

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LINGUISTICS

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

E. F. K. KOERNER, *General Editor*

Series III — STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS

Advisory Editorial Board

Herbert E. Brekle (Regensburg); Ranko Bugarski (Belgrade)
H. H. Christmann (Tübingen); George Cardona (Philadelphia)
Rudolf Engler (Bern); Hans-Josef Niederehe (Trier)
R. H. Robins (London); Aldo Scaglione (Chapel Hill)
Jean Stéfanini (Marseille)

Volume 19

E. F. K. Koerner

Toward a Historiography of Linguistics

TOWARD A HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LINGUISTICS

SELECTED ESSAYS

E. F. K. KOERNER
University of Ottawa

FOREWORD BY

R. H. ROBINS
University of London

AMSTERDAM / JOHN BENJAMINS B. V.

1978

© Copyright 1978 – John Benjamins B. V.
ISBN 90 272 0891 / 90 272 0960 X

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by print, photoprint,
microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

FOR AUDREY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For permission to reprint the articles presented in the present volume, I wish to express my thanks to the following:

The Linguistic Society of America, Arthur S. Abramson, Secretary-Treasurer, and William Bright, Editor of *Language*, for item 1; Prof. Dr. H. Wenzel and Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin & New York, for item 2; John W. M. Verhaar, S. J., Editor of *Foundations of Language*, for item 4; Drs W. H. Wimmers, President, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, and Simon C. Dik, Executive Editor of *Lingua*, for item 5; R. C. Elwood, Managing Editor, *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, for item 6; Dr. Fritz Karger, Basel, and Wolfgang Bethge, Redactor of *Phonetica*, for item 7; Luisa Pece Pasquino and the Società Editrice Il Mulino, Bologna (and Prof. Luigi Heilmann for his kind intervention) for item 8; Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg, for item 9; Hansjürgen Linke, Editor, and Dr. Henz of the Böhlau Verlag GmbH, Köln, for item 10; Roger Pearson, General Editor of *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Washington, D. C., for item 11, and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlagsbuchhandlung, Göttingen, and Claus Haebler, Editor of *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, for item 12.

Bibliographical details concerning the original places of publication of these twelve studies may be found in the author's preface (p. xix).

Special thanks are due to Professor R. H. Robins, London, for having agreed to write a Foreword to this volume, and Mr. J. L. Benjamins, Amsterdam, for his friendly support in publishing it.

Ottawa, 26 April 1978

E. F. K. Koerner

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vi
Foreword by R. H. Robins	ix
Author's Preface	xv
I. <i>Toward a Historiography of Linguistics</i>	1
1. Linguistic Historiography till 1970: A state-of-the-art report	3
2. Towards a Historiography of Linguistics: 19th and 20th century paradigms	21
3. Four Types of History Writing in Linguistics	55
4. The Importance of Linguistic Historiography and the Place of History in Linguistic Science	63
II. <i>Appraisals of Individual Scholars</i>	71
5. Hermann Paul and Synchronic Linguistics	73
6. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay: His place in the history of linguistic science	107
7. A Minor Figure in 19th-Century French Linguistics: A. Dufriche-Desge- nettes	127
8. Animadversions on Some Recent Claims regarding the Relationship between Georg von der Gabelentz and Ferdinand de Saussure	137
III. <i>Trends and Traditions in Linguistics</i>	153
9. Bloomfieldian Linguistics and the Problem of 'Meaning': A chapter in the history of the theory and study of language	155
10. Zu Ursprung und Entwicklung des Phonem-Begriffs: Eine histori- sche Notiz	177
11. 1876 as a Turning Point in the History of Linguistics	189
12. Zu Ursprung und Geschichte der Besternung in der historischen Sprachwissenschaft Eine historiographische Notiz	211
Index of Authors	217

FOREWORD

It is a sign of the maturity of linguistics that linguists are now actively conscious and even proud of the history of their subject. 'History is bunk', an aphorism attributed to the first Henry Ford, is an ejaculation of over-enthusiastic youth, eager to reject the past and to strike out boldly into the beckoning future, be it the mass-production of automobiles or the pioneering of the once brand-new techniques of structuralist descriptive linguistics.

