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INTRODUCTION BY THE GENERAL EDITOR OF THE SERIES
Waxing contemporary disenchantment with the value of functional notions in linguistics appears to be primarily due to votes of no-confidence in functional principles as having explanatory force. A few years short of a decade ago Chomsky's feelings about the utility of functional notions seemed to be mixed: on the one hand, where structures serve functions, functional notions are valuable; on the other, explaining structure in terms of functions appears impossible:

"(Structural dependence) seems to be a general property of an interesting class of linguistic rules, innate to the mind. Following what I take to be Searle's (1969) suggestion, let us try to account for it in terms of communication. I see no way of doing so. Surely this principle enters into the function of language; we might well study the ways in which it does. But a language could function for communication (or otherwise) just as well with structure-independent rules, so it would seem. For a mind differently constituted, structure-independent rules would be far superior, in that they require no abstract analysis of a sentence beyond words. I think that the example is typical. Where it can be shown that structures serve a particular function, that is a valuable discovery. To account for or somehow explain the structure of UG (universal grammar), or of particular grammars, on the basis of functional considerations is a pretty hopeless project, I would think..." (Chomsky 1975:57-58)
The Chomskyan challenge, in fact the original Praguian paradigm, is thus the discovery of relationships between structure and function, in one or several senses of the expression "function". Attempts to do this within the generative framework have been confronted with considerable opposition. Some have involved the incorporation of discourse features ranging from the syntactic representation of "points of view" in the interests of preserving already established, or thought to be established, syntactic conditions, to claims about the relevance of non-syntactic, or less syntactic notions, such as the abstractness of a fact or someone else's feelings, or, and these perhaps best thought of as extra-paradigmatic, others involving notions such as "theme" and "predictable and unpredictable information" (Kuno 1975) and aspects of language perception (Bever 1975), critically discussed and rejected in favor of an alternative approach entailing the notion of "symbiosis" (Dirven 1981), a biological import. By 1979 we have the indirect, but quite explicit, injunction to throw the notion "function" overboard. Chomsky (1979: 86ff.), understanding "functionalism" to mean that the use of language influences its form, comments that, to his knowledge, "no functional principle with very great plausibility has yet been proposed, concluding that "...there is no sensible way to invoke functional notions as explanatory, concepts at the synchronic or ontogenetic levels...". This introductory note is devoted to the premise that an undifferentiated notion of function, monolithically equating it simply with "use", blurs the vision of the concept as projected in myriad ways by the papers collected in this volume and those they directly or indirectly inspired aspects of which I would like to discuss, albeit highly selectively and fragmentarily.
Vilém Mathesius, in his "On the potentiality of the phenomena of language" (1911), admonishes against mixing up the methods used for language study with the nature of language itself and pleads for the study of what today would be called "performance":

"Even more important - at least in the present-day stage of linguistic research - than the protest against mixing up the methodological simplification of language with its actual makeup should be the emphasis to be laid on the manner in which the potentiality of language phenomena is actually manifested, i.e. on the static oscillation of the speech of the individual."

It appears the greater the extent to which performance phenomena, described and explained in terms of a viable conception of the sound-meaning relationship, are viewed as covarying with functional considerations, the closer we will come to the realization of Mathesius' program, and this only in due deference to the notion that the linguistic sign is inextricably embedded in a social matrix, affirmed emphatically by Karl Bühler (1927). A recent commentator on Bühler (Innis 1982:6) writes:

"Throughout all Bühler's work, the central and ever-recurring thesis is the irreducible social matrix of meaning in both the human and non-human spheres. Bühler wanted to argue, in a way analogous to the work of Mead, that the origin of meaning and the conditions of sense is to be found not in the individual but in society or social life as lived (Gemeinschaft) and that, as a matter of fact, there is an intrinsic reference to meaning (as embodied in objective structures) - a constitutive semantic factor - in all animal or human social life."

