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Editors’ Foreword

There has in the later decades of the 20th century been an increasing awareness in the field of theoretical linguistics of the value in modern work of an appreciation of the views, findings, and insights of our predecessors through the ages. This book aims to present within the compass of a single volume a comprehensive history of the language sciences. Hitherto, works in this field have tended to concentrate on major periods of the history of Western linguistics. In our Concise History of the Language Sciences (henceforward CHoLS) an effort has been made to go beyond the traditional Eurocentric accounts which include the work of Indian grammarians only in the context of the discovery of the Indo-European language family by European scholars in the late eighteenth century, or which at times include a small chapter of classical Arabic linguistics as an alibi rather than because a dedicated effort is made to break through the Western (claim to) hegemony. Breaking with this tradition should need no justification. A proper understanding of mankind’s reflections on the nature of language involves an awareness of the fact that there has been sophisticated discussion of the subject in all the great civilizations of antiquity. Moreover, whatever the geographical origin of linguistic theories developed in the twentieth century that have attracted international attention — and it would be going against the facts to deny that this is almost exclusively Europe and North America — it is the case that a number of these theories have benefited from insights developed in distant parts of the world in ancient times. Of these the best known example is probably Leonard Bloomfield, who stated in a number of his publications that he was making use of concepts and techniques that were to be found in Panini’s work on Sanskrit produced some two and a half millennia ago, but he is by no means an isolated figure in this respect. Because a reasonably full account of all the linguistic treatises composed outside Europe in ancient times would fill a whole volume on its own, it has nevertheless been necessary to impose some restrictions on coverage, and the concentration has been on those traditions that one might claim have the greatest international relevance. Otherwise space would have been needed for, among others, the early Tibetan grammarians, the Korean, Burmese and Old Javanese linguistic traditions and early works in several of the regional languages of India, including those in three major Dravidian languages in addition to Tamil.

With the range of topics that have been covered, CHoLS is intended to complement recent, multi-volume histories of linguistics, two of them still in progress, beginning with Geschichte der Sprachtheorie edited by Peter Schmitter of Münster since 1987 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr), of which the first two volumes have been published, one dealing with issues of methodology of linguistic historiography, the other with Western antiquity. Another series of volumes, under the editorship of Sylvain Auroux of Paris, Histoire des idées linguistiques has also brought out two volumes thus far (Brussels: Mardaga, 1989, 1992), with a third and concluding volume scheduled to appear in the course of 1995. Like Schmitter’s and Auroux’s volumes, those edited since 1990 by Giulio C. Lepschy of Reading, Storia della linguistica (Bolonga: II Mulino), whose third and last volume appeared late in 1994, comprise chapters devoted to major periods of the history of (almost exclusively) Western linguistics written by acknowledged specialists in these areas.
Editors' Foreword

The geographical spread in CHoLS is much narrower for more recent periods than that for distant ages, particularly with regard to the early nineteenth century onward. This is because of the important changes in the history of linguistics that occurred from that period through the development of comparative and historical linguistics in Central Europe, and the subsequent spread of these new approaches into most regions of the world may be taken to justify the stronger focus on Western linguistics in the latter half of CHoLS. The shift towards synchronic linguistics at the beginning of the twentieth century, as the ‘Saussurean revolution’ began to unfold, adds to the justification for this choice. In the twentieth century linguistics has come to mean ‘Western linguistics’ for better or worse. It should at the same time not be forgotten that many distinguished contributions to this modern linguistic scene have been made by scholars from all the continents. In this sense, perhaps, what we are seeing is a new ‘world linguistics’.

Because of such considerations, we have seen fit to include an entire section on various trends, schools, and theoretical frameworks developed in Europe, North America and Australasia over the past 70 or so years. Here, again, considerations of space have necessitated that a selection be made. Choice has concentrated on those approaches in linguistic theory which can be expected to have some direct relevance to work being done at the beginning of the twenty-first century or those of which a knowledge is needed for a full understanding of the history of the linguistic sciences through the last half of the present century. In the final section of the book, there is coverage of some of the areas in which the findings of the linguistic sciences have been applied in important and significant ways.

This book is based on articles which originally appeared in The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (published in 10 volumes in 1994 by Pergamon Press, Oxford), for which E. F. K. Koerner was subject editor for the History of Linguistics and R. E. Asher, Editor-in-Chief. One chapter, on the Hebrew Grammatical Tradition, is entirely new, and thanks are due to Professor David Téné of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, for taking up the challenge of writing it. All the already existing articles have been revised and updated where necessary, and some have been significantly modified and enlarged, notably W. John Hutchins’ “Machine Translation: A Brief History”, Stefan Kaiser’s “Linguistic Thought in Japan”, J. M. Y. Simpson’s “Prague School Phonology”, and Kamil V. Zvelebil’s “Tamil Linguistic Tradition”. In the case of the articles contributed to the Encyclopedia by the late Fred W. Householder, Professor Daniel Taylor of Lawrence University kindly agreed to undertake whatever modifications he felt were called for. We are grateful to him as well as all other contributors for their cooperation and their ready support of the present project.

Finally, the editors of CHoLS would like, on the one hand, to acknowledge the generous support received over the years from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in Ottawa and to express gratitude to The University of Hong Kong and Professor John E. Joseph, Head of its Department of English, for having provided the kind of environment that makes one pull all one’s intellectual strengths together; and on the other to express appreciation to The University of Edinburgh and to the International Christian University, Tokyo, for providing pleasant and stimulating environments for writing and research during the preparation of this volume.