Barely twenty years ago Hockett could write, in a standard introduction to linguistics, that the history of linguistics had no place in such a book,¹ and 1786 was considered by many a generously retrospective starting point for linguistics as a seriously scientific subject. Since then we have had several elementary books on the history of linguistics, historically oriented volumes like *Portraits of Linguists*, the massive *Historiography of Linguistics*, a specialist journal devoted to research in the history of linguistics, and series of monographs making available to linguists in general the significant texts produced by our predecessors during the past two thousand years or more.² And Chomsky, more responsible than any other single linguist for the changes of direction and focus in the subject from the late 1950s to the present day, so far from abjuring historical studies, has insisted more than once, though not without arousing controversy, on the historical roots of his theories in the European tradition and especially in 17th and 18th century thinking about language.³

1) Charles F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), p. vii.

2) E.g., in chronological order of publication: *Portraits of Linguists* ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 2 vols. (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1966); *Grammatica Universalis: Meisterwerke der Sprachwissenschaft* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1966-); *The Classics of Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1972-); *Studies in the History of Linguistics* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1973-); *Historiographia Linguistica* (ibid., 1973/74-); *Historiography of Linguistics* (= *Current Trends in Linguistics*, 13), 2 vols. (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), and *Grammatica Speculativa* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1977-).

3) Noam Chomsky, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), p. 25, and idem, *Cartesian Linguistics* (New York & London: Harper & Row, 1966) and *Language and Mind* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968), chap. 1, and the criticisms by Hans Aarsleff, "The History of Linguistics and Professor Chomsky", *Language* 46.570-85 (1970), and G. A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700: The Latin tradition* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976), chap. 5.

The history of linguistics is a frequent component course in present-day Linguistic Institutes in America and in similar international summer schools elsewhere (for example at Salzburg in 1977), something unheard-of "in the smug 1930s, during the war years, and in the decade thereafter".⁴ At least two international symposia have been held on the subject, at Burg Wartenstein in 1964 and in Chicago in 1968,⁵ at the Twelfth International Congress of Linguists, held in Vienna in 1977, the history of linguistics was for the first time accorded a plenary session, and in the year in which this foreword is being written we have the first open International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences, to be held in Ottawa, for the inception and the planning of which we must in considerable measure express our appreciation of the enthusiasm and energy shown by Professor Koerner, whose *Selected papers* are republished in this book.

Nevertheless, we must remind ourselves that, however welcome current interest in the history of linguistics is, it is not enough, if this branch of linguistic studies, and of historical studies, is to justify and maintain the place it has now acquired. History, and especially the history of ideas or intellectual history, is not anecdote, annalistic recording, the handing down from author to author of *idées reçues*, nor just individual biographies of leading persons, valuable as these last are. There must be some general frame of reference and some consistent view of the past and the present of the subject, within which to trace the personal and the doctrinal connections and the passing on of work accomplished and work proposed from one generation to the next, that constitutes the intellectual tradition which each historian of ideas is trying to comprehend and to interpret.

This is no easy requirement. European linguistics goes back along unbroken lines as far as the pre-Socratic philosophers and rhetoricians of sixth-century Greece, and the Sanskrit Indian schools of linguistics, whose work so invigorated and fertilized European linguistics from the end of the 18th century, can trace a likewise unbroken tradition of scholarship stretching even further back into the first millennium B.C., whatever date may be preferred as the *floruit* of its most illustrious representative, Pāṇini.

Moreover the state and the availability of primary and secondary sources vary greatly from period to period and from area to area. For recent and contemporary linguistics we have too much rather than too little material, and the problem for the historian of the 20th century, apart from the mastery

4) Thomas A. Sebeok in his Preface to *Portraits of Linguists*, vol.1, p.x.

5) The results of these two meetings are embodied in *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and paradigms* ed. by Dell Hymes (Bloomington & London: Indiana Univ. Press, 1974).

or at least the awareness of all that has been and is going on, is to see the wood for the trees, to detect and interpret significant trends and distinctive contributions and lines of thought. But of Pāṇini's life and times we know all too little, and almost nothing about the long line of his predecessors in the morphological description of Sanskrit, who must have been the means whereby the achievement of brevity and economy of statement at all costs was progressively cultivated. Nor in this field are we likely to get any more primary data, as against secondary interpretation of what we do have.

