste Comte) (G. Ivănescu, *Alexandru Philippide – teoretician al limbajului* [Alexandru Philippide – theoretician of language], in Philippide, 1984, p. XVII, XIX, XX, XXII, XXXVIII, XLI; cf. Pamfil, 2008, p. 108–109).

Properly contextualized in connection to the era in which it was written, Philippide's work can also be understood as a synthesis of different, sometimes even contradictory, conceptual elements and models, whose weight varies from one phase to another and from one work to another, still remaining an original synthesis to which author's contribution is evident and undeniable. This observation is first confirmed by *Principii de istoria limbii* [Principles of the History of Language], in which Philippide himself points out that, despite the fact that the work is modelled on Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (the handbook of neogrammarians, which had appeared in two editions up to that date: 1880 and 1886, and had been directly studied by Philippide at Halle an der Salle, where he had a postgraduate specialization in 1888–1890), more important than the similarities are the differences (Philippide, 1984, p. 224). Thus, the great merit of the book is that, unlike H. Paul, its author eliminates from the historical study of language the description of language facts and deals exclusively with changes and their causes, which, according to G. Ivănescu, makes it the second work in the entire world, after von der Gabelentz's, "care tratează lingvistica evolutivă (diacronică) generală separat de lingvistica descriptivă" [which treats general (diachronic) evolutionary linguistics separately from descriptive linguistics] (G. Ivănescu, *Alexandru Philippide – teoretician al limbajului*, in Philippide, 1984, p. XIX; see also Pamfil, 2008, p. 115). Another plus compared to H. Paul, who was not preoccupied by this aspect in his *Prinzipien*, is the fact that Philippide explains the

⁸ Manifested in spite of the generalizing temptation to which some dictionaries fall prey, such as the *Dicționarul de lingviști și filologi români* [Dictionary of Romanian Linguists and Philologists] (Balaciu, Chiriacescu, 1978, s.v., p. 202), which undeniably places him in the neogrammatical current.

causes of the changes in language by spirit; in his spiritualist (psychologist) conception of this period, later replaced by a materialist (naturalist) one (cf. Pamfil, 2008, p. 115), we can find the germs of the notion of *psychological basis*, later applied and detailed in *Originea românilor* [The Origin of the Romanians] (Pamfil, 2008, p. 119).

One of the first Romanian works on theoretical linguistics, *Principii de istoria limbii* is therefore a detailed analysis, based on the changes observed in language presented by Hermann Paul with German illustrations, of an extremely rich inventory of Romanian language facts. The writing is favourably reviewed by W. Meyer-Lübke (in *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, no. XVI, 1895, col. 170–174) and H. Suchier (in *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*, no. 46, 1895, col. 1051–1053) (see Pamfil, 2008, pp. 109), who appreciated not only the richness and variety of the illustrative material, little known to the German scientific world, but also the new conceptual perspective proposed by Philippide, generated, among other things, by the adaptation to the specificity of the Romanian language. It is also worth noting that the writing operates with the latest concepts of European linguistics of the time (even if the terminology was not always appropriate: *alunecarea sunetului* [sound slippage] instead of *schimbare fonetică* [phonetic change], etc.) and proposes modern perspectives for approaching the fundamental problems of language, some of which offering suggestions that are still valid and have been used by linguists after Philippide, whether or not they followed his work⁹.

In the opinion of the scholar from Iași, causality, and not finality¹⁰, is the only one able to explain the phenomena of language. If, in *Principii*, he described changes in language exclusively by “spiritual” causes, in the second phase of his scientific activity (whose beginning is marked, as the language theory is concerned, by the publication of *Introducere în știința limbii* [Introduction to the Science of Language], 1920–1921, lithographed course), once he starts to comprehend the dualism of the language as both a physical and psychological reality (see D. Irimia, 1983), Philippide believes that it corresponds to the dual, physical and psychological, nature of the causes of changes in language. In fact, this is where the concepts of *articulatory basis* (the configuration of the articulatory organs and the habits of articulation) and *psychological basis* (the psyche, the intellect, the temperament)¹¹

⁹ In this sense, Carmen Pamfil points out the possible continuities between the concepts of *limbă, uz, vorbire ocazională* [language, use and occasional speech] at Philippide and *sistem, normă, vorbire* [system, norm, speech] in the conception of Coșeriu (see Pamfil 2008, p. 111).