E. F. K. K. 
Hong Kong 

R. E. A. 
Tokyo 

March 1995
SECTION I

General
A discipline comes of age when it seriously contemplates its own past. The ‘History of Linguistics’ (HoL)—frequently also referred to as ‘History of the Language Sciences’—is an attempt to steer away from a narrow view of ‘linguistic science.’ HoL as a bona fide subject of academic research (in which doctoral dissertations can be written, for instance) began to develop only during the late 1960s, though such work had previously been done in departments of Germanic, Romance, or Slavic where such research surveys were at times undertaken to delineate the course a particular field had taken or the evolution of a specific idea or research project. It has been customary at least since the 1880s to add an historical introduction to textbooks in linguistics, but usually the intent has been to show the significance of recent advances in the field compared with previous endeavors. During the 1960s, following various claims made by Noam Chomsky that his own theories had little to do with the pursuits of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, but instead follow quite different traditions such as those of the Port Royal Grammar (see Port-Royal Tradition of General Grammar) and of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the bulk of the dissertations written in HoL were devoted to just these areas of interest, at times seriously distorting the true intent and purpose of these earlier authors. During the 1960s, following various claims made by Noam Chomsky that his own theories had little to do with the pursuits of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, but instead follow quite different traditions such as those of the Port Royal Grammar (see Port-Royal Tradition of General Grammar) and of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the bulk of the dissertations written in HoL were devoted to just these areas of interest, at times seriously distorting the true intent and purpose of these earlier authors. Only from the 1970s onwards, following the creation of the first journal for this particular field of interest in 1973, Historiographia Linguistica, and the associated monograph series united under the umbrella title ‘Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science,’ did serious work begin to emerge that challenged this pro-domo type of history-writing. These and other organized activities (on which further information is given below) led to the much more recent field of study, now generally referred to as ‘Historiography of Linguistics’ (see the next article) or ‘Linguistic Historiography’ for short, an approach to HoL which is conscious of methodological and epistemological requirements in adequate history-writing in linguistics as in any science. (Most of the contributions to the two-volume Historiography of Linguistics published in 1975 under the main editorship of Thomas A. Sebeok were little else but surveys of previous scholarship; ‘historiography’ there being used in the old sense of the term; the volume edited by Parret in 1976 followed largely the Chomskyan manner of misappropriating the history of linguistics for ‘political’ purposes.)

It is true that one would perhaps by now speak of a 200-year tradition of linguistic history writing, perhaps beginning with François Thurot’s (1768–1832) 1796 Tableau des progrès de la science grammaticale (cf. Andresen 1978), though several earlier works have been cited, for instance, Elias Caspar Reichard’s (1714–91) Versuch einer Historie der deutschen Sprachkunst of 1747 (cf. Koerner 1978a: vi, for references to other eighteenth-century works). However, as the record suggests, it is only from the late 1860s onwards that a more thorough type of treatment of HoL emerges, of which Theodor Benfey’s (1809–81) Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft of 1869 may be regarded as the most outstanding example. It had been preceded by Heymann Steinthal’s (1823–99) work of 1863, which sought to supersede Laurenz Lersch’s (1811–49) three-volume Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten (1838–41), but which dealt only with the contributions of Greece and Rome to linguistic thought. Benfey’s history of linguistics was followed by other influential works such as Raumer (1870), Delbrück (1882[1880]), and Bursian (1883), which, however, were more limited in scope. The same could be said of books such as Thomsen (1902; German translation, 1927), Delbrück (1904), Trabalza (1908), Jellinek (1913), Pedersen (1916; English translation, 1983), Pedersen (1924; English translation, 1931), Drăganu (1945; Italian translation, 1970), or Robins (1951) from the first half of the twentieth century (for detailed descriptions of these books, see Koerner 1978a).

New endeavors and, at times, more insightful stud-
ies in HoL appeared in the 1960s, perhaps beginning with Paul Diderichsen's (1905–64) work on his compatriot Rask of 1960 (German translation, 1976). It was followed by works such as Ivic (1963; English translation, 1965), Leroy (1963; English translation 1967), Tagliavini (1963), Malmberg (1964). Lepschys (1966; English translation, 1970), Mounin (1967), Robins (1967), Coseiri (1969, 1972), Helbig (1970), Szemerényi (1971), Jankowsky (1972), and others (see Koerner 1978a for a full list). Yet most of them relied uncritically on earlier accounts and rarely ventured into questions of historiographical method or touched upon matters concerning the philosophy of science, except perhaps for a fashionable nod to Kuhn's Structure of Scientific Revolutions of 1962.

Looking back on the history-writing of linguistics since the 1880s, it is possible to discern three distinct types, each associated with particular motives for engaging in such activity and each occurring at specific periods in the development of the discipline. A fourth type (argued for in, e.g., Koerner 1976) has begun developing only since the late twentieth century (see the subsequent article for details).

First, there is the type of history written at a time when a particular generation or an individual representing the ideas, beliefs and commitments of his or her generation to a significant extent is convinced that a desired goal has been reached and that subsequent work in the field will mainly be concerned with what T. S. Kuhn has referred to as ‘mopping-up operations.’ These accounts assumed that the theoretical framework had been sufficiently mapped out for the ordinary member of the scientific community to conduct his or her investigations and that there was no longer any need for a revision of the methodology or the approach to the subject matter under analysis; they were summing-up histories which viewed the evolution of the field as growing in a more or less unilinear fashion.

This idea of, or motive for, writing such a history seems to be best expressed in Benfey’s voluminous Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischn Philologie (1869), appearing one year after Schleicher’s untimely death, but also by Raumer’s Geschichte der germanischen Philologie (1870). It is difficult in the 1990s to recreate the atmosphere of the late 1860s even if one limits oneself to linguistic matters abstracting from external, e.g., sociopolitical, currents: histories available in the late twentieth century supply one with little, if any, information on this pre-neogrammarian period. Suffice it to recall for the present purpose that the works of Bopp, Rask, Grimm, and others had been significantly synthesized and methodologically developed by the generation of Georg Curtius (1820–85) and, especially, August Schleicher (1821–68), to the extent that one might speak of a ‘paradigm’ change having taken place at that time, of which the neogrammarians tenets of historical linguistic research associated with the names of their former students, notably Karl Brugmann (1849–1919) and August Leskien (1840–1916) were the logical, if somewhat overstated, outcome.

A similar observation about the motives of history-writing, it would seem, could be made about Holger Pedersen’s (1867–1953) 1924 history of the achievements of nineteenth-century Indo-Europeans, which was preceded by a similar and somewhat shorter account of his first published in 1916, the year of the completion of the second edition of Brugmann and Delbrück’s Grundriss as well as the appearance of Saussure’s Cours. The feeling of the need of such a summing-up history is expressed more clearly, perhaps, in Wilhelm Streitberg’s (1865–1925) voluminous undertaking, entitled Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft seit ihrer Begründung durch Franz Bopp. However, this is in fact more of a résumé of the work accomplished in the various branches of Indo-European philology by that time than a regular HoL (cf. Koerner 1978a: 16–17, for details). Begun in 1916, the enterprise was abandoned after 1936.