A quintessential, but hitherto grossly neglected notion
(see below) is that the members of society are guided by the attitudes which they exhibit toward one another, which attitudes covary with behaviors including language performance. The irreducibles of social life are sign-senders and sign receivers guiding each other ultimately by their attitudes.

Mathesius, sixteen years later in his "New currents and tendencies in linguistic research" (1927), restates the case for the static, i.e. synchronic, approach to language in terms of its relevance to the study of function, the emotional elements of language, the covariation of linguistic facts, the study of language tendency and linguistic characterology, where static considerations of coexistent and interdependent linguistic facts lead to explanations of historical changes. The study concludes with a fascinating account of what Mathesius calls the "double-faced" character of linguistic phenomena, the continuous fluctuation of the general or conventional and the individual, a topic resurrected for detailed, although partial and preliminary discussion, in the unorthodox and captivating collection Individual differences in language ability and language behavior (Fillmore, Kempler, and Wang 1979). Mathesius' comment that:

"Linguistic research work can either concentrate on what has become a common possession of all members of the linguistic community or it can study the individual efforts of linguistic creation," pithily paraphrased by Charles Ferguson as "the paradox of universal order and individual differences" (Ferguson op cit: 194), distinguishes functional from formal grammar. The former is devoted to the analysis of the semantic activity of assigning names and the syntactic activity of stringing names into mutual relations, leading to the grouping of linguistic material into functional categories.
It constitutes the only possible basis for the analytical comparative method, stressing the centrality of functional notions in general linguistic theory.

The concept of behavior being functional in the sense of goal-directed, individuated, and variable reverberates throughout the literature. Herrick (1956: 20-21) underscores the teleological character of human nature:

"Most behavior is obviously directed toward some end. The objective may be something advantageous or satisfying to the individual, or it may be something favorable to the species or group to which he belongs... what (people) do must in the aggregate be beneficial or they perish...The goal of human behavior, we repeat, is satisfaction, which may or may not be consciously recognized as such. This directive behavior is here called "goal-directive", whether or not the goal is consciously recognized as such."

Carl Gustav Jung (1959: 259) presents individuation as a core concept in psychology with important developmental and even major moral implications:

"The concept of individuation plays no small role in our psychology. In general, it is the process of forming and specializing the individual nature; in particular, it is the development of the psychological individual as a differentiated being from the general, collective psychology. Individuation, therefore, is a process of differentiation, having for its goal the development of the individual personality...individuation leads to a natural appreciation of the collective norm, whereas to an exclusively collective orientation towards life the norm becomes increasingly superfluous: whereupon real morality disintegrates. The more completely a man's life is molded and shaped by
the collective norm, the greater is his individual immorality."

In an explanatory account of variability John A. Ryle (1947:4) writes:

"For every organ and tissue, and in respect both of its structure and function, there is a natural range of variability in any population studies and in the species as a whole. Within this range efficient performance and adaptation to common stresses may be recognized. The "normal", in biology and medicine, is better expressed in terms of this variability than as a hypothetical mean or standard.

Temporal variations (perhaps better described as "variants") in the individual, to allow of necessary continuing adaptations, must be distinguished from species variations which establish differences between man and animal. Both have essential survival value. Adaptability depends on variability."

Bohuslav Havránek's "Currents of present-day linguistic research" (1928) viewed it as a requirement that the sound-meaning relationship be approached starting with the meaning, which he equated with function, hastening to add that in doing so one runs the risk of superimposing functions on the language which are not there or neglect ones which are. Havránek agreed with Jespersen that these functional, in Jespersen's terminology "notional", categories, should be gained empirically by means of formal and functional analysis and introduced as working hypotheses; in Havránek's words, "They live on credit and are accepted only as long as they prove correct."