¹⁰ This, against the subjective idealism represented at the time by K. Vossler, who explained linguistic changes exclusively by purposes created by will and saw phonetic transformation as a spiritual phenomenon of imitation (see G. Ivănescu, *Alexandru Philippide – teoretician al limbajului*, in Philippide, 1984, p. XL).

¹¹ The basis of articulation and the psychological basis are the foundations of Philippide’s linguistic conception of the causes of changes and states in language, whose definitive formulation is widely set out in an extensive note in *Originea românilor* (see Philippide, 1928, pp. 245–309; cf. Philippide, 1984, pp. 341–398).

are originated, which, in Philippide's doctrine (with later refinements due to G. Ivănescu) covers, besides the situation of languages and ethnic groups, the condition of individuals (Pamfil, 2008, p. 125). In other words, a language changes by the adaptations to which a language is subject when it is spoken by an alloglot (conquered) people and, on the other hand, through the natural evolution of individuals over time. In other words, "limba se schimbă pentru că se schimbă organele articulatorii" [a language changes because the articulatory organs change] (the articulatory basis, which causes phonetic changes) and "pentru că se schimbă psihicul" [because the psyche changes] (the psychological basis, the cause of morphosyntactic and lexical transformations) (Philippide, 1928, p. 245; cf. p. 281). The psychological base and the articulatory base (both subsumed by Philippide to the laws of nature) appear, evolve and function in the language as sets of elements structured according to certain laws, hence the possibility for linguists to observe and even anticipate their evolution (Philippide, 1928, p. 273).

However, Philippide does not limit the causes of changes in language to the influence of the articulatory and psychological bases, adding to them the role played by the borrowings between individuals, between (sub)dialects and between (territorially neighbouring) languages (see Philippide, 1928, p. 306-309). Called in *Principii* "amestecul vorbirilor" [the mixture of speeches]¹², it is a unifying, standardizing factor, which acts, on one hand, to reduce the linguistic differences "de la individ la individ și de la dialect la dialect" [from individual to individual and from dialect to dialect] (Philippide, 1928, p. 306) and, on the other, through the innovations that spread themselves (*ibid.*). The probability of borrowing varies according to the level of the language, ranging from a maximum for the lexicon ("cel mai lesne anume se împrumută cuvintele" [words are borrowed most easily]), with an intermediate variant for morphosyntax ("mai greu cu mult se împrumută formele gramaticale" [grammatical forms are borrowed much more difficultly]), to a minimum for phonetics ("cel mai greu se împrumută sunetele" [sounds are borrowed most difficultly]) (*ibid.*).

Masterly continued by G. Ivănescu, A. Philippide is thus the creator of an original vision in theoretical linguistics which, despite some errors and outdated ideas, is a relevant research model, with universal applicability. Accordingly, the scientific community is invited to accept or reject it, but above all to know it (Pamfil, 2008, p. 194).

2.5. HISTORY OF THE ROMANIAN LANGUAGE

Conditioned by the historicism of the epoch and catalyzed by the influence of his ancestor Dimitrie (Daniel) Philippide¹³, his appetite for the history of the

¹² Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil notes that the syntagma was common at the time, being used, among others, by Timotei Cipariu (Pamfil, 1983, p. 91).

¹³ Author, among others, of the works *Istoria României* [History of Romania] and *Geografia României* [Geography of Romania] (both written in Greek and published in Leipzig, in 1816), in which the term *Romania* is used for the first time with reference to the Carpatho-Danubian-Pontic area (see Arvinte, 2006, p. 278–285).