After World War II, it appears that the histories by Malmberg (1964), Ivic (1965), Leroy (1963), and others fulfilled a similar function of summing up previous attainments in linguistic science. This time the focus of attention was the post-1916 period in the history of linguistics, following the success story of Saussure’s Cours, with its perceived emphasis on a non-historical approach to language. The neogrammarians framework of linguistic research was propounded in the histories of Pedersen, the organizational efforts of Streitberg from 1916 onwards, and other less influential books—and one may add that Pedersen, a second-generation neogrammarian, reflects the alleged ‘data-orientation’ of that school much more emphatically than the original group of scholars (note that neither Delbrück’s Einleitung nor Paul’s Prinzipien are even mentioned in his 300-page study of 1924). Only in the second half of the twentieth century (Jankowsky 1972, Einhauser 1990) have the neogrammarians received a more adequate treatment. By the same token, the histories of Malmberg, Ivic, Leroy, and other similarly slanted studies of the 1960s put forward particular post-Saussurean trends as the most significant achievements of the discipline to date, whether Copenhagen-type, Pragman, or Bloomfieldian. Their endeavor, like that of Benfey, Raumer, Pedersen, Streitberg, and others from an earlier stage in the development of linguistics, was to a large extent the presentation of a framework of research in which they themselves had been brought up, and, concomitantly, an attempt to maintain the strength and impact of the structuralist mode of thought.

The second type of history-writing activity may be characterized by the intention on the part of an indi-
vidual usually in his thirties (not late forties or above, as is generally the case with the first type), again representing a particular group, to launch a campaign opposing previously cherished views and still prevailing doctrines. Thus in contrast to Benfey (1869), for example, Berthold Delbrück's (1842–1922) 1880 *Einleitung* served, together with Paul's *Principien* of the same year, as the mouthpiece of a new generation of scholars eager to demonstrate that their achievements significantly surpassed previous attainments in the field, and that their theories rightfully replaced those taught by the preceding generation of linguists. The claim in favor of discontinuity is what characterizes this type of activity, and Delbrück's book is a prime example of this endeavor. Typically, Schleicher was depicted by Delbrück as representing the conclusion of the phase of comparative-historical grammar inaugurated by Franz Bopp in 1816, and the *Junggrammatiker*, with whom he associated himself early in his career (soon after he had received Schleicher's chair at the University of Jena in 1873), as marking a decisive new turn in the field.

No comparable history of linguistics was written in the 1930s or 1940s with regard to structuralism, but a look into Bloomfield's *Language* (1933) or Gray's *Foundations of Language* (1939) clearly suggests that the chapters devoted to HoL were an attempt to redress the development of the discipline and to document the superiority of the structuralist approach to any other theory or method hitherto put forward. This endeavor to prove earlier views to be utterly insufficient and inadequate has by no means been abandoned by adherents of the prevailing modes of linguistic thinking. On the contrary, it can easily be shown that their advocates have been eager not only to revive an interest in the history of linguistics itself but also to rewrite it to an extent that the ideas of the generation immediately preceding the present one appear the least worthy of attention. As a matter of fact, what C. F. Voegelin felicitously termed the 'eclipsing stance' that transformational-generative grammar had embarked on was best illustrated by Noam Chomsky himself, for instance in his 1962 lecture at the Ninth International Congress of Linguists held in Cambridge, Mass. (Chomsky 1964). Soon thereafter, a number of his followers ardently engaged themselves in writing their particular view of history; compare the articles by Dingwall (1963), Bach (1965), or Bierwisch (1966). In 1980, Frederick Newmeyer published a book which constitutes the best example to date of this *pro-domo*, whiggish type of history-writing. It selects and reinterprets past linguistic research in an attempt to prove his view that linguistics was made a science only in 1955 or in 1957, and by Chomsky, and that previous work was totally inadequate, barring a few minor incidental insights foreshadowing the 'revolution' in the field (cf. Koerner 1983, for a critical assessment of this kind of activity).

Newmeyer's *Linguistics in America* (1980) appeared exactly 100 years after Delbrück's *Einleitung*, and the parallels between their authors are striking indeed: both were less than 40 when they wrote their books; both were primarily interested in syntax, not phonology, and neither had done his doctorate at the respective centers of the schools whose success story they depicted.

While Type I history-writing may appear more benign as it seeks to represent matter-of-fact accounts (though one should not be too sure about this), Type II HoL can best be described as propagandistic in nature; the most successful example of this type is Chomsky's 1966 *Cartesian Linguistics*. This book presents the author's views regarding the ancestry of his own theories so brilliantly that many a young student of language was carried away by this new vision of history. Still today, one may discover a considerable amount of useful information in the histories written for the purpose of summing up previous work in the field, viz. the accounts by Benfey, Raumer, Pedersen, and others—although one may have become quite aware of their biases and shortcomings (for an assessment of these works, see Hoeningswald 1986 and Koerner 1990), whereas histories of the second category are already dated. It appears that, once their propagandistic purpose has been satisfied in proselytizing for the new ideology, the remainder rapidly loses its initial interest and apparent informational worth.

There is a third type of HoL which is intended neither to advocate a particular framework or 'paradigm' nor to attempt to provide an argument in favor of a scientific revolution within the discipline. This type may occur at any time in the development of a particular field of research since its ultimate intent is less partisan than in the other two instances and often more holistic in attitude, though the motivation behind the work may be fairly personal. The best example appears to be Arens's 1955 *Sprachwissenschaft*, in which an attempt was made to delineate the development of Western linguistic thought from the early discussions of the Greeks about the nature of language to contemporary linguistic work, certainly with a view to indicating not only that the discipline has come a long way to gain those insights which are now cherished and the methods that have been developed, but also that they have been built, knowingly or not, on the findings of previous generations of linguists, and that much more is owed to these scholars than one might ever become fully aware of.

While this Type III manner of presenting the HoL might well have been the result of a very personal choice, it appears that it expressed the endeavor of a whole generation of scholars, namely, the rebuilding of a discipline after its almost total destruction through a world war. Taken in this way, Pedersen's 1924 book may well be included in the third category in that it sought to re-establish a linguistic tradition
which in his belief could continue to serve as a sound basis for subsequent work in the field.

Undoubtedly, other, often non-linguistic, motives played a role in presenting the history of the discipline in one way or another. Thus it should be recalled that particular socioeconomic conditions, historical events, or political situations have often had a considerable influence on the motivation of writing the history of a particular discipline or the acceptance of a seemingly new theoretical framework of research or mode of thought—and in this respect histories of linguistics have failed to increase our awareness of the impact of matters or events outside the field. The works of Benfey and Raumer, for instance, were highly motivated by the rise of German nationalism and the aspiration to national unity if not superiority. Similarly, Malkiel (1969:557) rightly observed that the success of Saussure’s Cours ‘cannot be properly measured without some allowance for the feelings of that time: The acceptance of the leadership of a French-Swiss genius connoted for many Westerners then opposed to Germany a strongly desired, rationalized escape from the world of Brugmann, Leskien, Osthoff, and Paul.’

