COMPARATIVE-HISTORICAL METHOD: CONTENT, STRUCTURE, HISTORY

Volodymyr A. Glushchenko

Doctor of Science (Linguistics), Professor at the Department
of Germanic and Slavonic Linguistics
Donbas State Pedagogical University,
Sloviansk − Dnipro, Ukraine
e-mail: sdpunauka@ukr.net
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2394-4966

Viktoriia V. Roman

Candidate of Science (Linguistics), Associate Professor at the Department
of Germanic and Slavonic Linguistics
Donbas State Pedagogical University
Sloviansk − Dnipro, Ukraine
e-mail: roman.victoriya2016@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3468-1062

Maryna Yu. Rudenko

Candidate of Science (Linguistics), Associate Professor at the Department
of Linguistics and European Languages
Horlivka Institute of Foreign Languages
Donbas State Pedagogical University,
Horlivka − Dnipro, Ukraine
e-mail: marinarudenko2016@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000−0002−6587−3860

SUMMARY

The authors of the article reveal the content of the comparative-historical method as a means of understanding linguistic history. By means of the comparative-historical method, comparativists uncover the laws that governed the development of related languages in the past, trace the evolution of these languages on the basis of their common origin from the proto-language (the basic language). This proto-language is reconstructed and hypothetically restored by scholars.

The structure of the comparative-historical method is characterized in the context of a broad interpretation of the linguistic method as a heterogeneous unit. Within the structure of the linguistic method three heterogeneous components are distinguished: ontological, teleological, and operational. The authors characterize such means within the ontological component as principle and approach. The teleological component of the linguistic method includes the aim of the research. The operational component consists of certain techniques and procedures.

Within the ontological component of the comparative-historical method are included the principles of historicism, causality, and systemicity as concretizations and manifestations of the principle of general connection of the phenomena, as well as historical, causal, and systemic approaches. Within the teleological component, the purpose of the research is interpreted in factual and methodological aspects. First, this is the reproduction of models of proto-linguistic states of families and groups of related languages, their further development and division into independent languages, as well as the creation of comparative-historical descriptions (grammars and dictionaries) of related languages. Second, the purpose of comparative-historical research may be presented as the disclosure of historical, causal, and systemic connections of linguistic facts, that is, as the realization of the principle of general connection of the phenomena on specific historical-linguistic material.

Considering the genesis and evolution of the comparative-historical method, the authors distinguish three stages of its history. Regarding the first stage (1820s–1860s), it is appropriate to speak of the emergence and formation of the comparative-historical method. The content of the second (classical) stage (the 1870s – the 1910s) is the development of the comparative-historical method and the systematization of comparative-historical material. The third stage (the 1920s – the 2020s) is characterized by the study of new languages, the incorporation of newly discovered ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works), as well as the application of new research methods that complement the comparative-historical method.

The authors emphasize that during the 19th century and the early 20th century, the comparative-historical method was the leading method in linguistics. It remains relevant today.

Key words: *comparative-historical method, comparative-historical linguistics (comparativistics), content, structure, genesis, evolution, ontological, operational and teleological components, ontological, operational and teleological components, genesis, evolution, stages.*

Introduction. The comparative-historical method has played, and continues to play, a significant role in linguistics. According to a number of scholars, linguistics as an independent discipline emerged in the 1820s with the advent

of the comparative-historical method. Undoubtedly, this method has repeatedly been the subject of investigation in both theoretical and historiographic perspectives. It has been characterized in a range of studies with varying degrees of detail. However, since the publication of those works, a considerable period of time has passed. Over the past half century, the comparative-historical method has made significant advances in its development; however, we find almost no books or articles in which these changes have been theoretically conceptualized. The works of V. A. Glushchenko may be noted, although the author focuses primarily on the problem of the structure of the comparative-historical method, concentrating attention on its ontological component (reference).

The **purpose** of the proposed study is to reveal the substantive dimension, the structure, the genesis, and the evolution of the comparative-historical method over the two centuries of its existence.

This purpose is specified in the following **tasks**: 1. To clarify the structure of the comparative-historical method. 2. To determine the most important aspects of its substantive dimension. 3. To demonstrate the particular features of the origin of the comparative-historical method; 4. To refine the periodization of the development of this method; 5. To identify the specific features of the evolution of the comparative-historical method; 6. To establish the contribution of comparativists of different epochs to the development of the comparative-historical method and comparative-historical linguistics.

The **research material** consists of linguistic texts, specifically works by linguists from the 19th to the 21th centuries, focusing on language history and the comparison of languages.

The study employs the actualist **method** as a tool for linguistic-historiographical research (Глущенко, Роман, Руденко 2020).

Results and discussion. The problem of linguistic methods is one of the most important in linguistics.

First of all, it should be noted that linguists use the term method in different senses. Most often, it is interpreted in a narrow sense, as "a set of techniques employed in the study of language" (Ахманова 1966: 232).

However, such an interpretation does not fully correspond to the meaning of the word *method* as a certain way of approaching reality and its cognition, and it impoverishes the very concept of the linguistic method. The interpretation of the method as a complex logical unit with a certain structure appears promising (Глущенко 1998: 12; Глущенко 2010: 34–36; Глущенко 2017: 12).

The most elaborated conceptual frameworks and tools for adequately characterizing the linguistic method have been developed within the approach that views the method as a complex entity comprising three distinct components: ontological, operational, and teleological (Постовалова 1978: 24; Глущенко 1998: 12; Глущенко 2010: 41). The ensemble of scientific techniques and procedures, along with the methodology of their application, represents only one component of the method — the operational dimension. The inclusion of the teleological component in the structure of the method is justified by the fact that any method is inherently linked to the research objective.