Romanian language (and of the Romanian people, as inseparable themes), translated into an aptitude for diachronic research into the facts of language, runs through Alexandru Philippide's entire career and scientific work, as early as his first publications (*Încercări asupra stărei sociale a poporului român în trecut* [Essays on the Social State of the Romanian People in the Past], 1881; *Cronica lui Hur* [Hur's Chronicle], 1882; *Introducere în istoria limbii și literaturii române* [Introduction to the History of the Romanian Language and Literature], 1888). Philippide did not publish a work entitled as such during his lifetime, but the very first draft of *Principii de istoria de limbii* (1894),¹⁴ viewed as the first volume (meant to prepare the theoretical framework) of an *Istoria limbii române* [History of the Romanian Language], alongside with drafting of *Gramatica elementară a limbii române* [Elementary Grammar of the Romanian Language] (1897), as an aid to the study of the Romanian language, attest his intention to do so.

On the other hand, and with other objectives had in view, the cycle of lectures on this subject delivered by the professor from Iași to his second and third year students for almost forty years (between 1893 and 1932) represented, through its structure and substance, exactly the treatise on the history of the Romanian language that was apparently missing from Philippide's bibliography, but which was later published (Philippide, 2011), at the initiative of G. Ivănescu and through his and Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil' joint efforts, who later co-opted Luminița Botoșineanu in this activity. The substance of the four university courses on the history of the Romanian language (*Originea poporului român și a limbii române* [Origins of the Romanian People and Language]¹⁵ and *Latina populară* [Popular Latin], taught in the second year, then *Istoria sunetelor* [History of sounds] and *Istoria formelor* [History of forms], in the third year) was reconstructed, in a similar conception to the model of editing Saussure's *Course on General Linguistics* (published by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, former students of the Geneva professor, with the collaboration of Albert Riedlinger), based on the course notes (mostly fragmentary) from the notebooks of former students, corroborated, for the last two parts of the course, with an incomplete autograph manuscript of Philippide, preserved at the Library of the Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, "A. Philippide" Fund (Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, Luminița Botoșineanu, *Notă asupra ediției* [Note on the edition], in Philippide, 2011, p. XLII–XLIII).

¹⁴ Text edited, together with other theoretical works of Philippide (*Introducere în știința limbii* [Introduction to the Science of Language], *Fiziologia sunetelor* [Physiology of Sounds] and *Baza de articulație și baza psihologică* [Basis of Articulation and Psychological Basis], by G. Ivănescu and Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, with an introductory study and commentary of G. Ivănescu, under the title *Opere alese. Teoria limbii* [Selected Works. Theory of Language] (Philippide, 1984). One of the first Romanian works on the theory of language, *Principii* is a detailed analysis of an extremely rich factual material elaborated in Romanian, based on the changes in language theorized by Hermann Paul (*Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, Halle, 1882), to which the author adds some others (psychological causes, rhythm, spelling, etc.).

¹⁵ Or, for short, *Origini* [Origins].

It should be noted that, similarly with the courses on language theory, the lectures on the history of language also had two fundamentally different editions, covering the two well-known phases of Philippide's scholarly activity: an old one, from 1893 to 1918, and a new one, after 1918 (Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, Luminița Botoșineanu, *Introducere* [Introduction], in Philippide, 2011, p. VIII).

Originea românilor was built, over time, on the relatively more accessible foundation¹⁶ (by adapting it to the addressee) represented by the courses of history of the language, whose connection with the lectures belonging to the *Istoria limbii române* cycle goes beyond the strictly structural aspect (the first volume of *Originea românilor*, entitled *Ce spun izvoarele istorice* [What the Historical Sources Say], corresponds to the content of the first two university courses of history of the Romanian language: *Origini* and *Latina populară*, whereas the second volume, *Ce spun limbile română și albaneză* [What the Romanian and Albanian Languages Say] is in connection with the last two courses, *Istoria sunetelor* [History of Sounds] and *Istoria formelor* [History of Forms]), reaching conceptual, substantial continuities. This is especially true with reference to the new edition of this course, written after 1918, at the same time as *Originea românilor*, and which, in fact, attests the conception of the history of the Romanian language, as established in the second phase of Philippide's scientific activity.