Despite the respect scholars may have for works of the third type, in particular Arens’s Problemgeschichte, some have felt a need for yet a fourth type of history-writing (e.g., Koerner 1976[1972]; Simone 1975[1973]), namely, the presentation of the linguistic past as an integral part of the discipline itself and, at the same time, as an activity founded on well-defined principles which can rival, in terms of soundness of method and rigor of application, those of linguistics itself. This fourth type, now usually referred to as ‘linguistic historiography’ or, more properly, the ‘historiography of linguistics’ holds that the history of linguistics should not merely be subservient to the discipline, but ought to assume a function comparable to that of the history of science for the natural scientist. In short, while recognizing the important distinction between chronicle and history which in his belief could continue to serve as a sound basis for subsequent work in the field.

Undoubtedly, other, often non-linguistic, motives played a role in presenting the history of the discipline in one way or another. Thus it should be recalled that particular socioeconomic conditions, historical events, or political situations have often had a considerable influence on the motivation of writing the history of a particular discipline or the acceptance of a seemingly new theoretical framework of research or mode of thought—and in this respect histories of linguistics have failed to increase our awareness of the impact of matters or events outside the field. The works of Benfey and Raumer, for instance, were highly motivated by the rise of German nationalism and the aspiration to national unity if not superiority. Similarly, Malkiel (1969:557) rightly observed that the success of Saussure’s Cours ‘cannot be properly measured without some allowance for the feelings of that time: The acceptance of the leadership of a French-Swiss genius connoted for many Westerners then opposed to Germany a strongly desired, rationalized escape from the world of Brugmann, Leskien, Osthoff, and Paul.’

Despite the respect scholars may have for works of the third type, in particular Arens’s Problemgeschichte, some have felt a need for yet a fourth type of history-writing (e.g., Koerner 1976[1972]; Simone 1975[1973]), namely, the presentation of the linguistic past as an integral part of the discipline itself and, at the same time, as an activity founded on well-defined principles which can rival, in terms of soundness of method and rigor of application, those of linguistics itself. This fourth type, now usually referred to as ‘linguistic historiography’ or, more properly, the ‘historiography of linguistics’ holds that the history of linguistics should not merely be subservient to the discipline, but ought to assume a function comparable to that of the history of science for the natural scientist. In short, while recognizing the important distinction between chronicle and history which in his belief could continue to serve as a sound basis for subsequent work in the field, which only too often tended to be partisan-histories, if not what Henry Butterfield termed ‘Whig-histories’ (see also Historiography of Linguistics, sect. 1.2), and partly because previous histories did not provide a usable guide for the adequate treatment of past developments in the history of the language sciences, and thus failed to provide a better understanding of where the theories of the late twentieth century may lead us to.

Another indication of the History of Linguistics having become a mature field of scholarly endeavor is its professionalization. In 1978 the first International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS) was held in Ottawa, Canada, the same year in which the Société d’Histoire et d’Epistémologie des Sciences du Langage (S.H.E.S.L.) was founded in Paris. In 1984, the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas (HSS) was established in Oxford, and several similar international and regional societies have been launched since; for instance, the North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences (NAAHoLS) which was launched late in 1987. In the meantime further ICHoLS meetings have been held in 1981 (Lille, France), 1984 (Princeton, NJ), 1987 (Trier, Germany), 1990 (Galway, Ireland), and 1993 (Washington, DC). In addition to Historiographia Linguistica, a second journal with similar goals, entitled Histoire–Epistémologie–Langage, was established in Paris in 1979, and in 1991, a third journal, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft, was launched in Münster, Germany. In short, if the professionalization of the subject is any guide, the History of Linguistics has become a widely recognized and practiced field of scholarly research.
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Historiography of Linguistics

E. F. K. Koerner

Historiography of Linguistics in the sense of ‘principled manner of writing the history of the study of language,’ and not in the (perhaps more traditional) sense of ‘merely recording the history of linguistic research,’ is of recent vintage. It is to be kept distinct from ‘History of Linguistics’ (HoL) or ‘History of the Language Sciences.’ Thus, ‘Historiography of Linguistics’ is more than a term describing the activity of history-writing although it is of course concerned with this activity. ‘History of Linguistics,’ the field of study concerned with delineating the development of the science of language from its early beginnings to present-day commitments in the field, has, it appears, come into its own in recent years. The establishment of scholarly societies devoted to the history of linguistics, both in Europe and North America, is just one such sign, to which should be added the various specialized international meetings which have taken place since the late 1970s, notably the triennial International Conferences on the History of the Sciences of Language (ICHoLS): Ottawa, Canada (1978), Lille, France (1981), Princeton, U.S.A (1984), Trier, Germany (1987), Galway, Ireland (1990), Washington, D.C. (1993), and Oxford, England (1996). Other indications of the subject’s approaching maturity are that a number of scholars have begun to take a serious interest in questions of method and epistemology of linguistic historiography, which had its first organized discussion in the late 1960s, when Thomas S. Kuhn’s The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962) began to make its impact on the history of linguistics (Hymes 1974). Individual book-length efforts (Koerner 1978; Grotsch 1982; Schmitter 1982) were followed by colloquia and collective volumes devoted to the subject (Dutz & Kaczmarek 1985; Schmitter 1987; Hüllen 1990; Dominicy 1991), and one should like to see that the debate continues, as one cannot yet say that a viable manner of procedure, and a canon of historiographic research in linguistics that is widely accepted by the scholarly community, has been established to any satisfactory degree. In the meantime, it is quite legitimate for linguistic historiographers to look outside their own field for guidelines and models to imitate. It is important to realize, however, that
the historians of linguistics because of the particular nature of the subject of investigation, namely theories of language (as well as theories of linguistics) and their evolution through time, must find their own framework, their methodology and epistemology, and cannot expect to be able to apply methods and insights from other fields directly to their own subject of investigation, as may become clear below.

