Sahlin, Gunvor. 1928. *César Chesneau Du Marsais et son rôle dans l'évolution de la grammaire générale.* Paris: Presses Univ. de France. (New ed. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins [in prep.].)

Scaglione, Aldo. 1972. *The Classical Theory of Composition from its Origins to the Present: A historical survey.* (= *U.N.C. Studies in Comparative Literature,* 53.) Chapel Hill, N.C.: Univ. of North Carolina Press.

Silvestre de Sacy, Antoine Isaac (1758-1838). 1803 [1799]. *Principes de grammaire générale, mis à la portée des enfans et propres à servir d'introduction à l'étude de toutes les langues.* Paris: A. Belin. (Repr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1973.)

Thiébault, Dieudonné (1733-1807). 1802. *Grammaire philosophique; ou, La métaphysique, la logique et la grammaire réunies en un seul corps de doctrine.* 2 vols. Paris: Courcier. (Repr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1973.)

Vater, Johann Severin (1771-1826). 1801. *Versuch einer allgemeinen Sprachlehre.* Halle: Renger. (Repr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1970.)

Wrobel, Johann, ed. 1887. *Eberhardi Bethuniensis Graecismus ... .* (= *Corpus grammaticorum Medii AEvi,* 1.) Breslau: G. Koebner.

*****

Bibliographia Saussureana, 1870-1970: An annotated, classified bibliography on the background, development and actual relevance of Ferdinand de Saussure's general theory of language. By E. F. K. Koerner. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1972. Pp. xliii, [45-] 406. Cloth, $ 11.00.

Contribution au débat post-saussurien sur le signe linguistique: Introduction générale et bibliographie annotée. (= *Approaches to Semiotics;* paperback series, 2.) By E. F. K. Koerner. The Hague: Mouton, 1972. Pp. 103. Paper, Hfl. 12,-.

Reviewed by HENRI WITTMANN, *Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières*

I. INTRODUCTION. Here are new tools for the study of Saussure's contribution to linguistics. Venturing into compiling "an annotated, classified bibliography on the background, development and actual relevance of Ferdinand de Saussure's general theory of language" is definitely no assignment for the faint-hearted, even for someone like Koerner who has already to his credit, at the time of publication of *Bibliographia Saussureana* (henceforth *BS*) and *Contribution*, something like nine items on Saussure or related subjects in the

history of linguistics, and is publishing a major work on Saussure in 1973. That
Koerner has undertaken his task is a tribute both to his courage and to the
importance of Saussure to a general theory of language.

Modern theorizing on language is imbued with conceptions attributable to
Saussure, though it is rare to see him get the credit he ordinarily would have
deserved. This is particularly true for the way in which most American linguists
dismissed his theoretical assumptions, overtly at least. The extent to which FdS
has remained an unknown entity in the mind of the general linguistic public
can be appreciated in the fact that, as recently as 1964, we were able to register
the old fellow for a regular summer meeting of the Linguistic Society of
America (*LSA Bulletin* 38:7, 1965, transcribed as "F. D. Soussure"). This
situation may partly have its roots in the intellectual climate of the 1930's and
1940's and the then prevailing "strong anti-European feeling of many
American linguists" Hall (1969:194-96) talks about:

> Difference from Europeans in theoretical matters was often magnified into unrea-
> soning hatred or contempt, taught as part of a self-styled "scientific" approach
> and all too often accepted uncritically by students.

Though the "economic and professional tensions" of the time, given by Hall
as a somewhat 'understandable' motivation for reacting foolishly, are no longer
with us, it remains fashionable to view the history of linguistics from Saussure
back to Humboldt in terms of a *reductio ad absurdum* of the former and a
amplificatio ad libitum of the latter. (Chomsky 1964:17-25, is typical for this.
Cf. Wittmann 1967, and forthcoming.) The unfavorable intellectual climate
notwithstanding, there has been over the past decade something like a renewal
of interest in FdS as a scholar whose enormous impact on linguistic thinking is
a phenomenon as yet to be assessed seriously. We are indebted to Koerner for
providing us the materials on which such appraisals can be based.