We shall characterize the ontological component of the method in greater detail. Ontology functions as the way which helps the researcher to perceive the world as a kind of extended integrity given in the system of philosophic categories. Thus, such cognition means as principle and approach should be regarded as belonging to the ontological component of the scientific method (Глущенко 1998: 12; Глущенко 2010: 42; Глущенко 2017: 12).

The scientific principle is a major methodological means, a basis of cognition, a theoretical-methodological basis of method. Global statements with a wide range of action having a strategic meaning act as principles.

The scientific approach closely linked with the principle is interpreted as a research methodological orientation, as a position from which the study subject, i. e. a notion directing the research general strategy, is viewed. The approach determines the research direction, but in contrast to the principle, it doesn't act as a direct cognition instrument; the approach is reflected in principles, techniques and procedures of this method (Глущенко 1998: 12; Глущенко 2010: 42; Глущенко 2023).

Let us turn to the comparative-historical method. It has been, and continues to be, the most important means of establishing the genetic relationship of languages and of uncovering their history.

There exist various definitions of this method. Among comparativists, a well-known definition was presented in the collective monograph *Вопросы методики сравнительно-исторического изучения индоевропейских языков*: the comparative-historical method is "a system of research techniques employed in the study of related languages in order to reconstruct the picture of their historical past with the aim of revealing the regularities of their development, beginning from the proto-language" (Десницкая, Серебренников 1956: 58).

But this definition proves to be both too narrow and too broad. It is too narrow when considered from the perspective of the structure of the method, since it equates the method with its techniques. At the same time, it is too broad in terms of characterizing the techniques of the comparative-historical method: in the proposed interpretation, the method encompasses any procedures employed by scholars in the study of language history. Commenting on such an approach, G. A. Klimov emphasized its inadequacy (Климов 1973: 9). And we concur. As is well known, in contemporary linguogenetic research scholars widely employ, alongside the comparative-historical method, other methods such as quantitative approaches and linguistic geography. In this context, the comparative-historical method remains the principal one, while other scientific methods serve to complement it. Naturally, each of these methods has its own techniques. If we were to follow the logic of the cited definition, we would have to regard these techniques as part of the comparative-historical method, which is, of course, incorrect.

Linguistics of the 19th through the early 21st century allows us to qualify the comparative-historical method as the most important means of comprehending linguistic history, which possesses, first, certain distinctive features and, second, definite limits of applicability.

By means of the comparative-historical method, comparativists uncover the laws that governed the development

of related languages in the past and trace their evolution on the basis of their common origin in a proto-language. Thus, many of the world's languages (for example, Ancient Greek, Modern Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Gothic, German, English, Swedish, Ukrainian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, Serbian, Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Avestan, Persian, Tajik) derive from Proto-Indo-European, which existed several millennia ago. This proto-language is reconstructed by scholars through hypothetical restoration.

Linguists posit the existence of a proto-language in the past on the basis of comparing words and forms in related languages. The leading sources for the study of linguistic history are the materials of ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works) together with contemporary dialectal data.

The comparative-historical method rests upon the following fundamental premise: related languages, which emerged as a result of the "splitting" of a proto-language (we use this term in a sufficiently conventional sense, recognizing in A. Schleicher's "family-tree" model a simplified but convenient scheme of linguistic genesis), share numerous commonalities at all levels of the linguistic system. They are connected by phonological, morphonological, and morphological correspondences and develop unevenly, which makes them amenable to comparison. Within languages, certain strata of elements (phonemes, morphemes, words, and so forth) of differing chronology coexist simultaneously. A language cannot change all of its elements at once. The analysis of "sound" (in essence, phonemic) correspondences has made it possible to advance the hypothesis of a series of phonetic laws operating in the past, which produced regular alternations of individual "sounds" (sound-types, phonemes) and their combinations.

According to the comparative-historical method, the differences among related languages can be explained by their continuous development. Sound changes in related languages follow strictly regular patterns, which is why roots and affixes (including inflections) have been preserved over the course of millennia; this makes it possible to reconstruct archetypes (proto-forms).

Thus, the word ***мати*** (in the genitive ***матері***) in the Slavic languages and in the Indo-European family as a whole exhibits a closely similar phonetic form. Compare in the Slavic languages: Russian ***мать*** (genitive ***матери***), Belarusian ***маці***; Bulgarian ***ма́йка***, ***ма́ти***; Macedonian ***мајка***; Slovene ***máti*** (genitive ***matere***); Polabian ***motei***; Polish ***matka***; Czech ***máti***, and so forth. In other Indo-European languages: Latin ***māter***, Ancient Greek μήτηρ, Avestan ***mātar-***, Tocharian A ***mācar***, Tocharian B ***mācer***, Old High German ***muoter***, English ***mother***, Latvian ***mâte***, Armenian ***mair***, and others (Мельничук 1989, 3: 413−414).

Comparativists reconstructed for Proto-Slavic the form *****mati*** (genitive *****matere***), while for Proto-Indo-European the form *****māter-*** is considered the archetype.

Scholars see in these forms not only a genetically common root but also a genetically common kinship suffix; compare, in particular, Latin ***pater***, Old Icelandic ***fadir***, Old English ***father***, Gothic ***fadar***.

Compare the genetically related roots and inflections in Ukrainian ***стежка***, Russian ***стёжка***, Serbian ***staza***, Slovene ***stŭza***, Old Church Slavonic ***стьsа***, Polabian ***stadza*** (Proto-Slavic had the form *****stьga***), Latvian ***stiga***, Gothic ***staiga*** (Мельничук 2006, 5: 406).