To R. G. Collingwood and others (e.g., Croce) is owed the important distinction between chronicle and history. It is important to go a step further and distinguish between history and historiography. Few historical treatments of linguistics written up to the late twentieth century have outlined, not to say anything of having developed, a usable guide according to which the researcher in the field should and could operate without repeating the shortcomings, errors, and serious distortions of previous accounts. For the establishment of a historiography of linguistic thought, it must be stated that it is by no means sufficient to be well versed in matters linguistic in order to qualify as a historian of the discipline. As a matter of fact, until today the history of linguistics has suffered considerably from amateur work performed by distinguished students of language who turned their interest to this particular aspect of the discipline. Malkiel (1969: 532) spoke about the ‘dual expertise’ with which the historian of a given science must be equipped, namely, in addition to ‘the specific knowledge of a scientific [...] domain,’ she or he ‘ought to know a good deal about the intellectual history (embedded within the matrix of general history).’ The historiographer of linguistics, however, needs more than this dual expertise which must be regarded as the conditio sine qua non for anyone engaging in the research of past events in the development of linguistics.

Undoubtedly, the setting up of the very bases of a historiography of linguistics, a field of inquiry whose biases should be only in favor of re-establishing the most important facts of our linguistic past sine ira et studio and explaining, as much as possible, the reasons for the changes of direction and emphasis, and for possible discontinuity that can be observed, places high demands on individual scholarship, breadth of scope, and depth of learning, requiring an almost encyclopedic knowledge on the part of the investigator, given the almost interdisciplinary nature of this activity. Furthermore, it demands a capacity for synthesis, a faculty for distilling the essentials from the mass of empirical facts that may be gleaned from the primary sources. In other words, to use a contemporary distinction, the historiography of linguistics has to be ‘theory-oriented,’ not ‘data-oriented,’ though no doubt much reading of the original sources still will have to be done in order to establish adequately the basic facts in the development of the discipline. This has not been done to any satisfactory extent even for that century, the nineteenth, on which modern Western linguistics has built, whether speaking of the Neogrammarians and their work or those linguistic trends which followed Humboldtian ideas of language and mind, a tradition which has hardly been recognized in its full scope in present-day histories of linguistics. In effect, much of the job of presenting the history of linguistics in a scientific manner still needs to be done, the many efforts, individual or collective (e.g., Schmitter 1987; Auroux 1989–95; Lepschy 1993–95) notwithstanding.

Already during the early 1970s several scholars interested in the history of linguistics as an academic specialty endeavored to propose guidelines for the proper conduct of historiographic research (e.g., Hymes 1974; Simone 1975; Koerner 1976). At the time Kuhn’s book (1962) had a considerable impact on the debate, resulting in much of the discussion centering on the question of to what extent Kuhn’s morphology of scientific revolutions could provide a useful guide to the historian of linguistics. This discussion appears to have subsided during the later 1970s, possibly as a result of Percival’s (1976) paper which argued against the search for ‘paradigms’ in linguistics without, however, offering any alternative route. There are of course a number of reasons why Kuhn had been so enthusiastically embraced by various social and behavioral scientists, although Kuhn’s book was meant for the natural sciences, in particular theoretical physics. They include lack of acquaintance with the work of other, earlier and contemporary, philosophers of science and historians, lack of precision in many of Kuhn’s definitions (allowing for differing interpretations of his argument), and his emphasis on the social dynamics involved in such changes, which appealed especially to social scientists. In other words, it may have been in part because of the open-endedness of Kuhn’s book that it itself became paradigmatic. (Another reason for the success of Kuhn’s book among the social sciences seems to be due to the fact that Kuhn had derived a number of ingredients of his work, including the concept of ‘paradigm,’ from the intellectual disciplines.)

The 1980s saw a variety of studies offering alternative lines of historiographic conduct, entering the debate over the proper approach to the history of linguistics (e.g., Bahner 1981; Bokadorova 1986; Christmann 1987). However, until the early 1990s no common ground has been established as to how to proceed in linguistic historiography and indications are that the debate will continue for some time (e.g., Ellfers-van Ketel 1991, Part I). As a result, some of the positions and proposals that have been made by various authors outside linguistics and its history are analyzed before a variety of considerations are offered within which research in the history of the language sciences should be undertaken and past developments in the field presented.
1. Approaches to Linguistic Historiography

The search for the proper foundation of the historiography of linguistics has led to a number of differing proposals. These may have had their source in the particular area of study chosen by the researcher—no doubt it would make a difference whether one is studying the linguistic writings of the Middle Ages or the nineteenth century—as well as in the researcher’s Erkenntnisinteresse (‘research focus’). Those who enter the history of linguistics from the study of literature will, one may expect, offer different perspectives than someone coming from philosophy, history, or linguistics proper, not to mention those who enter linguistics from mathematics or the ‘hard’ sciences. The position advocated here is that a historian of linguistics should have linguistic training in order to have an adequate understanding of what the issues in this particular field are. Of course this is not enough. Too often late twentieth century linguists tend to project their interests and understanding of the subject back on past theories and, as a consequence, are apt to distort the issues and theoretical commitments of previous periods. Therefore the historiographer of linguistics has to familiarize himself or herself with more than the delineation of transmission of linguistic theory and practice and their changes through time.

1.1 History of Linguistics and Intellectual History

It appears that many scholars consider the History of Linguistics to be part of an overall History of Ideas. This impression may also be drawn from the fact that the Henry Sweet Society of Oxford, launched in 1984, carries ‘for the history of linguistic ideas’ as part of its name. It is a truism that the history of linguistics cannot be studied in a vacuum, simply as a succession of theories about language divorced from the general intellectual climate in which they were formulated. But the context must be still much wider and include an awareness of what other, neighboring as well as distant, disciplines were like at a given point in time. In short, too close an alignment of the History of Linguistics with the History of Ideas or a similar field of study does not appear to be a solution to the problem of finding the proper methodology for historiographical research in linguistics. For instance it appears revealing that as late as 1977, some forty years after the publication of Arthur O. Lovejoy’s (1873–1962) influential book The Great Chain of Being (1936), a paper was published in the Journal of the History of Ideas, founded by Lovejoy in 1940, whose author asserts:

On the whole, the methodology of the history of ideas is in its infancy. The field is in this respect behind general history, of which it is a part. One may therefore suggest that the interest of historians of ideas should be more directed towards the methodological problems of their field than has hitherto been the case. The reason is that when the foundation of a house is shaky, it does not make much sense continuously to add new stories to it. (Kvastad 1977: 174)