The programmatic 1929 Prague Theses, surely one of the most imposing linguistic edifices of the twentieth century, encapsulate the functionalist credo and delineate the field of linguistics as it has subsequently come to be known:
"Seen from the functionalist viewpoint, language is a system of purposeful means of expression." Structure and function should be the most essential concepts in both synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Analysis of structure involves the study of phonology, the morphological utilization of phonological differences (morphophonology), the phonotactics, and the functional load. In the discussion outlining the field of onomatology, there is an explicit claim about the explanatory power of the functional notion: "...the functional conception permits linking facts so far separated, to disclose the system of particular languages and to present an explanation where older methods were content with a mere statement...". Structural analysis further involves the theory of functional syntax, functional sentence perspective, and morphology. There follows an elaboration of the notion that language study involves investigating linguistic functions and their realizations, including internal vs. manifested speech, intellectual vs. emotional language, the communicative vs. the poetic social functions, the functions of written vs. oral language, the sociology of language, and the function of variation in diachronic studies. The differentiation of the literary language is attributed to its several functions, a topic developed in extenso by Bohuslav Havránek three years later in "The functional differentiation of the standard language" (1932). Poetic language is thought of as an individual creative act, as parole, which should be evaluated against the background of current poetic tradition (langue) and the communicative language of the period. Poetic expression is directed towards itself qua expression, with the result that poetic expressions tend to become foregrounded. The section on linguistic geography contains the relevant admonition that "The con-
frontation of heterogeneous systems can only be fruitful if one respects the equipollence of the compared systems: if one introduced between them the category of mechanical causality and if one deduced the facts of the one system from those of the other one, one would deform the synthetic grouping of these systems and replace scientific analysis by flattening unilateral judgments." An entire subsection of the Theses is devoted to the at best undernourished theme of the importance of functional linguistics for the cultivation of the standard language, where "language cultivation" is defined as the attempt "to intensify in the standard language, literary as well as colloquial, those qualities which are needed by the special function of the standard literary language." Although the reference here is to the Slavic languages, as is the case with all of the Theses, the qualities mentioned, namely, stability, accuracy, and specificity, are general enough to be applicable to any standard literary language, extant or in the making. The Theses conclude with a discussion of the application of functional linguistics to language instruction in the secondary schools. Within the functionalist perspective the task of the language teacher is to foster in the learner the ability to comply, in the best possible manner, with the function of language indicated for the given case, e.g., in a dialogue, in various kinds of written manifestations, in composing essays, etc. Here Mathesius' linguistic characterologies, i.e., total methodologically conceived structures, of diverse contemporary languages form firm footing for the classification of linguistic phenomena and their exposition at school. Taken seriously, the Praguian view that the development of linguistic readiness is not promoted by imparting knowledge of historical linguistic considerations, but rather by deliberations on the present-day system of language, would occasion curricular
reforms in those countries where undue emphasis is placed on historical linguistics in foreign-language teacher-training programs. In both native and foreign language instruction the ultimate goal is competence in matching utterance with function, where the functions vary with the level of education and interests of the pupils involved. In the instance of foreign language instruction, both the teaching and the texts should be based on copious confrontational analysis.