As the title of the first series of lectures suggests (*Originea poporului român și a limbii române*; the findings are also valid for the corresponding part of *Originea românilor*, vol. I), Philippide deals here with some essential questions of language history, such as the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people and (implicitly) the period and territory of the formation of the Romanian language, then its dialectal distribution, which can provide valuable information on the formation and evolution of the language itself. The method by which the professor believed he would achieve the desired result consisted, apart from presenting, with his characteristic critical spirit, previous research by Romanian and foreign linguists and historians (D. Cantemir, P. Maior, Gh. Șincai, D. Philippide, M. Kogălniceanu, A.T. Laurian, B.-P. Hasdeu, A.D. Xenopol, D. Onciul, I. Bogdan, N. Iorga; J. Thunmann, Fr. J. Sulzer, I.C. Eder, I. Ch. Engel, B. Kopitar, W. Tomaschek, P.J. Schafarik, W. Meyer-Lübke, F. Miklosich, K. Hopf, R. Roesler, J. Jung, P. Hunfalvy and others) (Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, Luminița Botoșineanu, Introduction, in Philippide, 2011, p. X), in reviewing an impressive number of ancient and medieval historical testimonies (texts by ancient Roman or Greek writers, then accounts on the Vlachs by Byzantine chroniclers, as well as by Middle Ages monks or scribes). From these sources, commented and explained in detail, Philippide offered, both in his course on the history of language (Part I, *Origini*) and in the first volume of *Originea românilor*, substantial fragments (in translation, sometimes abbreviated), by exploring the direct information provided

¹⁶ Only relatively, because Philippide was primarily preoccupied with preparing scholars and referred less to his students as future teachers of Romanian language and literature (cf. Iordan, 1969, p. 53).

or by extracting and analyzing words in Romanian or with Romanian phonetics and forms, recorded especially in onomastics. The results, often pertinent, aim at establishing the period in which the Romanization of the various territories of Eastern Europe took place, and at identifying the indigenous peoples of this area who underwent Romanization (with some more general conclusions concerning the languages spoken by them, their political and social structures, their cultural practices and economic life) and, on the other hand, the question of the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people.

If, in the old version of his course on the history of language, as well as in his *Introducere în istoria limbii și literaturii române* (Philippide, 1888), Philippide advanced the idea of the continuity of the Romanians in Dacia (against the migrationist point of view, represented at the time by Thunmann, Sulzer, Miklosich, Tomaschek, Roesler, etc.), instead, in the modern version of the course and in *Originea românilor* (see Philippide, 2011, p. 86–87; cf. Philippide, 1925, p. 854), he argued in favour of the southern Danube origin of the Romanians. More specifically, by studying Latin and Greek inscriptions discovered in the Balkan Peninsula, he drew conclusions about the intensely Romanized areas, tracing the eastern and southern limits of the ethnogenetic territory of the Romanian people and making certain corrections to the results of previous research, due in particular to Jireček. “Rezultatele faptelor istorice” [the results of historical facts] led him to this conclusion (Philippide, 2011, p. 85), as the linguist from Iași says, but he does not exclude the presence “de-a stânga Dunării [...] (în Transilvania, în Banat, în Oltenia și pe malul stâng al Dunării, de la Olt începând în sudul Moldovei)” [to the left of the Danube ... (in Transylvania, in Banat, in Oltenia and on the left bank of the Danube, from Olt to the south of Moldavia)] of a “populații romane” [Roman population], which, in time, migrated to the right of the Danube (ibid.)¹⁷.