Unfortunately, Kvastad’s own proposals are far from satisfactory; the pseudo-formal apparatus and the ‘logical’ definitions which he offers do not seem to lead, at least in his paper, to any new insight or useful principles of research. But a discussion regarding the points of contact—and the epistemological differences—between the History of Linguistics and the History of Ideas, whether in the sense of Lovejoy (1936) or in the sense of ‘intellectual history’ (Mandelbaum 1965) need not be abandoned for good. Indeed, some may argue that certain work such as Dominick LaCapra’s Rethinking Intellectual History (1983) and much of his other writings could lead the historian of linguistics to new insights. However, if the exchange between one of his reviewers (Pagden 1988) and LaCapra (1988) is any guide, it appears that this line of work has progressed little beyond the discussion stage, and where it appears to be exemplified—at least in the case of LaCapra (see p. 680 and n. 3)—it produced analyses of literary or philosophical works, not intellectual history. As LaCapra himself concedes (1988: 678) his style is ‘often polemical,’ his objective being ‘to lay the groundwork for a more fruitful inter-change among intellectual, cultural, and social history’ and to defend ‘intellectual history against misguided attacks’ (p. 679). In short, it appears that the focus is still on epistemological and ‘attitudinal’ problems rather than methodological ones, so that one may wonder how much a historian can learn from these projects which are infiltrated by post-structuralist French thought, notably the work of Jacques Derrida, and which pretend to enter into ‘dialogical discourse’ with ‘past voices’ without realizing ‘that to converse with the past one must first attempt to reconstruct it—text or author’ (Pagden 1988: 526).

Interestingly enough, while attacking the work of those that follow the French histoire des mentalités program which, because of their emphasis on a given ‘mind set’ said to determine a given culture, has to resort to unspecified external pressures if they want to account for change, the work of LaCapra and others seems to lead to presentist accounts rather than to historical analysis.

The nature of linguistics as a field with a well-defined object—human language in all its manifestations—requires more than an association with or an inspiration from the History of Ideas—or the ‘History of Philosophy,’ for that matter. Passmore (1967) expresses himself against the idea, championed by Kristeller (1964), that historians rather than philosophers write the history of philosophical ideas, arguing that the ‘pure historian with no philosophical enthusiasm is almost certain to compose a doxography’ (1967: 229), i.e., an entirely detached chronological and biographical account of past philosophical
schools of thought. In this Passmore is in full agreement with the view expressed by Malkiel (1969), cited earlier.

In Koerner 1978, Carl Lotus Becker’s (1873–1945) concept of ‘climate of opinion’ was particularly useful in mapping out the intellectual atmosphere of a given period in which certain ideas flourished, were received, or rejected. Becker (1932: 5) exemplified his term in the following manner:

Whether arguments command assent or not depends less upon the logic that conveys them than upon the climate of opinion in which they are sustained. What renders Dante’s argument or St Thomas’s definition meaningless to us is not bad logic or want of intelligence, but the medieval climate of opinion—those instinctively held conceptions, in the broad sense, that Weltanschauung or world pattern—which imposed on Dante and St Thomas a peculiar use of the intelligence and a special type of logic. To understand why we cannot easily follow Dante or St Thomas it is necessary to understand (as well as may be) the nature of this climate of opinion.

Those working in the history of linguistics will surely have learned to appreciate Becker’s observation, though they will also have learned that not only the intellectual climate of a given period will have to be reconstructed but also a number of other factors that may have played a role in fostering certain views or theoretical positions. That is, if one is to obtain a better understanding of the general intellectual context in which particular theories are developed, then a broadly defined history of ideas may prove of use, but not a panacea.

1.2 History of Linguistics and the Philosophy, Theory and Practice of History

As suggested by Malkiel, general historical research and the discussions guiding it may have something to offer historians of linguistics. In this field of study the work of Hayden White has been referred to frequently in the late twentieth century—albeit not by linguistic historiographers as far as can be seen—as influential in the debate of proper historical method. In his book *Metahistory* White was celebrating the work of four nineteenth-century historians—Jules Michelet, Leopold von Ranke, Alexis de Tocqueville, Jacob Burckhardt—as representing ‘not only original achievements in the writing of history but also alternative models of what a “realistic” historiography might be’ (1973: 141). At the same time, White (p. 433) argued that ‘we are free to conceive “history” as we please, just as we are free to make of it what we will;’ thus suggesting, it would seem, that there are no criteria available to define the subject. In a collection of papers published five years later, he is found taking a ‘linguistic turn’ similar to LaCapra and others. Here he claims that ‘the conventional distinctions between “history” and “historism” are virtually worthless’ (White 1978: 101); instead, he ‘seeks to show that in the very lan-

*guage that the historian uses to describe his object of study, [...] he subjects that object of study to the kind of distinction that historians impose upon their materials in a more explicit and formal way’ (p. 102).

In other words, White is not much interested in actually writing history but in analyzing and criticizing the “discourses” of other historians or theorists of history, notably Michel Foucault—hence his predilection for ‘metahistory.’ In his collection of essays, subtitled ‘Narrative discourse and historical representation,’ White characterizes Foucault’s discourse as “positively” wide (if seemingly capricious) erudition [presented as] solemn disclosures of the “way things really were” aggressive redrawings of the map of cultural history, confident restructurings of the chronicle of “knowledge”’ (1987: 107). He does not venture into a discussion of how Foucault’s (1926–84) *Les mots et les choses*, for instance, might have contributed to the discussion of early nineteenth-century historical-comparative philology as constituting a new ‘épistémé’ in the history of linguistics.

Again, observations by ‘traditional’ historians at times more enlightening than the theoretical ‘discourses’ of modern theorists with literary aspirations have been found. For example, in discussing twentieth-century developments in linguistics and the manner they are presented, Herbert Butterfield’s (1900–79) description of the ‘Whig interpretation of history’ is particularly apt:

Through this system of immediate reference to the present-day, historical personages can easily be classed into the men who furthered progress and the men who tried to hinder it; so that a handy rule of thumb exists by which the historian can select and reject, and can make his points of emphasis. (Butterfield 1931: 11)

While some may think that ‘Whig history’ and/or ‘presentism’ are modern phenomena, they are found as long as history has been written. Again from a methodological point of view there does not seem to be much guidance from regular historians or philosophers or theorists of historical analysis available to the linguistic historiographer, in part because the subject of inquiry, theories about language as well as linguistics itself, is epistemologically quite distinct from historical events, their description, interpretation, and explanation.