In "Functional linguistics" Mathesius describes the preceding 20 years of linguistics as a transitional stage between the Neogrammarian School and Functional Linguistics. The former was diachronistic, used the comparative method to trace genetically related languages to a common source, and interpreted texts from form to function; the latter synchronistic, used to compare unrelated languages to gain a contrastive insight into language structure, and proceeds from function to form. Functionalism is illustrated by its approach to the study of the sentence, Czech word-order, and the study of sounds. Finding the Neogrammarians' definitions of the sentence too narrow and mentalistic, Mathesius replaces them with the notion of a sentence as "a communicative utterance by which the speaker assumes an active attitude (my underscoring—P.A.L.) to some fact or group of facts." The discussion of Czech word-order constitutes the classical Praguean statement of functional sentence perspective, the division of the sentence into theme and rheme (objective word-order) and rheme and theme (subjective word-order). In pronunciation, functional linguistics inquires which elements have functional meaning. "...phonology studies phonemes, i.e., sounds endowed with functional meaning...characterizes the repertory of phonemes by finding out how they are
grouped in the phonological system and how they are structurally utilized in the shape of words," reflecting a "conception emphasizing the intentionality of human speech activity." Mathesius remarks that an insight might be gained into the psychology of speech production by studying the data resulting from obstacles to expression: "Only when we are blocked by some obstacle whether of an incidental or a pathological nature, does part of the mental process preparatory to an actual utterance appear in a clearer light. An example of expression with normal obstacles can be seen in a writer's struggle for expression or in a foreigner's difficulties in his attempt to speak a language of which he has poor command. An example of pathological hindrances is supplied by various speech disorders." Mathesius contrasts the notion of a synchronic, "scientific" grammar with the notion of a "linguistic characterology." The former is "a detailed and accurate inventory of everything that occurs in a given language at a given time, the latter an attempt at a hierarchy of the listed language phenomena according to their importance", where the structural comparative method is thought of as a "useful tool" to achieve this aim. Although unstated by Mathesius, it is apparent from the general tenor of the discussion that the "importance" of linguistic phenomena can only be gauged by the extent of their success in fulfilling specific linguistic functions.

Bohuslav Havránek's "The functional differentiation of the standard language" (1932) is given over to substantiating the claim that the use of linguistic devices in popular speech and in the standard language is determined by the purpose or the function of the act of speech, whereby the functions served by folk speech may be equally well served by the standard language, but not vice-versa.
Functional and stylistic differentiation of language is based mainly on lexical and syntactic devices, to a lesser extent phonological and morphological. Havránek makes the important distinction between the inventory of devices of functional and stylistic differentiation, on the one hand, and the mode of utilization of the devices, on the other, including the intellectualization of the devices and their automatization and foregrounding in terms of their functional differentiation. Intellectualization is expressed in terms of the scaler notion of definiteness, ranging from intelligibility to definiteness and accuracy. Viewed before the backdrop of individual and shared systems of knowledge and belief, this linguistically based kernel of a theory of understanding, the theme of some current work, for example Jürgen Habermas' theory of universal pragmatics (1976), appears not only extraordinarily suggestive of promising lines of inquiry, but socially redemptive as well. Understanding must be some composite function of shared language and shared systems of knowledge and belief where the interrelations between the two seem inordinately intricate. Automatization is equated with lexicalization and the condition that the speaker's intent evoke the desired effect. In foregrounding the use of language itself attracts attention, thought to be unusual, deautomatized. Transfer of automatizations involves displacing an utterance which is an automatization in one context to a context in which it isn't, thereby producing a foregrounding. Havránek concludes his discussion of the functional differentiation in terms of functions of the standard, functional dialects, and functional styles.

Jan Mukařovský's exemplary essay "Standard language and poetic language" (1932) is a study of the relationship between standard language and poetic language from the
the point of view of poetic language. The systematic violation of the norm of the standard is seen to make poetic language possible. The function of poetic language is served by a maximum of deautomatization, of "foregrounding" in Paul L. Garvin's famous translation of the Czech ak-tualizace. In the standard language foregrounding is subordinated to communication. In poetic language communication is subordinated to foregrounding, the latter used for its own sake. The construction of a piece of poetry consists in the mutual relationships of its foregrounded and unforegrounded constituents, each part deriving its value from its functional relation to the whole:

"The problem in evaluating is to determine how and to what extent a given component fulfills the function proper to it in the total structure; the yardstick is given by the context of a given structure and does not apply to any other context."

Vladimír Skalička, in "On questions of phonological oppositions" (1936), discusses the phonological oppositions of differentiation, correlation, and relation, derived by analogy to their presence in grammar, a methodologically interesting study insofar as it illustrates a convincing projection of relations established among the elements of one domain of grammar to those of another, similar, for example, to the subsequent projection of features in phonology to features in semantics (Chomsky 1965).