Thus, in establishing genetic relationships among languages, comparison often involves not words but morphemes (since words are comparatively easily borrowed from one language into another). In related languages, common morphemes are far more numerous than common words.

In the examples of genetic relatedness cited, one also observes the phonemic (consonantal) correspondence ***p : f***. Analyzing such phenomena, Germanic scholars formulated the law of the first Germanic consonant shift, a landmark discovery in the field of historical phonetics of the Germanic languages. As noted by historiographers of linguistics, this law was independently discovered by three scholars: J. Grimm, R. Rask, and J. Bredsdorf.

What, then, is the essence of this law (the law of Grimm, or the Rask − Grimm law)?

When comparing words of various Germanic languages with lexemes from other Indo-European languages (Ancient

Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Ukrainian, and so forth), clear regular correspondences emerge, which can be formulated as follows: Indo-European voiceless stops *p, t, k* correspond to Germanic voiceless fricatives *f, þ, h*: Latin *plenus*, Ancient Greek πλεός − Gothic *fulls*, Old English *full*; Latin *pater*, Ancient Greek πατήρ − Gothic *fadar*, Old English *father*; Latin *tu*, Ukrainian *mu* − Gothic *þu*; Latin *tres*, Ukrainian *три* − Gothic *þreis*, Old English *þreo*; Latin *canis* − Gothic *hunds*, Old English *hund*; Latin *cor, cordis* − Gothic *hairto*, Old English *heort*; Indo-European voiced stops *b, d, g* correspond to Germanic voiceless *p, t, k*: Ukrainian *болото*, Lithuanian *bala* − Old English *pōl*; Latin *decem*, Ukrainian *десять* − Gothic *taihun*, Old English *tien*; Latin *ego* − Dutch *ik*; Indo-European voiced aspirated stops *bh, dh, gh* correspond to Germanic voiced unaspirated *b, d, g*: Sanskrit *bhrata*, Ukrainian *брат* − Gothic *broþar*, Old English *broюor*; Sanskrit *vidhava*, Ukrainian *вдова* − Old English *widwe*; Sanskrit *lagh*, Ukrainian *лягати* − Old English *licgean*.

Thus, the concept of a phonetic law as a sound shift emerged already in the works of the first comparativists. F. Bopp introduced the term *phonetic law* into linguistic science. This term became established in linguistics to denote the fixation of a sound change that occurred in the past under specific conditions. The studies of scholars of the Leipzig linguistic school (th Neogrammarians) played a significant role in this regard. The Neogrammarians substantiated the thesis of the exceptionlessness of phonetic laws (A. Schleicher had written earlier than the Neogrammarians about the possible exceptionlessness of phonetic laws).

Let us characterize the structure of the comparative-historical method on the basis of the assertion that it comprises three heterogeneous components: the ontological, the teleological, and the operational.

The ontological component of the comparative-historical method includes certain principles and approaches. The leading principle of this method is the principle of historicism. It presupposes the study of language in its development, in diachrony, the identification of stages in this development, and the differentiation of linguistic elements of varying

chronology (for example, *небо* of Indo-European origin; *літо* of Proto-Slavic origin; *снігур* of East Slavic origin; *хлопчик* of specifically Ukrainian origin).

However, this is not the only principle within the ontological component of the comparative-historical method. Linguists also address the causes of the emergence and development of linguistic phenomena in the historical study of language. Thus, the principle of historicism is closely connected with the principle of causality. The study of the history of linguistic phenomena and the investigation of their causes necessitate a systematic examination of linguistic facts. From this it follows that the principles of historicism and causality are closely linked to the principle of systemicity. This principle consists in the fact that historians of language consider the development of linguistic phenomena not in isolation but in systemic relations with groups of homogeneous phenomena. Accordingly, the principles of historicism, causality, and systemicity make it possible to reveal the historical, causal, and systemic connections among linguistic facts. This provides grounds for viewing these principles as a concretization and manifestation the principle of general connection of the phenomena (Журавлев 1986: 39—40; Глущенко 1998: 22). These principles correspond to certain approaches (historical, causal, systemic).

The teleological component of the comparative-historical method is its purpose. In contemporary comparative-historical linguistics, this purpose is interpreted quite broadly: it is the reconstruction of models of proto-language states of families and groups of related languages, their subsequent development and division into independent languages, as well as the creation of comparative-historical descriptions (grammars and dictionaries) of related languages (Нерознак, 1990: 485).

This purpose is realized in the following tasks: 1) establishing the genetic relatedness of certain languages on the basis of the postulate of their origin from a common source (a proto-language); 2) explaining the causes and conditions of the disintegration of the proto-language and the emergence of independent languages; 3) uncovering the regularities of the evolution of related languages, identifying secondary

convergences and divergences among them, and distinguishing archaisms and innovations within the languages of a given family (group, subgroup).

Simultaneously, as V. A. Glushchenko notes, comparative-historical research may be directed not only toward obtaining specific facts from the history of particular languages, that is, of an exclusively factual character. Concrete linguistic facts may be understood as manifestations of general regularities within the "subsystem" of ontology, while the purpose of research may be seen as the disclosure of the historical, causal, and systemic connections among linguistic facts — that is, as the realization of the principle of general connection of the phenomena on specific historical-linguistic material. Scholars of the Kharkiv and Moscow linguistic schools interpreted the purpose of comparative-historical research precisely in this way (Глущенко 1998: 99, 175).