We are rather better placed in regard to ancient Greek linguistics. Despite large gaps in the surviving primary texts we are able to trace the processes and the stages by which the earliest fragmentary linguistic observations on the part of the pre-Socratics and the speculations indulged in, on the evidence of Aristophanes and Plato, by Socrates himself were progressively systematized by Aristotle and by several generations of Stoics into the morphology of Dionysius Thrax and the syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus, which, for all their deficiencies, served as paradigm writings for a thousand years of Greek and Latin grammar, and whose influence, especially that of Dionysius, is to be seen in almost every school grammar book in Europe today.⁶

It is not just the availability of primary texts that differs over the whole field of the history of linguistics. Texts must be edited, printed, and interpreted to linguists of the present day. Such a task requires knowledge both of the time and the place of the text and of modern linguistics. We are reasonably well served with editions of the linguistic texts of Greece and Rome, thanks in part to the long tradition of classical studies in Europe. Ancient India has been treated by Indian, European, and American Indologists, though we still need more books like Allen's *Phonetics in Ancient India*⁷ to present and expound Indian linguistic work to linguists not necessarily having specialist knowledge of Sanskrit. The European late Middle Ages, one of the most exciting periods in the history of grammatical theory, is now in a better position, thanks to the discovery, classifications, and editing of the large body of surviving mediaeval grammars and the exposition of their doctrine by scholars such as Bursill-Hall and Pinborg.⁸ Similar work, at both primary and secondary levels, is

6) Cf. P. B. R. Forbes, "Greek Pioneers in Philology and Grammar", *Classical Review* 47.105-12 (1933).

7) W. Sydney Allen, *Phonetics in Ancient India: A guide to the appreciation of the earliest phoneticians* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1953).

8) G. L. Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971); Jan Pinborg, *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter* (Copenhagen: Frost-Hansen; Münster: Aschendorff, 1967).

being actively carried through on Renaissance linguistics by Percival and others.⁹ But of mediaeval Arabic linguistics, despite the ritual praise of Sibawaih, only a little below that rightly accorded to Pāṇini, we have all too few scholarly presentations of his and others' writings and the tradition they represent in a form that can be fully appreciated and integrated into the history of linguistics by those working outside the Arabic language itself.¹⁰

In the era of the printed book we are, of course, far better placed in relation to the accessibility of primary sources. But much remains to do before we have a full and clear picture of the resources available to the historian of linguistics from the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. And although the documentation is largely complete for nineteenth century European and American linguistics, we are still far from an adequate appreciation of the relations between person and person and between persons and their times, that constitute the real substance of intellectual history.¹¹

With the exception of the most primary stage of research, the editing and publication of previously unedited texts, all the types of writing required in the history of linguistics are exemplified in Koerner's papers here reprinted:

1. General theoretical and methodological essays on the historiography of linguistics: what should the history of an academic discipline such as linguistics set out to achieve and how should it be undertaken for this purpose? Opinions, of course, differ on both these questions; a case in point is the applicability or non-applicability of the Kuhnian concept of a scientific paradigm to the history of linguistic science.¹²

9) W. Keith Percival, "The Grammatical Tradition and the Rise of the Vernaculars", *Current Trends in Linguistics* 13.231-75 (with full bibliography).

10) Attention may be drawn to Michael G. Carter, "An Arabic Grammarian of the Eight Century A.D.: A contribution to the history of linguistics", *JAOS* 93.146-57 (1973). and to Anwar G. Chejne, *The Arabic Language: Its role in history* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1969).

11) Cf. Henry M. Hoenigswald, "On the History of the Comparative Method", *Anthropological Linguistics* 5:1.1-11 (1963), and Anna Morpurgo-Davies, "Language Classification in the Nineteenth Century", *Current Trends* 13.607-716. — On 17th and 18th century work see Herbert E. Brekle, "The Seventeenth Century", and Hans Aarsleff, "The Eighteenth Century, including Leibniz", *Current Trends* 13.277-382 and 383-479 (both with bibliographies).

12) Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962); E. F. K. Koerner, "Towards a Historiography of Linguistics: 19th and 20th century paradigms", *Anthropological Linguistics* 14.255-80 (1972), rev. and extended version in *History of Linguistic Thought and Contemporary Linguistics* ed. by Herman Parret (Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter, 1976), 685-718 (repr. in the present volume, 21-54); W. Keith Percival, "The Applicability of Kuhn's Paradigms to the History of Lin-

2. Studies more restricted in their time and place, devoted to particular trends or movements of thought on language and the development of particular linguistic concepts; the various studies that have appeared on the history of the phoneme are a familiar example of these.

3. Biographical accounts of the work of individual scholars who have been influential in the course taken by linguistic science during some part of its history.

The history of linguistics, as this brief foreword has tried to show, is a vast and varied field for study and research, and an important component of the history of ideas. Many workers with many specialist skills will be needed if it is to make the progress that its inherent interest merits.¹³ No one person can possibly claim first-hand knowledge or anything like it over the whole. He who is master of one area of specialization must accept the secondary and tertiary work of others for the background of his special period and its predecessors and successors; and anyone rash enough to try to write on the history of linguistics overall is even more at the mercy of other people's scholarship, just as he is, to a far greater extent, indebted to them and to their prior labours.