Josef Vachek's "Some remarks on writing and phonetic transcription" (1945) presents a semiotic approach to the distinction between writing and phonetic transcription:

"...the transcribed text does not constitute the sign of the outside world, but the sign of the sign of the outside world (in other words, it is a sign of the second order)",
the semiosis entailing (1) the acoustic interpretation of visual signs (the phonetic transcription) and (2) the semantic interpretation of the acoustic facts. We are thus left with the notion of the metasemiotic nature of the transcriptional system. Opposed to this is the written text which

"...is to be taken, at least in advanced cultural communities, as a sign of the first order (i.e., the sign of the outside world). That is to say, in deciphering a text put down in writing no detour by way of spoken language is necessary to make out its content, as is the case in deciphering a phonetically transcribed text."

Assuming this claim that reading need not involve the spoken language, considering, for example, the phenomena of oral reading or silent reading with "inner" phonation to be marginal, then we have a distinction between phonetic transcriptions and writing which, Vachek thinks, can be efficiently accounted for only by recourse to functional notions such as the dynamic vs. static response to a stimulus:

"...the function of phonetic transcription is to fix the phonetic realizations of spoken utterances which respond to the given stimulus in a dynamic way; the function of writing, on the other hand, is to set up values which are at work in written utterances responding to a given stimulus in a static way."

By "responding in a dynamic way" Vachek means "...quickly, readily and with equal attention to both the intellectual and emotional factors in the situation which gave rise to the stimulus." The static response should be permanent (i.e. preservable), affording full comprehension as well as clear survey of the situation concerned, and stressing the intellectual factors of the situation.
An in-depth study of this question, involving placing the written symbol as channel in the extended Bühlerian organon-model of language would surely shed light on the nature of the reading process, involved though the discussion might become. Writing might be used to refer to phonetic transcriptions, and it is possible to phonetically transcribe written texts in the way that you pronounce them or think that other speakers might pronounce them. Then, even in the case of speed readers, where the phonetic interpretation of the written text is presumably bypassed, writing may be pronounced as occasion dictates, i.e., in the case of words which are unfamiliar. The first reaction here is to try to pronounce them or consult a source of pronunciation, then ascertain their meaning, or simply pass them over. Thus we might picture the distinction between transcription and writing as involving two gears, a phonetic gear and a semantic gear, transcription a model with both by nature always, writing a model with both occasionally exhibiting a reciprocal semantic relationship between them. Moreover, there are attitudinal differences between them. Then, what would be the status of a dictation or a court protocol, where the written record kept is surely a dynamic response?

The notion central to Bohumil Trnka's "Linguistics and the ideological structure of the period" (1948) is that linguistic theory exhibits parallelism with the structure of the science of the period while also reshaping external influences inside its own scientific sphere in order to discover new facts and problems. Trnka stresses the factor of language experience, including experiencing both the affective and the intellectual elements of language, as essential to understanding the concept of function.

To return to functional poetics, a fertile field has
yet to be ploughed by the study of the interrelationships between automatization and foregrounding and their prede­
cessors in the Russian avant-garde "strangification", "facturity", "justification/motivation", "feeling for
language", "energetism," "realization," "individualization," and "dynamization". For detailed discussions of these no­
Motivirovka, perhaps best translated "justifying" or "mo­
tivating", constitutes an especially interesting case in
point, one of the key concepts of Russian formalism as it
was, replacing the then still undeveloped concept of
"function" referring to a work-immanent artistic causality
which deforms and strangifies as opposed to that extra-ar­
tistic, pragmatic, empirical causality called motivacija,
"motivation". Or the requirement of the mutual functional
justification of the "construemes" of a construction in
constructivist poetics (Grübel 1981). One anticipates an
exhaustive interlinguistic and intralinguistic inventory
of devices (priëmy) whose application results in the
effect of foregrounding, their interrelationships and the
principles which underlie their deviation from the devices
responsible for automatization. One device recently added
to the forthcoming list (Franck 1981) is called a syntactic
"double-bind" capable of being generally represented by
linking brackets in the syntactic surface structure. A
written example - Franck is concerning herself with con­
versational analysis - involving both the leftward and the
rightward modification of an NP by an AP:

"...I thought the figure of the woman, the one who did
the embroidery, very, very beautiful, and the descrip­
tion of the embroidery all in gold, just because it is
as it were a question of the color of the different
yellows, whole and broken up." (The Letters of van Gogh, p. 318)

an example of syntactic foregrounding since APs normally modify either prepositionally or postpositionally, but not both, explaining the effect of strangification.

A promising reading of "function," with stated implications for the development of Praguian theory, namely as a condition on use, has been recently applied to the study of ad hoc nominal compounding in the early work of the British poet Kevin Crossley-Holland (Boase-Beier 1981). After recapitulating Brekle's (1981) three conditions on the use of ad hoc nominal compounds, namely:

(1) Economy of means, what Brekle refers to as the "minimax principle," a variation of the psychological principle of that name originating in economics, a minimum of surface complexity combined with a maximum of semantic information, expressible as

\[ P = \frac{C}{F} \]

where \( P \) = pithiness index, \( C \) = content, and \( F \) = form, other things like content being equal, the less the form, the pithier the content;

(2) Inaccessibility - neologisms, including nominal compounds, can be novelly generated (a) in the absence of an option to designate a particular entity and (b) when the appropriate designation cannot be recalled;

(3) Concretization - making a concept concrete, reifying it.

These conditions might be better thought of as conditions on the creation of, rather than the using of, ad hoc nominal compounds, where I would wish to distinguish between the creation of something and its use. The taxonomy could be elaborated by distinguishing between the causes and the
effects of creating novel forms. Boase-Beier adds a fourth condition on use, i.e. creation, namely,

(4) Creating the entity through creating the word, which might be termed "entityification".

Based on the work of W. Fleischer, Boase-Beier investigates the stylistic devices employed to implement these functions, focussing on four:

(1) Using a nominal compound in preference to a phrase with the same meaning, a case of foregrounding;
(2) Forming nominal compounds by either (a) analogizing or (b) analogizing and contrasting;
(3) Compounding nominals to yield literal nonsense;
(4) Constructing nominal-compound constructions consisting of semantically unconnected constituents.

The precise interrelationship between the so-called "stylistic resources" and the "conditions on use" is not in general clear; what does appear to be clear is that considerations of this sort do play a role in determining semantical interpretational difficulty, hence relate to understanding, both of which topics were broached above.

To conclude, I would like to recollect the notion that the members of society are guided by the attitudes which they exhibit toward one another, these attitudes covarying with behaviors including language performance, and that the irreducibles of social life are sign-senders and sign-receivers guiding each other ultimately by their attitudes. Attitude, I now propose, be included as a factor in the expanded and ever-expanding Bühlerian organon-model of language (Luelsdorff 1982), leaving it to the interested student of language to ascertain the myriad linguistic reflexes of attitudes in relation to each and all of the posited factors and functions of speech events. This program requires the computation of the Cartesian
product of the entire set of human attitudes as its first coordinate and the set of factors and functions as its second and the determination of how these mappings covary with linguistic competence and performance.