The operational component of the comparative-historical method includes such techniques and procedures as 1) genetic identification of facts, 2) linguistic reconstruction of the archetype and the phonetic law, and 3) the dating and localization of linguistic phenomena and their systemically related complexes (Климов 1973: 9, 29; Климов 1990: 84).

1. The technique of genetic identification of facts constitutes the foundation of the comparative-historical method. The existence of this method is possible only if the genetic identity of a large number of heterogeneous linguistic elements can be demonstrated. For comparison, only the most stable linguistic material may be used: certain thematic groups of vocabulary from the basic lexical stock (terms of kinship, words denoting vital objects such as *земля*, *небо*, *вода*, *дерево*, and others; personal pronouns; numerals of the first ten; the numeral *сто*), inflectional forms, and means of word formation. Thus, genetically identical are Ukrainian *ліс*, Belarusian, Russian, and Bulgarian *лес*, Polish *las*, Czech and Slovak *les*, Upper and Lower Sorbian *lěs*, Polabian *l'os*, Old Church Slavonic лѣсъ. Comparativists reconstruct Proto-Slavic **lěsъ* on the basis of this genetic identity (Мельничук 1989, 3: 266).

In applying the technique of genetic identification of facts, one must exercise great caution. Accidental similarities cannot

be interpreted as genetically identical (for example, one cannot etymologically associate Russian **скот** with Scottish **Scott**, as some scholars of the 18th century attempted to do).

2. The most essential part of the comparative-historical method is the procedure of linguistic reconstruction. Scholars distinguish three types of reconstruction: external, internal, and the "philological method". In external reconstruction, researchers operate with facts from two or more related languages. Internal reconstruction involves the recovery of the past exclusively on the basis of the material of a single language. The "philological method" is based on the study of ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works); in this case, the facts of one language or of several related languages may be analyzed. Traditionally, however, external reconstruction is regarded as a hallmark of the comparative-historical method, while internal reconstruction and the "philological method" are considered features of the so-called historical method. At the same time, it should be noted that in linguistic-genetic studies these types of reconstruction may be combined within a single scholarly work.

It is appropriate here to indicate the questions that come to the forefront in connection with linguistic reconstruction: its external and internal character, its retrospective and prospective orientation, its systemic nature, its literalness or conventionality (abstractness), the balance between divergent and convergent interpretations, the orientation of linguists toward the "family-tree" model, the "wave" model, the model of divergent-convergent language evolution, the substratum model (or possibly a combination of these models), the attitude of comparativists toward the reconstruction of the proto-language as such and of "intermediate proto-languages", the orientation of researchers toward the reconstruction of synchronic cross-sections of proto-languages and the depth of reconstruction associated with this, and the attitude of linguists toward reconstructed phonetic laws and the manner in which they take the factor of analogy into account.

Linguistic facts from periods not documented by ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works)

are recovered precisely through linguistic reconstruction. For example, researchers have identified Ukrainian *гість* (genitive *гостя*) with corresponding words in other Slavic and, more broadly, Indo-European languages: Russian *гость*, Belarusian *госць*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *гост*, Slovene *góst*, Polish *gość*, Czech *host*, Slovak *host'*, Lower Sorbian *gość*, Upper Sorbian *hóść*, Latin *hostis* (in Latin originally meaning 'foreigner, guest,' later 'hostile foreigner, enemy [especially of the homeland]'), Gothic *gasts* 'foreigner, stranger,' Old High German *gast* 'foreigner, stranger,' and New High German *Gast* 'guest, foreigner, newcomer' (Melnychuk 2012, 1: 517).

On the basis of this identification, comparativists reconstructed the Proto-Slavic form **gostь* and the Proto-Indo-European form **ghŏstĭs* 'stranger,' where **gh* represents an aspirated consonant phoneme.

3. The techniques of chronology and localization of linguistic phenomena are indispensable, for without taking the factor of time into account it is impossible to construct the history of a language.

For example, ancient manuscripts attest that in Ukrainian (in Proto-Ukrainian dialects) the shift *e > o* occurred in the 12th—13th centuries. During this period, the change *e > o* took place before all hard consonants and independently of stress (**чоловік**, **чотири**, **жолудь**). It should be noted that in modern Russian literary language the pronunciation *o* in place of etymological *e* is observed only in stressed syllables (**нёс**, **лёд**, **похлёбка**, **чёрный**, **жёлудь**), whereas originally the change *e > o* was probably not connected with stress. Evidence of the process of unstressed *e > o* is provided by contemporary northern Russian dialects (**[н'осу]**, **[в'осна]**, **[в-л'осу]**).

Chronologization may be absolute or relative.

In giving absolute chronology, researchers rely on the testimony of ancient manuscripts. For instance, Old Ukrainian and Old Belarusian texts attest the change of *l* to non-syllabic *u* in the cluster *tьlt* from the 15th century (**повнейше**, **не вдовзе**). But there is no doubt that the pronunciation of non-syllabic *u* was known much earlier, already from the 13th century. The relatively late fixation is due to the absence in the alphabet

of a letter to denote non-syllabic **u**. From the 16th century the letter **в** is increasingly used; by the 17th century such orthography becomes standard (**товста**, **стовб**, **довгии**, **мовчу**, **повно**, **жовта**, etc.).

Relative chronologization makes it possible to establish which of several linguistic phenomena preceded others. An example is provided by the first, second, and third Slavic palatalizations. Prior to the first palatalization in Proto-Slavic, profound phonetic transformations had already taken place: the loss of aspirated stops, the disappearance of labialized velars, the change of palatal **g', k'** to **z, s**, the emergence of a new consonant **x** from aspirated **kh** as well as from **s** after **i, u, r, k**, and so forth.