There is work to be done correcting *sine ira et studio* errors of factual detail in what is already in print, and providing broader and more revealing interpretation of our factual knowledge. All this will take time; but in our present position and in the year of the Ottawa conference we may rejoice at the progress already made in the recognition of the history of linguistics as a significant component in the study both of general linguistics and of general history.

London, April 1978

R. H. Robins

guistics", *Language* 52.285-94 (1976), and Koerner, "On the Non-Applicability of Kuhn's Paradigms to the History of Linguistics", *Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society (Cambridge, Mass., 5-7 Nov. 1976)* ed. by Judy Anna Kegl, David Nash et al; (Cambridge, Mass.: Dept. of Linguistics, M. I. T., 1977), 165-74.

13) Some observations on the qualifications required for the historian of linguistics are to be found in Yakov Malkiel and Margaret Langdon, "History and Histories of Linguistics", *Romance Philology* 22.530-74 (1969).

PREFACE

As late as Spring 1977, a contributor to the almost 40-year-old "Journal of the History of Ideas", addressing himself to methodological questions in intellectual history, made the following concluding statement:

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.¹

It appears that the history of linguistics, though it has become only in recent years a widely accepted field of scholarly inquiry, has paid more attention to questions of theory and method.² There are few indications, however, that widely-accepted principles for linguistic historiography have been established; indeed a number of issues in the field are far from having been settled. In the later 1960s and early 1970s there was a wide-spread optimism that the history of science could offer something like a guide to historians of linguistics. T. S. Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) has been thought to represent something of a model that the historian of linguistic science might wish to imitate and to reformulate in accordance with the requirements of his particular domain. More recently, however, this idea has come under heavy, though not always constructive attack. Part of the criticism appears to rest upon a misinterpretation of Kuhn; other criticisms seem to stem from a misunderstanding of the goals and tasks of linguistic historiography.

Interestingly enough, those who have advocated a debunking of Kuhn's ideas about scientific revolutions and the establishment or existence of disciplinary matrixes or 'paradigms' have not come forth with a possible alternative framework; they appear to have been satisfied with a demonstration that those

1) Nils B. Kvastad, "Semantics in the Methodology of the History of Ideas", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38:1.157-74 (1977), on p.174.

2) Cf. the fine exposition of these issues by Raffaele Simone, "Théorie et histoire de la linguistique", *Historiographia Linguistica* 2:3.353-78 (1975).

who believe that Kuhn's proposals could be made use of, in a judicious way, by the historian of linguistics are misinformed and misleading. Unfortunately, this whole-sale rejection of Kuhnian ideas advocated in the recent literature appears to have led many to abandon the discussion of methodological and epistemological questions in linguistic historiography, if the small number of papers offered for presentation at the plenary session "History of Linguistics: Theory and Method" at the forthcoming International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (Ottawa, 28-31 August 1978) may be taken as an indication of such a trend.

If this diagnosis is adequate, some of my papers devoted to theoretical, epistemological or methodological issues in linguistic historiography included in the present volume may serve as an antidote. Although I never regarded the uncritical application of principles proposed by historians of science, whether by Kuhn, Popper, or another scholar, as a remedy for the traditional malaise in linguistic history-writing, I have always been of the opinion that the history of linguistics is served better if at least a preliminary frame of reference is at hand which could guide the researcher in the field. The discussion rather than the unreflected adoption of suggestions made by historians of science has always been my intention, as should be obvious from items 2 (1972/76) and 3 (1973) in the present collection of papers.

Recent criticism of Kuhn's principles by scholars working in the history of linguistics and their advice to dismiss them altogether from consideration have not failed to influence my own outlook on the matter, at least in two respects: First, I have directed much of my attention to empirical research devoted to the work of a distinguished scholar in the discipline or to particular concepts that made history, trying not only to correct traditional misconceptions (often due to uncritical reliance on verdicts passed by earlier historians of linguistics) but also attempting to advance historiographic methodology by exemplary investigation and presentation of facts. The other effect of the rejection of Kuhnian ideas by historians of linguistics has been that I have proposed, in a paper presented at a meeting of linguists held at M. I. T. in November 1976, models for the analysis of particular stages of development in linguistics, e.g., the Progress-by-Accumulation Model, the Pendulum-Swing (between data orientation and theory orientation) Model, the Mainstream versus Undercurrent Model, the Continuity vs. Discontinuity Model, etc.³ In other