According to K. Lukascyk (quoted in Rathgeber and Plattner 1979), attitudes are "Phenomena which dispose the individual to react in the environment in a certain way. These, in turn, lead to linguistic variation in the interests of adaptation with one or several of at least the following six functions:

1. **Selection**: Attitudes are the reason why we make a selection of the matters of fact and experiences which we consider relevant, and, for example, do not take those things into consideration about which we want to know nothing;

2. **Structuring of the environment**: Objects of the environment are chosen through selection, and these objects are then interpreted according to certain attitudes, the environment thereby structured, which permits a rapid, albeit not always objectively correct, orientation;

3. **Stabilization of behavior**: Attitudes generate a regularity of behavior by their longevity and ability to resist change;

4. **Adaptation**: Attitudes generally generate socially desired conformist behavior, thus, viewed from society, function as a means of social adaptation and integration in a reference or membership group;

5. **Instrumentality**: Attitudes, insofar as they are desired, have instrumental function for the individual; they serve then mainly to realize certain goals or purposes. Example: the one who expresses deviant and critical attitudes out loud can make himself disliked by his superiors, thereby ruining
his chances for professional advancement, the one who exhibits conformist attitudes thereby increases his chances for vertical "upwards" mobility;

(6) Defensiveness: Attitudes make possible resistance against attacks and threats directed against the self from without or within and the justification of one's own positions and ways of behaving. (my translation—P.A.L.)

It is this attitudinal factor, with its associated functions, which has hitherto been seriously neglected, and, when not neglected, unnecessarily circumscribed. Retrospective consideration of Mathesius' notion of the sentence as "a communicative utterance by which the speaker assumes an active attitude toward some fact or a group of facts" suggests a promising attitudinally-based paradigm of linguistic research devoted to the study of the interrelationships among attitudes in their factorial and functional aspects in speech events.
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THE CLASSICAL PERIOD OF THE SCHOOL
ON THE POTENTIALITY OF THE PHENOMENA OF LANGUAGE*

Vilém Mathesius

By the term potentiality we mean, for the present moment, static oscillation, i.e. instability at the given period; it is opposed to dynamic changeability, manifested by alterations occurring in the course of time. In linguistics, the term denotes two kinds of phenomena.

First, one can speak about static [= synchronistic, J.V.] oscillation of speech among the individuals inside the communities of language. This phenomenon concerns not only the difficult problem of the dialects but also language as the proper object of linguistic research. It is true, linguistics necessarily takes as its starting point the speech of an individual but it is in no way confined to it. Linguistics proceeds from the concrete utterances of an individual to his speech-habits, to his speech, and finally to dialect and language, i.e. to language usage existing in a narrower or wider language community. Language thus includes, theoretically, all the phenomena of language that occur in concrete utterances of all individual speakers, belonging at that time to the same broad language community, called a nation. In reality, of course, linguistics can never do justice to this fact, not only on account of the astonishing richness of language phenomena in general, but mainly in view of the fact that such a community - especially a culturally highly active one - witnesses the rise of new, even if transient, language phenomena day by day. For this reason, from its
very beginnings linguistic analysis has almost invariably concentrated on the main outlines of languages, the more so that such outlines usually prove to be more accessible to primitive methods of analysis. This simplification (the degree of which naturally differs in different languages and in the examination of different kinds of language phenomena) mostly originated unconsciously and has been as unconsciously handed down to the following generations. As a result of this, the seeming simplicity of language phenomena is not infrequently regarded not as a consequence of the employed method, but as an actual quality of the examined phenomena, and this often leads to regrettable errors. The very development of linguistics thus reveals that linguists should not only try to discover regularities as general as possible but also to fight, even more intensely, against the excessive, mechanical simplification of language phenomena.

Even more important - at least in the present-day stage of linguistic research - than the protest against mixing up the methodological simplification of language with its actual makeup should be the emphasis to be laid on the manner in which the potentiality of language phenomena is actually manifested, i.e. on the static oscillation of the speech of an individual. It may seem that this issue is virtually identical with the issue pointed out in the preceding paragraph. As a matter of fact, however, there are linguists who are fully conscious of the differences existing among the speech habits of individual speakers of the community, but regard the speech habits of an individual as too stable. One may only quote Oertel, who in his Lectures on the Study of Language (New York and London, 1902) very aptly discusses the problem of dialect and language,