Significant chronological depth has been revealed in the reconstruction not only of linguistic facts connected with language families but also of facts connected with macrofamilies. The Nostratic hypothesis, which has gained considerable currency in comparative studies, may serve as an example.

The spatial distribution of linguistic facts is likewise of great importance. For this reason comparativists devote much attention to the technique of localization. For instance, linguists have established that the clusters **гы**, **кы**, **хы** were transformed into **г'і**, **к'і**, **х'і** (**сѣкира**, **вєликии**, **нєбєскімъ**) not throughout the entire territory of East Slavic, but only in those dialects on the basis of which Russian and Belarusian later developed.

The recognition by linguists of the relatedness of languages and their establishment of regular correspondences among related languages at various levels (lexical, phonological, derivational, morphological, and syntactic) led to the emergence of the comparative-historical method.

The comparative-historical method emerged gradually. In the 11th century, Mahmud al-Kashgari proposed the idea of linguistic relatedness (based on the study of Turkic languages), which was grounded in a historical approach to linguistic phenomena.

In the early 14th century, Dante composed the treatise *De vulgari eloquentia*, in which he advanced the idea that the Romance languages derive from a common source. Similar ideas regarding various languages were later expressed by

scholars such as G. Postellus (1538), A. Bogorych (1584), E. Guichard (1606), J. J. Scaligeri (1610), M. Lithuanus (1615), G. W. Leibniz (1646−1716), L. ten Kate (1723), P.-J. Strahlenberg (1730), Ph. Ruhig (1747), M. Lomonosov (1755), J. Dobrovský (1792), S. Gyarmathi (1799), F. Schlegel (1808), among others (Glushchenko 2024: 21−22).

Scholars quite reasonably regard the 1820s as the time of the emergence of the comparative-historical method.

1. First stage: discovery and formation of the comparative-historical method and comparative-historical linguistics (comparativistics) (1820s−1860s). F. Bopp, R. Rask, J. Grimm, and A. Vostokov became the founders of the comparative-historical method and comparativistics.

The assertion of linguistic relatedness became generally recognized. The principle of relatedness was developed in close connection with the principle of historicism. Language emerges as a dynamic phenomenon. The idea arose of the uneven development of units at different linguistic levels. The process of language development came to be understood as continuous, successive, and gradual. The method of genetic identification of linguistic facts acquired a systematic character, with identification carried out primarily at the phonetic (phonological), derivational, and morphological levels. The purpose of comparative-historical research was interpreted as the reconstruction of proto-languages.

W. von Humboldt provided the theoretical justification for the status of comparative-historical linguistics as a specific linguistic discipline, whose conclusions are of primary importance for the study of culture, intellectual activity, and folk psychology.

The comparative-historical method was applied in Germanic studies (F. Bopp, R. Rask, J. Grimm, A. Schleicher, G. Curtius), Romance studies (F. Renoir, F. Diez), Slavic studies (A. Vostokov, F. Miklosich, F. Buslaev, I. Sreznevskyi, P. Lavrovskyi, M. Maksymovych, Y. Holovatskyi), and others. A. Schleicher, the author of the "family-tree" model, identified the principal phonetic and morphological correspondences of the Indo-European languages, reconstructed

the Proto-Indo-European language, and produced a genealogical classification of the Indo-European languages.

Comparativists began to study not only the Indo-European languages but also languages of other families (Afroasiatic, Finno-Ugric).

Almost simultaneously with comparativistics, scientific etymology arose (the theory of etymology was set forth in the works of A. F. Pott), and etymological dictionaries were compiled.

2. Second (classical) stage: the development of the comparative-historical method and the systematization of comparative-historical material (1870s—1910s). The assertion that language develops through the interaction of the individual and the social was elaborated. Considerable explanatory power in revealing the regularities of linguistic development characterized the theory of divergent-convergent language evolution (F. F. Fortunatov), which was based on A. Schleicher's "family-tree" theory. In explaining certain linguistic changes, some scholars turned to the "wave" model of J. Schmidt and H. Schuchardt. The negative attitude toward the "wave" model some linguists was connected with the fact that it did not fully take into account specific historical facts of the life of particular peoples.

Comparativists carried out a detailed phonological and morphological reconstruction.

Neogrammarians, the scholars of the Leipzig school of linguistics (A. Leskien, B. Delbrück, K. Brugmann, H. Osthoff, H. Paul) formulated the principle of the regularity of sound changes (the thesis of the exceptionlessness of phonetic laws).

Linguists thoroughly investigated, from a linguogenetic perspective, the vocalic, consonantal, and accentual subsystems of the phonological systems of Indo-European and other languages, as well as the units of the morphonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical levels.

The comparative-historical method has become a universal means of investigating languages of different families.

Indo-European languages and the languages of other families in their history (beginning with reconstructed proto-languages)

were systematically described in the works of scholars of the Kharkiv, Moscow, and Kazan linguistic schools led by A. A. Potebnia, F. F. Fortunatov, and J. A. Baudouin de Courtenay (we have in mind the works of P. Zhytetskyi, A. A. Shakhmatov, N. N. Durnovo, B. M. Lyapunov, N. V. Krushevskyi, V. A. Bogoroditskyi, and others); in the books and articles of scholars of the Leipzig school; in the works of F. de Saussure, K. Verner, E. Sievers, F. Edgerton, M. Bréal, H. Hirt, V. Jagić, W. Whitney, A. I. Sobolevskyi, O. Ohonovskyi, S. Smal-Stotskyi, A. Ye. Krymskyi, A. M. Selishchev, G. A. Ilinskyi, N. van Wijk, A. Martinet, J. Kuryłowicz, N. S. Trubetzkoy, M. Vasmer, Ye. F. Karskyi, J. Vovk-Leonovych, P. Buzuk, Ye. Tymchenko, J. Endzelīns, and others (compare, in this connection, the widespread thesis about the "atomism" of most comparative-historical studies of the 19th century; Glushchenko 2017: 34).