1.3 Linguistic Historiography and History and Philosophy of Science

In contrast to intellectual history and the various approaches to the treatment of general history—though linguistic historiography has to take into proper account intellectual currents of a given period which may have impacted on linguistic thinking—the History and Philosophy of Science appears to have more to offer to the historian of linguistics, in part
because of its advances in epistemology and methodology. Evidently, Kuhn's (1962) morphology of scientific revolutions played an important part in the discussion (cf. Lakatos & Musgrave 1970). However, it seems widely agreed that the nature of (the conduct of) science and of the philosophy of science, whether it be in terms of the more recent paradigmatism (cf. also Laudan 1977) or traditional inductivism and its opposing philosophy of science, refutationism (Popper 1959, 1962), make their proposals interesting to the historian of linguistics. Of particular interest are proposals made by scholars such as Foucault (1970); Hesse (1963, 1980); Kuhn (1977); Lakatos (1974, 1978); Pandit (1983); Sneed (1971), and others (e.g., Krige 1980).

As an example of how observations made by historians of science could offer historians of linguistics fruit for thought, the following quotation is given. This statement was made some fifteen years ago by the British historian of science Martin Rudwick who—referring to Hesse (1963)—noted the following about the desirability of investigating what he terms 'creative analogies' in the development of a field of research, especially in its formative stage:

It is at least arguable that major cognitive innovation is most likely to emerge in the scientific work of individuals who choose to employ analogies that [...] are strongly external: that is, analogies that are furthest removed from the normal practice of the discipline concerned. This may happen when a scientific field scarcely yet deserves the name of discipline, because its practice is not yet strongly insulated and institutionalized.

(Rudwick 1979: 67)

Rudwick was writing about Charles Lyell's role in the development of geology as a science but his observation could well have characterized the situation that the early comparative-historical linguists at the beginning of the nineteenth century were facing. The displacement of concepts is to be reckoned with each time a scholar or scientist is concerned with developing something of a research program (Lakatos 1978). How else could s/he express him/herself in a new mode without resorting to analogies, metaphor, and borrowing from other fields of knowledge?

There are of course many other instances where the historian of linguistics can profit from reading historians and philosophers of science. Indeed, especially for nineteenth- and twentieth-century linguistics many of their findings could offer useful concepts and tools for research and actual history-writing. As said earlier, Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions has been singularly influential, not only in linguistics but also in anthropology and sociology. In programmatic statements made during the 1970s Kuhn's ideas are frequently referred to but nowhere is an uncritical application of his proposals to the history of linguistics suggested. Yet concepts such as 'paradigm' or, following Kuhn's own suggestion of 1970, 'disciplinary matrix,' 'normal science,' and 'scientific revolution' may still prove 'useful to the historian of linguistics if he does not press the argument to a point where it no longer makes sense' (Koerner 1989: 50). Needless to say, the same would apply, mutatis mutandis, to concepts and notions found in the works of other historians and philosophers of science, be it those in the line of Popper's refutationism or any other framework, for example, Mario Bunge's epistemological approach (1984).

1.4 Linguistic Historiography and Sociology of Science

Several years ago Roger Chartier complained about 'the almost tyrannical preeminence of the social dimension' in historical studies (quoted by Pagden 1988: 520). It seems therefore inescapable that the historian of linguistics should take note of work in the sociology of science (e.g., Merton 1973; Mulkins 1973; Amsterdamska 1987; Murray 1994), possibly even of the findings of 'Wissenssoziologie' (Stark 1991).

Again Kuhn's emphasis on the social nature of scientific revolutions played a role in the study of group formations in science—Kuhn spoke about the 'invisible college'—such as analyzed by Mulkins (1973) for biology and, following him, Murray (1994) for anthropology and linguistics. However, Amsterdamska's (1987) account of a hundred years of linguistics from Bopp to Saussure from a point of view of Mertonian sociology of science, while not without merit, has brought out little which has not been known—and accounted for—by historians of nineteenth-century linguistics, such as the important role of the system of higher education in Prussia for the institutionalization of the field.

Yet it remains true that the success story of the Junggrammatiker—or the followers of Noam Chomsky for that matter—cannot simply be explained in terms of the victory of one particular, supposedly novel, linguistic approach over another, although it cannot be denied that the replacement of the 'San­

scrito-centric' view of the Indo-European Ursprache by one giving ancient Greek and Latin more attention in phonological reconstruction played an important role in the change from the position upheld by Schleicher during the 1860s to the framework advocated by Brugmann and his associates from 1876 onwards (cf. Mayrhofer 1983). In other words, while certain proposals within a discipline have had their intrinsic merits, their wider acceptance within the research community has been helped by external factors, such as the considerable expansion of post-secondary education after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, as a similar drastic expansion of college education in the USA and also in Europe during the 1960s had a significant effect on the wide reception of the theories of Noam Chomsky during the period and the
subsequent decades. But again it seems that there is no particular methodological framework to be gained for linguistic historiography from the sociological approaches to science, apart from retaining an awareness of extra-disciplinary factors which frequently have an effect on the evolution of a given discipline, whether seemingly exact or less rigorously defined.

1.5 Towards a Synthesis of Differing Approaches

The above excursions into other historical fields, general history, intellectual history, history and philosophy of science, and sociological approaches to history have all made us aware that the history of linguistics can learn something from all these disciplines or subdisciplines. However, none of them alone can serve the linguistic historiographer as a guide in research. In fact, in the final analysis, historians of linguistic science will have to develop their own framework, both methodological and philosophical. In this effort, a thorough acquaintance with historical theory and practice in other fields will prove very useful indeed, even if the result is negative, in that the historian of linguistics discovers that this or that another field of historical investigation has in fact little to offer in matters of historiographical method.

Thus it appears that the History of Ideas provides little insight to the linguistic historiographer that would not be come upon; it provides a general recognition that linguistic theories are not developed in total isolation from the general intellectual climate of a period or the particular attitudes maintained by the society fostering scientific activity. In a similar vein, it may be recognized that at least a smattering in the sociology of science and, perhaps more importantly, an understanding of the dynamics of social networks within any scientific organization would do the historian of linguistics some good (Murray 1994).

More promising results, may come from exposure to the discussions conducted among philosophers and historians of science. Kuhn’s influential 1962 book has been invoked several times before, but the various reactions and counter-positions deserve comparable attention. The history of linguistics is not to be treated like a branch of the history of ideas, at least not with the advent of comparative-historical philology in the early nineteenth century. This is because linguistics, unlike philosophy, for example, is a science and that it has to do with (at times rather complex) theories, not merely general ideas about the nature of language. This assertion might require the historian of linguistics to enter into the debate about the scientific status of linguistics, at least where nineteenth- and twentieth-century linguistics is concerned. (For earlier periods of the study of language, preceding the scientific age ushered in by nineteenth-century natural science, other criteria may have to be developed; no doubt, the application of modern principles in the philosophy of science to these earlier periods is hazardous. Indeed, the understanding of what is ‘scientific’ and what constitutes ‘science’ may have to be redefined for different periods in the history of the discipline under investigation.)