3) "On the Non-Applicability of Kuhn's Paradigms to the History of Linguistics", *Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society* ed. by J. A. Kegl, D. Nash, and A. Zaenen, 165-74. Cambridge, Mass.: Dept. of Linguistics and Philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1977.

words, I have tried to propose concepts that could help in the description of particular events or states of affairs in linguistic science, concepts which do not lean on those advocated by historians of science and which attempt to explain intra-disciplinary developments. In addition, quite in accord with views advanced in studies from 1970 onwards, I have tried to indicate how extra-linguistic factors which have influenced the development of linguistics can be accounted for. I hope to treat these issues more fully in papers that I am currently preparing for publication.

The papers brought together in the present volume represent, in my estimation, the essence of my reflections on issues concerning linguistic historiography and of particular investigations in 19th and 20th century linguistic thought worked out between 1969 and 1976. Some of them were embodied in or extracted and revised from larger works undertaken between 1969 and 1972, namely, my Simon Fraser University dissertation of 1971⁴ and my contribution to volume 13 of *Current Trends in Linguistics*.⁵ Others were written independently or for particular occasions, such as the foundation of a specialist journal or the organization of a scholarly meeting. I shall refrain from commenting on individual articles in this preface, but restrict myself to two or three general remarks that seem to bear on matters of scholarship concerning the history of linguistics.

To begin with, it appears to happen only too frequently that the interpretation of a particular theory is not judged according to principles of adequacy or jejuneness, but according to personal tastes, not to say prejudices. How else could it be explained that some scholars have regarded the argument in my paper on Hermann Paul (item 5) as unconvincing and in fact misleading whereas others have considered it as a most original contribution. Indeed it seems that opinion is taken as more important than a thorough, albeit somewhat polemical, documentation of facts; how else could it be explained that a scholar, who had been criticized for having argued that the Humboldtian linguist Georg von der Gabelentz was a forerunner of Ferdinand de Saussure (cf. item 8), now dismisses the entire argument by simply suggesting that Saussure's assimilation of the Humboldtian tradition does not diminish Saussure's genius, as if this had been the real issue. Indeed, as long as the history of linguistics is taken

4) Printed in somewhat revised form in 1973 under the title *Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and development of his linguistic thought in Western studies of language: A contribution to the history and theory of linguistics* (Braunschweig: F. Vieweg & Sohn, 2nd printing, 1974), XL, 428 pp.

5) "European Structuralism: Early beginnings", *Current Trends in Linguistics* ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, vol. 13: *Historiography of Linguistics*, 717-827. The Hague: Mouton, 1975. (The manuscript was completed in June 1972.)

as a happy hunting ground for ancestors, geniuses, and the like, and the forum for the advancement of personal tastes and preconceived opinion, scholars seriously engaged in historiographic work will have to face the criticism, perhaps ridicule, of linguists who discard the history of linguistics as a worth-while field of scholarly research.

Perhaps one more paper requires a brief comment as it seems to involve a principal aspect of the theory of linguistic historiography. It concerns the relationship between the argument brought forward in favour of attributing to the framework of linguistic analysis advanced by Schleicher the function of what Kuhn has called a 'paradigm' or 'disciplinary matrix' (cf. item 2 in the present volume) and the observation that the year 1876, which appears to be largely associated with the emergence of the neogrammarian 'school', constitutes a date which marks something like a turning point in linguistics (item 11). In my opinion these arguments are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary: It was Schleicher who, with his systematic use of concepts such as analogy, phonetic laws, the so-called starred forms, and with the introduction of concepts such as morphology, the family tree, etc., created the framework within which the particularly conspicuous advance in 1876 was made possible.⁶ In other words, the *junggrammatische Richtung*, despite the tremendous increase in the general activity and sophistication in linguistic science, did not constitute a break with previous over-all principles, a revolution in the Kuhnian sense of the term, but an extension, a working-out of those methods which are generally associated with Schleicher and other scholars, for instance Curtius, of the earlier generation of linguists. The rejection of the latent biologism in Schleicher's theory of language, which was the result of the climate of opinion in his days, during the 1880s and 1890s, and its replacement by ideas derived from sociology and psychology, marks a change of ideology which, it would seem, had little bearing on linguistic practice among Brugmann and his colleagues as well as his other contemporaries who were critical of certain claims of the 'Leipzig school' at the time.