At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, several ancient extinct languages of the Balkans and Asia Minor (Illyrian, Thracian, Phrygian, Lycian, and others) became the object of scholarly investigation. Newly discovered Indo-European languages also came to light — Hittite (B. Hrozný) and Tocharian (E. Sieg, W. Siegling, A. Meillet). This made it possible to model the Hittite-Luwian (Anatolian), Tocharian, and Illyrian branches of the Indo-European family, as well as to identify "isolated" languages such as Phrygian, Thracian, and Venetic. The decipherment and reconstruction of extinct languages became one of the most striking demonstrations of the effectiveness of comparative-historical research. The very fact of decipherment and reconstruction of dead languages served as proof of the power of the comparative-historical method: even with minimal data, it was possible to recover phonology, morphology, and, to some extent, vocabulary.

The considerable depth of linguistic reconstruction also made it possible to advance and substantiate the hypothesis of macrofamilies.

3. Third stage: expansion to the global level (the 1920s — the 2020s). The study of new languages,

the incorporation of newly discovered ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works), and the application of new methodologies constitute the content of this stage. Discussions are being conducted regarding the limits of application of the comparative-historical method (whether it is possible to reconstruct more than 10−12 thousand years into the past). Substrate and superstrate phenomena are being studied. Historical accentology reaches a high level of development. The most intensive work on comparative-historical research and the refinement of the genealogical classification of the languages of Southeast Asia, Africa, North and South America was carried out in the mid and latter half of the 20th century. To this same period belongs the beginning of systematic investigations aimed at uniting language families into macrofamilies. Alongside the comparative-historical method, structural linguistics, areal typology, linguistic paleontology, and computer modeling are employed (L. A. Bulakhovskyi, M. M. Gukhman, I. M. Tronskyi, A. S. Melnychuk, H. Pedersen, E. H. Sturtevant, A. Furdal, V. Mareš, V. M. Illich-Svitych, Vyach. Vs. Ivanov, T. V. Gamkrelidze, A. V. Desnitskaya, F. Maurer, A. I. Smirnitskyi, V. M. Zhirmunskyi, M. I. Steblin-Kamenskyi, Yu. Shevelov, V. V. Kolesov, V. N. Yartseva, V. K. Zhuravlev, A. A. Zaliznyak, V. N. Toporov, Ye. A. Khelimskyi, O. B. Tkachenko, V. G. Skliarenko, V. V. Levytsky, D. Q. Adams, L. Campbell, and others). Linguists deepened the study of the Hittite-Luwian (Anatolian) group, establishing genetic connections between the ancient Hittite-Luwian languages (cuneiform Hittite, Luwian, Palaic, and Hieroglyphic Hittite) and the Hittite-Luwian languages of the classical era (Lydian, Lycian, Carian, etc.).

Further decipherment of "dead" languages is taking place. Knowledge of the newly discovered ancient Greek language, the language of the Cretan-Mycenaean tablets from Pylos, Knossos, Mycenae, and other sites, was significantly enriched. O. Trubachov studied the Sindian-Meotian and Taurian relics of the Indo-Aryan language in southern Russia. É. Benveniste, H. W. Bailey, I. M. Dyakonov, L. G. Gerzenberg, and others

introduced into scholarly circulation a large and diverse body of material from the Middle Iranian languages. V. I. Abaev, J. Harmatta, and others investigated the Scythian language. The study of the Dardic languages should also be noted. Indo-European studies were enriched with new information about such languages as Illyrian, Messapic, Venetic, Thracian, Phrygian, and others (J. Pokorny, G. Bonfante, V. Pisani, V. Georgiev, I. Duridanov, V. P. Neroznak, and others). The problem of the classification of the Etruscan language arose.

During the 19th century and the early 20th century, the comparative-historical method was the leading method in linguistics. It remains relevant today.

The discovery of laws governing the development of related languages in the past became the principal result of the comparative-historical method. This method has yielded significant results in the study of linguistic relatedness and in the investigation of the regularities of phonological and morphological development.

At the same time, certain limitations in the use of the comparative-historical method became evident. Within its framework, it is often difficult: 1) to identify lost distinctions in related languages; 2) to differentiate between genetically identical and "borrowed" facts; 3) to study "non-related" phenomena within related languages.

The comparative-historical method produced relatively few results in the study of lexicon and syntax. It was not always possible to establish the chronology of reconstructed archetypes or to localize them. But, in our view, this does not indicate that the potential of the comparative-historical method has been exhausted.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Our study has demonstrated that the content of the comparative-historical method as a means of understanding linguistic history. By means of the comparative-historical method, comparativists uncover the laws that governed the development of related languages in the past, trace the evolution of these languages on the basis of their common origin from the proto-language. This proto-language is reconstructed and hypothetically restored by scholars.

The structure of the comparative-historical method is characterized in the context of a broad interpretation of the linguistic method as a heterogeneous unit. Within the structure of the linguistic method three heterogeneous components are distinguished: ontological, teleological, and operational. Within the ontological component are included the principles of historicism, causality, and systemicity as concretizations and manifestations of the principle of general connection of the phenomena, as well as historical, causal, and systemic approaches. Within the teleological component, the purpose of the research is interpreted in factual and methodological aspects. First, this is the reproduction of models of proto-linguistic states of families and groups of related languages, their further development and division into independent languages, as well as the creation of comparative-historical descriptions of related languages. Second, the purpose of comparative-historical research may be presented as the disclosure of historical, causal, and systemic connections of linguistic facts, that is, as the realization of the principle of general connection of the phenomena on specific historical-linguistic material.