As to the time when the Romanians will have occupied their present territories, Philippide is less certain. Some indications would suggest, however, that, from their primitive homeland on the Balkan Peninsula, the Romanians “trebuie să fi început a se scurge de pe teritoriile din a dreapta Dunării pe cele din a stânga ei încă de pe la începutul secolului al VII-lea și că trebuie să fi continuat această scurgere până pe la întâia jumătate a secolului al XIII-lea, inclusiv. Aceasta, în ce privește pe dacoromâni. În ce privește pe macedoromâni și pe românii din Istria, presupunerea că dacoromânii ar fi început să emigreze în părțile de-a stânga Dunării pe la începutul secolului al VII-lea implică pe aceea că tot atunci, din cauza presiunii celei mari a slavilor în Peninsula Balcanică, se va fi început și

¹⁷ According to G. Ivănescu, Philippide did not consider these conclusions absolute and definitive, seemingly and repeatedly stating in front of his students that “poporul român s-a putut forma și în părțile de la nordul fluviului imediat vecine cu cele din sud” [the Romanian people could have also been formed in the northern parts of the river, in immediate neighbourhood of those in the south] (G. Ivănescu, *Viața și opera lui Alexandru Philippide*, ms., pp. 8–9 and 273, *apud* Pamfil, 2008, p. 154).

despărțirea celor trei trunchiuri românești unul de altul” [must have begun to drain from the territories to the right of the Danube to those on its left as early as the beginning of the 7th century and must have continued this drain up to and including the first half of the 13th century. This, as far as the Dacoromanians are concerned. As far as the Macedoromanians and the Istrian Romanians are concerned, the assumption that the Dacoromanians would have begun to emigrate to the parts to the left of the Danube around the beginning of the 7th century also implies that, at that time, due to the great pressure of the Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula, separation of the three Romanian trunks from each other would have begun] (Philippide, 2011, p. 89). Thus, “începutul sec. al XIII-lea nu însemnează începutul migrației dacoromânilor, cum credea Roesler, ci sfârșitul ei: la începutul secolului al XIII-lea tot teritoriul ocupat actualmente de români era umplut de dânșii” [the beginning of the thirteenth century does not mean the beginning of the migration of the Dacoromanians, as Roesler believed, but its end: at the beginning of the thirteenth century all the territory currently occupied by the Romanians was filled by them] (Philippide, 2011, p. 102; cf. Philippide, 1925, p. 407).

As for the nature of the popular Latin that gave rise to the Romance languages (a subject intensely discussed by Romanists at the time), in the early version of his course, Philippide conceived popular Latin as a sum of dialects spoken in the Roman Empire and considered classical Latin as a common language. Later, in the new version of the course and in *Originea românilor* (Philippide, 2011, p. 182–208; Philippide, 1925, p. 353–388), he adopted, in part, the views expressed by H. Schuchardt, G. Mohl, G. Gröber, E. Seelmann and others, who considered popular Latin a common, supradialectal language, with the specification that it ceased “când a încetat existența centrului de guvernământ al cărui grai oficial era ea” [when the centre of government whose official language it was ceased to exist] (Philippide, 2011, p. 192; cf. Philippide, 1925, p. 361).

2.6. CONCLUSIONS

Classified by G. Ivănescu as realistic and “antropologică în cel mai larg sens al cuvântului” [anthropological in the broadest sense of the word] (G. Ivănescu, *Alexandru Philippide – teoretician al limbajului*, in Philippide, 1984, p. XLI), Philippide’s conception treasures and critically develops the currents and ideas of the nineteenth-century linguistics, transmitting “lingviștilor secolului al XX-lea ceea ce a fost mai bun în lingvistica aceluia veac, într-o formă dezvoltată și perfecționată” [to the twentieth-century linguists what was the best of the linguistics of that century, in a developed and perfected form] (G. Ivănescu, *Viața și opera lui Alexandru Philippide*, ms., *apud* Pamfil, 2007, p. 321). The particular relation of continuity, “rare in Romanian culture” (Pamfil, 2007, p. 321), between Philippide’s ideas and theoretical positions and the subsequent developments due