Both requests for offprint and ensuing correspondence with scholars all over the world who have taken an interest in the history of linguistics, and the fact that several papers were originally published in hard-to-come-by

6) After publication of the above-mentioned article I have been able to discover at least one article by Charles Léopold Rosapelly which substantiates Abbé Rousselot's report (cf. this volume p.199) and Zwirner's claim (*ibid.*, note 11), namely, "Essai d'inscription des mouvements phonétiques", in the series *Physiologie expérimentale: Travaux du Laboratoire de M. [Etienne Jules] Marey* 2.109-31 (Paris: G. Masson, 1876). – Another interesting article of 1876 is Heinrich Zimmer's (1851-1910) "Ostgermanisch und Westgermanisch" in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 19.393-462.

places (e.g., items 6, 9,⁷ and 10) have persuaded me to believe that their collection in one volume might not be unwelcome. With the exception of item 3, which constitutes a revised and condensed version of my editorial to the first issue of *Historiographia Linguistica* the original pagination, though moved toward the inside margin, has been retained so that reference to the original publications is possible. For the same reason the original sources of the articles are given below (in order of their present arrangement, not according to the chronology of their former publication):

1) *Language* 48:2.428-45 (June 1972) - actually a review article on Hans Arens' *Sprachwissenschaft*, 2nd rev. and enl. ed. (Freiburg & München, 1969).

2) *History of Linguistic Thought and Contemporary Linguistics* ed. by Herman Parret, 685-718. Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter, 1976. (A preliminary version appeared under the same title in *Anthropological Linguistics* 14:7.255-80 [October 1972].)

3) *Historiographia Linguistica* 1:1.1-10 (1973), originally entitled "Purpose and Scope of *Historiographia Linguistica*: Editorial"; here actually pp. 1-7 plus a revised and updated bibliography.

4) *Foundations of Language* 14:4.541-47 (1976[1977]).

5) *Lingua* 29:3.274-307 (August 1972).

6) *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 14:4.663-82 (December 1972).

7) *Phonetica* 33:3.222-31 (1976).

8) *Studi saussuriani per Robert Godel* ed. by René Amacker, Tullio De Mauro, and Luis J. Prieto, 165-80. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1974.

9) *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien / German Yearbook of American Studies* 15.162-83 (May 1970).

10) *Sprache in Gegenwart und Geschichte: Festschrift für Heinrich Matthias Heinrichs* ed. by D. Hartmann, H. Linke, and O. Ludwig, 82-93. Wien & Köln: Böhlau, 1978. (The article was submitted in Fall 1975.)

11) *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 4:4.333-53 (1976[1977]).

12) (Kuhn's) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 89:2.185-90 (1975[1976]).

For technical reasons it has not been possible to avoid a repetition here and there, especially with regard to issues of theory and method of linguistic historiography which run through these papers like a red thread. Misprints and several errors of fact in the original articles have been corrected on a number of occasions, though the thrust of the argument and, at times, the polemical tone

7) This article in particular, written in Spring 1969, has been largely ignored in the literature, a noteworthy exception being Dell Hymes and John Fought in their informative and thorough study, "American Structuralism", *Current Trends in Linguistics* 13:2.903-1176 (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), esp. pp. 951-52, 957 note, 988 note, 1003, 1031, 1041, 1062-63, 1067, which might be consulted for the rectification of certain errors of fact and the judicious evaluation they contain.

in which it has been couched, has not been altered. I believe that I would now take a somewhat different, or at least a less forceful approach to the history of linguistics, but I still feel today that, though salt may be a most desirable ingredient in almost every scholarly or other human undertaking, pepper should not be entirely dispensed with.