Three stages in the history of the comparative-historical method can be distinguished. Regarding the first stage (1820s—1860s), it is appropriate to speak of the emergence and formation of the comparative-historical method. The content of the second stage (the 1870s — the 1910s) is the development of the comparative-historical method and the systematization of comparative-historical material. The third stage (the 1920s — the 2020s) is characterized by the study of new languages, the incorporation of newly discovered ancient manuscripts (and, with the advent of printing, printed works), as well as the application of new research methods that complement the comparative-historical method.

The linguistic-historiographical aspect of comparative-historical research on "dead" languages offers promising perspectives for further investigation.

REFERENCES

Akhmanova O. S. (1966). Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. Moscow : Sovetskaya entsiklopediya.

Desnitskaya A. V., Serebrennikov B. A. (eds.). (1956). Voprosy metodiki sravnitel'no-istoricheskogo izucheniya indoevropeyskikh yazykov [Issues of Methodology of Comparative-Historical Study of Indo-European Languages]. Moscow : Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Glushchenko V. A. (1998). Pryntsypy porivnialno-istorychnoho doslidzhennia v ukrains'komu i rosiis'komu movoznavstvi (70-i rr. XIX st. — 20-i rr. XX st.) [Principles of Comparative-Historical Research in Ukrainian and Russian Linguistics (1870s — 1920s)]. Donetsk [in Ukrainian].

Glushchenko V. A. (2010). Linhvistychnyi metod i yoho struktura [The Linguistic Method and its Structure]. *Movoznavstvo* [*Linguistics*], № 6, P. 32—44 [in Ukrainian]

Glushchenko V. A. (2017). Porivnialno-istorychnyi metod v ukrainskomu ta rosiiskomu movoznavstvi XIX st. — 30-kh rr. XX st. [The comparative-historical Method in Ukrainian and Russian Linguistics of the 19th Century — 30s of the 20th Century]: monograph. Sloviansk : Vyd-vo B. I. Matorina [in Ukrainian].

Glushchenko V. A., Roman V. V., Rudenko M. Yu. (2020). Do pytannia pro aktualistychnyi metod yak metod studii iz linhvistychnoi istoriohrafii [On the Actualistic Method as a Method of Studies in Linguistic Historiography]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriia: Filolohiia* [*International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology*], № 45, Vol. 1, P. 90—93 [in Ukrainian].

Glushchenko V. A. (2023). Pryntsypy y pidkhody u strukturi porivnialno-istorychnoho metodu [Principles and Approaches in the Structure of the Comparative-Historical Method]. *Naukovyi visnyk Pivdennoukrainskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. K. D. Ushynskoho. Linhvistychni nauky*: zbirnyk naukovykh prats [*Scientific Research Issues of South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University Named after K. D. Ushynsky: Linguistic Sciences*] / [ed. A. I. Iliadi], № 36, P. 70—82 [in Ukrainian].

Glushchenko V. A. (2024). The Principle of Historicism and the Origins of the Comparative-Historical Method. *Naukovyi visnyk Pivdennoukrainskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. K. D. Ushynskoho. Linhvistychni nauky*: zbirnyk naukovykh prats [*Scientific Research Issues of South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University Named after K. D. Ushynsky: Linguistic Sciences*] / [ed. A. I. Iliadi], № 39, P. 18—34 [in English].

Klimov G. A. (1973). Metodika lingvogeneticheskikh issledovaniy (Vvedenie) [Methodology of Linguogenetic Researches (Introduction)]. *Obshchee yazykoznanie: metody lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy* [*General Linguistics: Methodology of Linguistic Researches*]. Moscow : Nauka, P. 9—33.

Klimov G. A. (1990). Osnovy lingvisticheskoy komparativistiki [Foundations of Linguistic Comparative Studies]. Moscow : Nauka.

Kovalyk I. I., Samiilenko S. P. (1985). Zahal'ne movoznavstvo: istoriia linhvistychnoi dumky [General Linguistics: The History of Linguistic Thought]. Kyiv : Vyshcha shkola [in Ukrainian].

Melnychuk O. S. (ed.). (1982−2012). Etymologichnyi slovnyk ukrayinskoii movy [An Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Language]. Т. 1−6. Kyiv : Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

Neroznak V. P. (1990). Sravnitelno-istoricheskii metod [Comparative-Historical Method]. *Lingvisticheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* [*Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*] / [editor-in-chief V. N. Yartseva]. Moscow : Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, P. 485−486.

Postovalova V. I. (1978). Istoricheskaia fonologiia i eio osnovaniia: opyt logiko-metodologicheskogo analiza [Historical Phonology and its Grounds: Experience of Logical and Methodological Analysis]. Moscow : Nauka.

Zhuravlev V. K. (1986). Diakhronicheskaia fonologia [Diachronic Phonology]. Moscow : Nauka.