The other, possibly complementary, avenues open to the historian of linguistics are to develop principles derived from historical practice. Thought is devoted to the development of particular models which may guide research, critical analysis of the work of predecessors, several of which have shaped much of the view of the past, and discussion of particular problems facing the researcher, such as the idea of ‘influence,’ the continuity/discontinuity debate or the question of ‘metalinguage’ in linguistic historiography, to cite just a few examples. In short, there is still much work to be done before the History of Linguistics will have become a Historiography of the Sciences of Language.

2. Developing Principles for Linguistic Historiography

The 1980s witnessed a lively debate on matters of historiographic methodology in the history of linguistics (see the papers brought together in Dutz & Kaczmarek 1985 and in Schmitter 1987); much of the earlier discussions—and controversies—has been surveyed by Ayres-Bennett (1987). Yet in the absence of accepted guidelines for the treatment of the history of linguistics (note however proposals made earlier by others, e.g., Simone 1975), an attempt should be made to develop principles of research and procedures of historiographical work in linguistics. In the meantime, concepts such as ‘disciplinary matrix’ and ‘climate of opinion,’ ‘continuity’ versus ‘discontinuity,’ ‘evolution’ versus ‘revolution,’ ‘mainstream’ versus ‘undercurrent,’ ‘data-orientation’ versus ‘theory-orientation,’ and others have become widely accepted terms even if there is not always unanimity with regard to their purport and the scope of their applicability.

There are a number of methodological—and epistemological—problems facing the linguistic historiographer. These include questions of periodization, contextualization, and research procedure generally as well as issues concerning shifts of emphasis in actual linguistic practice, the identification of different phases of development within a particular framework or wider periods of time, and the role of external, for instance socio-political, factors in the acceptance or rejection of particular theoretical frameworks. Their adequate discussion would require book-length treatment, so that the few selected topics presented below should simply be taken as examples of the complexity and range of the subjects the linguistic historiographer has to be a cheval with. At the same time, they may be taken to suggest that the principled treatment of the history of linguistics—linguistic historiography—is still far from having an established and widely practised frame of research conduct.
2.1 The Question of 'Metalanguage'

The use of present-day terminology in the depiction of earlier phases in the development of linguistic thought has led to a variety of problems in our understanding of past theories; Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics* (1966) is the best-known example of the distortion by a twentieth-century linguist of ideas about language held by seventeenth-, eighteenth- or nineteenth-century scholars. What the excitement of the 1960s and 1970s with Chomsky's interpretation had largely covered up became evident to every serious linguistic historiographer: that Chomsky's distortions were due to no small degree to the improper identification of terms and concepts of previous centuries with present-day definitions and concerns. It can easily be recognized that Chomsky's particular use of '(to) generate,' which has its source in mathematical work and translation theory of the 1950s, has little to do with Humboldt's idea of 'erzeugen,' which has its source in eighteenth-century psychology and philosophy of language. Unlike Chomsky, Humboldt did not view speech as the mechanical production of sentences by a high-powered machine (Chomsky's frequent disclaimers notwithstanding) but as the truly creative effort by the individual (in fact Humboldt had the artist and thinker in mind, not every-day small-talk). Considering the 150 or so years that separate Humboldt and Chomsky, this divergence of views is not at all unusual. But the linguistic historiographer must not only realize it but also account for it. Epistemological problems are no doubt involved here, but the most obvious point is the question of 'metalanguage,' that is the language employed to describe past ideas about language and linguistics.

When dealing with a given subject concerning the history of linguistics the writer cannot escape the issue when discussing theories of past periods, since an attempt is being made to render them accessible to present readers while at the same time trying not to distort their original intent and meaning. Unless the linguistic historiographer has nothing but an anti-quarian goal, namely to describe concepts developed many years ago solely within their own terms, there will be a temptation to use modern technical vocabulary in their analysis. This 'modernizing' procedure, however, has led to a number of serious distortions in the history of linguistics, and any discerning historiographer must realize the pitfalls and address this potential problem of the use of 'metalanguage.'

There are many examples in modern historical accounts of the ideas of past centuries where the ideas, concepts, and procedures were misunderstood, misrepresented, and distorted because of a lack of care taken by the author in the use of 'metalanguage.' Only too frequently have Saussurean notions of the arbitrariness of the sign been used to discuss Stoic 'semiotics' (as if these Greek thinkers had read *Cours* and the papers of C. S. Peirce to boot). Likewise, the (anonymous) authors of twelfth- and thirteenth-century tracts on Icelandic orthographic reform have been seen in the light of structural phonology (as if they had had access to Trubetzkoy's *Grundzüge*), the pedagogical intents of the Port-Royal grammarians have been interpreted as early examples of a 'generative' approach to syntax (as if they had seen Chomsky's *Aspects*), to mention just a few illusory examples (for further details, see Koerner 1995, ch. 2). The solution to the problem of the possible misuse of technical language by the linguistic historiographer may lie in the adoption of the following three principles, which admittedly go beyond the question of metalanguage:

(a) The first principle for the presentation of linguistic theories propounded in earlier (pre-twentieth-century) periods concerns the establishment of the general 'climate of opinion' of the period in question. Linguistic ideas have never developed independently of other intellectual currents of the time; what Goethe called the 'Geist der Zeiten' has always left its imprint on linguistic thinking. At times, the influence of the socio-economic and even political situation must be taken into account as well. (Consider the 'natural order' discussion of syntactic organization in eighteenth-century France, a discussion in which French was shown to be superior to other languages, and the political supremacy aspirations of France of the same period.) This first guideline may be called the 'principle of contextualization.'

(b) The next step the linguistic historiographer should take consists of endeavoring to establish a full understanding, both historical and critical, possibly even philological, of the linguistic text in question. It goes without saying that it is necessary to make abstraction from the individual's linguistic background and present-day commitments in linguistics. The general framework of the theory under investigation as well as the terminology used in the text must be defined internally and not with reference to modern linguistic doctrine. This consideration may be called the 'principle of immANCence.'

(c) Only after the first two principles have been followed so that a given linguistic pronouncement has been understood within its original historical context, may the historiographer venture to introduce modern approximations of the technical vocabulary and conceptual framework presented in the work in question. Maybe this last step could be termed the 'principle of adequation.' It is of course required that the historiographer must explain why and to what extent the late medieval concept of...