Bickenbach über Engelskirchen, May 1978

E. F. K. K.

I. TOWARD A HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LINGUISTICS

LINGUISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY TILL 1970

A STATE-OF-THE-ART REPORT*

A tentative survey of the past two decades will reveal an ever-increasing interest in the history of linguistic thought. Apart from the fifth edition of Tagliavini's *Panorama* (1963), the first post-war years saw only Hamel's booklet (1945) and a short book by Bolelli (1949) until the first serious studies of Robins 1951 and Verburg 1952. It seems that the publication of Arens' voluminous anthology (1st ed., 1955) marked the primary breakthrough of this period; a minor indication may be that the UNESCO *Linguistic bibliography* lists about two dozen reviews of this book between 1956 and 1960, whereas the similar anthologies of Bolelli 1965 (cf. Pisani 1965) and Zvegincev 1960 (cf. Lunt 1963) received only marginal attention. Interestingly enough, Arens' anthology was followed first by two Russian publications: a chrestomathy by Zvegincev (1956) and a short overview of linguistics by Gagkaev (1957). Then Western European publications appeared, such as Borst's monumental work (1957-63), devoted to the discussion of the origin of language from early historical times to the mid-twentieth century, and Malmberg's presentation of 19th and 20th century developments (1959). Again in the early sixties, East European scholarship was predominant in the field of the history of linguistics, perhaps because of the pent-up demand caused by Marxist doctrines which had until 1950 suppressed any progressive trend in Marxist-orientated countries. In 1961, the Latvian Loja and the Rumanians Graur and Wald published histories of linguistics concerned with (1) rehabilitation of linguists, especially those of the late 19th century (in particular Baudouin de Courtenay, Kruszewski, and Fortunatov, but also Humboldt, Whitney, and Saussure), and (2) catching up with European and American structuralism. In 1962 Kukenheim's monograph appeared, which set out to trace the development of French linguistics, from the Renaissance to the present, in its relation with general linguistics (including trends outside the Romania). In the same year, at the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics, Chomsky presented his paper on 'The logical basis of linguistic theory', in which he claimed that his transformational model 'is much closer to traditional grammar' (Chomsky 1964:11), associating his theories with those put forward by the authors of the *Grammar and Logic* of Port-Royal and by Humboldt. Chomsky's statements signaled another 'breakthrough', and in 1963 three studies dealing with this subject matter appeared. Ivić 1963 dealt with linguistic trends from (practically) Bopp to Chomsky (earlier periods received at best sketchy treatment; cf. Ivić 1965:13-34). Leroy 1963 had an ambitious title but disappointing content; not much more can be said of Waterman 1963, with its obvious preference for historical Indo-European linguistics and Bloomfieldian structuralism (not noticeably changed in the 1970 edition). After some of these 'histories' of linguistics had already been translated into other languages, Bolelli 1965 appeared, a somewhat curious anthology of linguistic thought from Vico to Spitzer¹. Chomsky's bold attempt, in his *Car* -

*On the occasion of Hans Arens, *Sprachwissenschaft; der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg & München: K. Alber, 1969).

tesian linguistics (1966), to claim 17th, 18th, and 19th century antecedents for his linguistic theory, besides being met with opposition and sharp criticism (cf. Percival 1969, Aarsleff 1970), was followed by a surprising number of publications. Two books were published in the same year: Lepschy's survey of the development of structuralist theory from Saussure to transformational grammar, the main bulk of which had been written in the early sixties (cf. Lepschy 1970: 11), and Vårvaro's history of Romance linguistics. The next few years showed a surprising increase in activity in the area of the history of linguistics, though this need not be regarded as an 'unforeseen surge' and 'in itself a tantalizing problem' (Malkiel & Langdon 1969: 530-1). First, monographs devoted to the history and evolution of linguistic thought have appeared, e.g. works by Aarsleff, Dinneen, Llorente, Mounin, Robins, and Zeller, all published in 1967, followed by Berezin 1968, Tagliavini 1968, and the voluminous Helbig 1970; second, the number of publishing companies, both in Europe and North America, which have prepared new editions of primary sources, has mushroomed. These monographs deal with general grammar, language philosophy, linguistic theory, and works devoted to language pedagogy, linguistic usage, the collection of data and lexicography—cf. the series *Grammatica universalis* (Stuttgart, Frommann-Holzboog, 1966-), *Studies in the history and theory of linguistics* (Indiana Univ. Press, 1966-),¹ *English linguistics 1500-1800* (Menston, England, Scolar Press, 1967-), *Documenta linguistica* (Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1968-), and more recently *Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik* (Tübingen, 1969).²

Into this time of increased intellectual awareness of our linguistic past, and of heightened scholarly activity in re-assessing the work of our predecessors (to whom we owe, knowingly or not, most of our insights into the nature of language), falls the second, revised and enlarged edition of Arens' anthology *Sprachwissenschaft*.³ Let it be stated from the beginning that none of the other books mentioned here compares with Arens' voluminous work; apart from Zvegincev's two-volume anthology (1964-65), and Borst's impressive six-volume opus—which hardly ever touches upon strictly linguistic problems—no other work has more pages. Many of the so-called histories of linguistics of the past few years deal almost exclusively with 19th and 20th century developments, with emphasis on the 19th century (e.g. Berezin, Graur-Wald, Loja, Vårvaro, Waterman), the 20th century (e.g. Ivić, Lepschy, Leroy, Llorente) or taking a middle course (e.g. Zvegincev). Other works attempt to cover western linguistic thought from the Greeks to modern times, until the 19th century, or until Saussure and the first

¹ I do not take into consideration the fact that in 1962 Indiana University Press republished Pedersen ([1924] 1931), but consider Vachek 1966, and in particular Sebeok 1966, followed by Lehmann 1967 (cf. Percival 1970a), as the first publications of this series.