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ІСТОРИЧНИЙ МЕТОД: ЗМІСТ, СТРУКТУРА, ІСТОРІЯ

Володимир А. Глущенко

доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри
германської та слов'янської філології
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет,
Слов'янськ − Дніпро, Україна
e-mail: sdpunauka@ukr.net
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2394-4966

Вікторія В. Роман

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри
германської та слов'янської філології
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет,
Слов'янськ − Дніпро, Україна
e-mail: roman.victoriya2016@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3468-1062

Марина Ю. Руденко

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри
мовознавства та європейських мов
Горлівський інститут іноземних мов,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»,
Горлівка − Дніпро, Україна
e-mail: marinarudenko2016@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000−0002−6587−3860

АНОТАЦІЯ

Автори статті розкривають зміст порівняльно-історичного методу як засобу пізнання мовної історії. За допомогою порівняльно-історичного методу компаративісти відкривають закони, що керували розвитком споріднених мов у минулому, простежують еволюцію цих мов на основі спільності їхнього походження з прамови (мови-основи). Цю мову-основу вчені реконструюють, відновлюють гіпотетично.

Структура порівняльно-історичного методу схарактеризована в статті з погляду широкого трактування лінгвістичного методу як одиниці гетерогенного характеру. У структурі лінгвістичного методу виділено три різнорідні компоненти: онтологічний, телеологічний, операційний. Автори характеризують такі засоби в межах онтологічного компонента, як принцип і підхід. В телеологічний компонент лінгвістичного методу входить мета дослідження. Операційний компонент становлять певні прийоми й процедури.

В онтологічний компонент порівняльно-історичного методу входять принципи історизму, причиновості, системності як конкретизація та вияв принципу загального зв'язку явищ, а також історичний, причиновий, системний підходи. У межах телеологічного компонента мета дослідження інтерпретується у фактологічному й методологічному аспектах. По-перше, це відтворення моделей прамовних станів сімей і груп споріднених мов, їхнього подальшого розвитку та членування на самостійні мови, а також створення порівняльно-історичного опису (граматик і словників) споріднених мов. По-друге, мета порівняльно-історичного дослідження може бути представлена як розкриття історичних, причинових, системних зв'язків фактів мови, тобто як реалізація принципу загального зв'язку явищ на конкретному історико-мовному матеріалі.

Розглядаючи генезис і еволюцію порівняльно-історичного методу, автори виділяють три етапи його історії. Щодо першого етапу (20-і − 60-і рр. XIX ст.) доцільно говорити про виникнення й формування порівняльно-історичного методу. Змістом другого (класичного) етапу (70-і рр. XIX ст − 10-і рр. XX ст.) є розвиток порівняльно-історичного методу та систематизація порівняльно-історичного матеріалу. Третій етап (20-і рр. XX ст − 20-і рр. XXI ст.) характеризується Вивченням нових мов, залученням нововідкритих давніх рукописів (а з появою друку − друкованих творів), а також застосуванням нових методів дослідження, які доповнюють порівняльно-історичний метод.

Автори підкреслюють, що впродовж XIX ст. та на початку XX ст. порівняльно-історичний метод був провідним методом у мовознавстві. Він зберігає актуальність і сьогодні.

Ключові слова: порівняльно-історичний метод, порівняльно-історичне мовознавство (компаративістика), зміст, структура, онтологічний, операційний і телеологічний компоненти, генезис, еволюція, етапи.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. Москва : Сов. энциклопедия, 1966. 608 с.

Глущенко В. А. Принципи порівняльно-історичного дослідження в українському і російському мовознавстві (70-і рр. ХІХ ст. − 20-і рр. ХХ ст.). Донецьк, 1998. 222 с.

Глущенко В. Лінгвістичний метод і його структура. *Мовознавство.* 2010. № 6. С. 32−44.

Глущенко В. А. Порівняльно-історичний метод в українському та російському мовознавстві ХІХ ст. 30-х рр. ХХ ст. : монографія. Слов'янськ : Вид-во Б. І. Маторіна, 2017. 255 с.

Глущенко В. А., Роман В. В., Руденко М. Ю. До питання про актуалістичний метод як метод студій із лінгвістичної історіографії. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія: Філологія.* 2020. № 45. Т. 1. С. 90−93.

Глущенко В. А. Принципи й підходи у структурі порівняльно-історичного методу. *Науковий вісник Південноукраїнського національного педагогічного університету ім. К. Д. Ушинського. Лінгвістичні науки* : збірник наукових праць / [гол. ред. О. І. Іліаді]. 2023. № 36. С. 70−82.

Десницкая А. В., Серебренников Б. А. (ред.). Вопросы методики сравнительно-исторического изучения индоевропейских языков / [отв. А. В. Десницкая]. Москва : Изд-во АН СССР, 1956. 323 с.

Журавлев В. К. Диахроническая фонология. Москва : Наука, 1986. 232 с.

Климов Г. А. Методика лингвогенетических исследований (Введение). *Общее языкознание : методы лингвистических исследований.* Москва : Наука, 1973. С. 9−33.

Климов Г. А. Основы лингвистической компаративистики. Москва : Наука, 1990. 168 с.

Ковалик І. І., Самійленко С. П. Загальне мовознавство : історія лінгвістичної думки. Київ : Вища школа, 1985. 216 с.

Мельничук О. С. (ред.). Етимологічний словник української мови. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982−2012. Т. 1−6.

Нерознак В. П. Сравнительно-исторический метод. *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь* / [гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева]. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. С. 485−486.

Постовалова В. И. Историческая фонология и ее основания: опыт логико-методологического анализа. Москва : Наука, 1978. 203 с.

Glushchenko V. A. The Principle of Historicism and the Origins of the Comparative-Historical Method. *Науковий вісник Південноукраїнського національного педагогічного університету ім. К. Д. Ушинського. Лінгвістичні науки* : збірник наукових праць / [гол. ред. О. І. Іліаді]. 2024. № 39. С. 18−34.