especially to Ivănescu, with the necessary amendments and reinterpretations, laid the foundations of a scientific school in the true sense of the word. Subsequently, a series of Romanian linguists (especially from Iași, but also other followers, formed as such or as a result of an elective adhesion), of older or newer generations, contributed to its current configuration, if not always with theoretical elements meant to refine Philippide-Ivănescu doctrine, at least illustrating with factual material some of its valid ideas. Undoubtedly, the researchers of the “Alexandru Philippide” Institute of Romanian Philology have learned the lesson of the founding fathers and assume, in addition to the critical spirit, the rigorousness and exigency that emanate from the activity of the Iași School of Linguistics, its specific directions.

REFERENCES

- (Arvinte, 2006) ARVINTE V., *Dimitrie Daniel Philippide et la dénomination Românie*, în *Studii de istorie a limbii române*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2006, p. 278–285.
- (Balacciu, Chiriacescu, 1978) BALACCIU J., CHIRIACESCU R., *Dicționar de lingviști și filologi români*, București, Editura Albatros, 1978.
- (Iordan, 1969) IORDAN I., *Alexandru I. Philippide*, București, Editura Științifică, 1969.
- (Irimia, 1983) IRIMIA D., *Dualismul limbii în concepția lui A. Philippide*, în *Alexandru Philippide: 50 de ani de la moarte*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 1983, p. 27–32.
- (Pamfil, 1983) PAMFIL C.-G., *Contribuția lui Timotei Cipariu la teoria limbii*, *Limba română*, XXXII, nr. 2, 1983, p. 83–95.
- (Pamfil, 2001) PAMFIL C.-G., *Manuscrisul Dicționarului limbii române*, *Buletinului Institutului de Filologie Română „Alexandru Philippide”*, anul II, nr. 1, 2001, p. 9–10.
- (Pamfil, 2007) PAMFIL C.-G., *Doctrina lingvistică a lui A. Philippide reflectată în opera lui G. Ivănescu*, în vol. *Români majoritari/Români minoritari: interferențe și coabitări lingvistice, literare și etnologice*, Iași, Editura Alfa, 2007, p. 321–332.
- (Pamfil, 2008) PAMFIL C.-G., *Alexandru Philippide*, Chișinău, Editura „Litera Internațional”, 2008.
- (Petrovici 1935) PETROVICI I., *Alexandru Philippide în evoluția culturii românești*, București, Monitorul Oficial, 1935.
- (Philippide, 1888) PHILIPPIDE A., *Introducere în istoria limbei și literaturii române*, Iași, Editura Librăriei Frații Șaraga, 1888.
- (Philippide, 1906) PHILIPPIDE A., *Istoria și critica literară, Viața românească*, vol. I, 1906, p. 38–45.
- (Philippide, 1925, 1928) PHILIPPIDE A., *Originea românilor*, vol. I. *Ce spun izvoarele istorice*, vol. II. *Ce spun limbile română și albaneză*, Iași, Tipografia „Viața românească” S.A., 1925, 1928.
- (Philippide, 1984) PHILIPPIDE A., *Opere alese. Teoria limbii*, editate de G. Ivănescu și Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil, cu un studiu introductiv și comentarii de G. Ivănescu, București, Editura Academiei, 1984.
- (Philippide, 2011) PHILIPPIDE A., *Istoria limbii române*, ediție critică de G. Ivănescu, Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil și Luminița Botoșineanu, Iași, Polirom, 2011.
- (Pușcariu, 1968) PUȘCARIU S., *Călare pe două veacuri*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968.
- ✱ (BIFR, 1934) *Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română „Alexandru Philippide”*, vol. I.