² I could mention a third kind of activity which has been brought about by Chomsky's somewhat idiosyncratic studies in the history of linguistics—namely the publication of monographs devoted to individual authors claimed by Chomsky to represent the theoretical ancestors of generative grammar, e.g. Donzé 1967.

³ In the same year, a rather ill-advised and ill-informed attempt was made by Salus 1969 to illustrate the main lines of western linguistic thought from Plato to Humboldt, in less than one-fourth the pages of Arens' book (cf. the reviews by Percival 1970b and Koerner 1970d).

generation of the Prague School (e.g. Salus, Mounin, Hamel, Tagliavini 1963) and are disappointing; still others restrict themselves to a certain period (e.g. Aarsleff, Robins 1951, Tagliavini 1968, Verburg) and are generally more fruitful (but regarding Lehmann, cf. Percival 1970a). Gagkaev and Mounin both include Indian and other non-European theories of language—without, however, offering a convincing general view of either Occident or Orient. Robins 1967 has covered a period quite similar to that of Arens, and his epistemological foundation might at times be the better; but the informational value of his book falls somewhat short: too many factual errors render it unreliable for reference or as a source book.

Arens' work is both an anthology and a history of western linguistics, unlike the two comparable anthologies of Bolelli 1965, Zvegincev 1964-65. Bolelli, covering the period between 1750 and 1950, quotes from about fifty authors (twelve of them Italian), giving a short introduction to each individual selection. Zvegincev takes a similar approach, covering western linguistics from 1816 to 1960; but he offers more textual comment of informational value, and sometimes gives several selections from the same author.⁴

At first sight, the volume under review appears to be almost the same as Arens' first edition of 1955; it has the same binding, paper, printing, and general arrangement of contents, and seems only to have become somewhat more bulky. In fact, the revised edition has about 250 more pages than the original book; as the reader is informed in the preface to the new edition (p. ix), only five (which?) of the 90 original selections have been eliminated, but 51 new texts have been added.

A closer look into the contents of the anthology reveals that, apart from the sections devoted to western linguistic development between about 1940 and 1965, there have been a number of important changes which apply less to the first half of the volume, covering the period from the 5th century B.C. to the end of the 18th century, than to the second half, devoted to the 19th and 20th centuries. However, a number of formal changes should be noted. Most of the first part of the anthology has been retained in its original setting, but significantly, its title 'Rise to linguistics' is now 'The paths to a science of language'; the traditional idea, according to which linguistics proper does not begin before the appearance of F. Schlegel's famous *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* in 1808, has been retained. Despite a number of recent claims to the contrary, I would adhere to this view, perhaps even by considering Bopp's *Conjugationssystem* of 1816 as the decisive turning point in the study of language: Bopp seems to have been the first to emphasize the study of language for language's sake, an aspect which the editors of the Saussurean *Cours* (published precisely 100 years later) stressed in the closing sentence of that epoch-making book. Sir William Jones, with whose biography Sebeok's *Portraits* begin, is surely 'the forerunner par excellence' (Hoenigswald 1968), but cannot rightly be regarded as one of the 'founding fathers' of linguistics; such a claim would be an injustice to the importance of one of the greatest scholars of the 18th century. The fact that Schlegel's opening passages recall the famous statement from Jones' 1786 address to the members of the Asiatick Society of Bengal cannot be cited as proof to the contrary, as Aarsleff (1967:136-4) suggests, but underlines Jones' position as an initiator of comparative studies malgré lui, in the sense that his call for more serious attention to the languages and (through them to the) cultures of the East was interpreted by Schlegel and others after him as an invitation to reconstruct the original proto-language from which the living languages have developed. As late as 1822 we find, in Humboldt's *Über das Entstehen der grammatischen Formen*, echoes of Jones' famous passage, a fact which appears to have puzzled Mueller recently (1966:150).

But all this is anticipating what Arens might have to say in the second half of his anthology, which now consists of two parts (instead of the 1955 single part): 'Linguistics in the 19th century' (155-399) and 'Linguistics in the 20th century'

⁴ For the contents of Zvegincev 1964, cf. *Linguistics* 14.127-8 (1965).