2. FERDINAND DE SAUSSURE IN GENERATIVE GRAMMAR. The infor-
mation contained in *BS* and *Contribution* constitutes a most valuable supple-
ment to the recent critical edition of *CLG* (Saussure 1968, reviewed by Koer-
ner 1972) and the *Lexique* by Engler 1968 (reviewed by Koerner 1971). As a
matter of fact, the lack of a fresh translation of *CLG* into English is another
lacuna awaiting a remedy. A critical edition in the original language can very
well afford to give all the variants or *Lesarten* of an author's verbal idiosyncra-
sies, but in a translation this would be foolish and cumbersome. If *image
verbale, image acoustique, tranche acoustique, unité matérielle, signifiant,* etc.
are all synonyms, then the translation of *tranche acoustique* as a "slice of
sound" (Saussure 1959:113, 104) must be ill-advised and considered a definite
shot in the dark. What a "slice of sound" can do to the understanding of a
relevant passage can be appreciated by what Chafe (1970:60) did with it.
Signifié, concept, substance conceptuelle, idée pure, etc. on one hand and *va-
leur* on the other are usually synonyms, though FdS uses them occasionally to

distinguish between paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects of deep structure. Indeed, some passages of a *critical* translation would make strange reading to a good number of generativists.

(FdS 1968:316; compare FdS 1959:139) A superficial element exists only through its underlying constituent, the function it has. This first principle is particularly important in understanding selectional restrictions of lexical items (*unités restreintes*), for one is easily tempted to think of those units [which are minimal syntactically functioning] merely in terms of their phonetic representation. Conversely, ..., an underlying constituent, a function, has existence only if sustained by some surface element. This second principle was formulated with respect to larger syntactic strings and provides the general framework for investigating overt syntactic structure in terms of underlying abstractions. By complementing each other, the two principles are in agreement with my general assumptions concerning labelling procedures for grammatical constituents.

(1968:236-37/1959:104) Adequate labelling requires that the structural description given to the superficial string be equivalent to the structural description given to the underlying string .... Let's take French *sizlaprã* .... The only structural descriptions possible are
    (a) *si-ž-la-prã* "if I take her"
    (b) *si-ž-l-aprã* "if I learn it"
and they are determined by the semantic interpretations assigned to the strings.

(1968:233-35/1959:103) Constituents arè not definable as such until they are labelled as to their function and assigned to a certain category. Constituents defined in this way are the entities that relate systematically to one another in the mechanism of language ... . In listening to an unfamiliar language, we are at a loss to say how a given string of phones is to be interpreted... . However, as soon as we have some knowledge of the underlying structure (in terms of categories and functions), the apparently amorphous string neatly subdivides into continuous substrings.

(1968:285/1959:125) All types of strings that can be reduced to rules are to be attributed to competence rather than to performance.... These types only exist if the mind has been able to register them on the basis of a representative sample. ... The same is true of sentences and syntagmatic groups based on recurring patterns. Strings such as
    la terre tourne "the world turns round"
    que vous dit-il? "what is he telling you? "
correspond to recurring sentence types sustained in competence by concrete engrams.

(1968:291/1959:128) The syntagmatic whole has meaning only through its constituents, whereas constituents have meaning by virtue of their relationship with the whole ... . Larger entities can always be interpreted in terms of more restricted entities, whilst mutually dependant on each other.

(1968:295) $A = a + b$.

(1968:294-96/1959:130-31) Our memory holds in reserve all the different types of syntagms of varying complexity, class-membership and length. Whenever we use any of them, we bring in the principle of paradigmatic selection procedures and restraints to make our choice ... . In any given string, the speaker knows what he must vary in order to generate the differentiation necessary to isolate the entity sought ... . This principle applies even to the most complex types of syntagms and sentences. When producing the sentence

que vous dit-il? "what is he telling you? "

the speaker varies one element in a latent syntactical pattern such as

$$que \left\{ \begin{array}{c} lui \\ me \\ vous \\ nous \end{array} \right\} dit\text{-}il?$$

until his choice settles upon *vous.* In this operation, which consists in mentally eliminating everything that doesn't help to bring about the necessary differentiation at the desired point, both paradigmatic and syntagmatic selection procedures and restraints are simultaneously involved. Conversely, this process of fixation and choice governs the smallest units including phonological elements wherever they have underlying phonological representations ... . For instance, if Greek *m, p, t,* etc. can never occur in word-final position, this means that their presence or absence in a given position is relevant to word and sentence structure. (Braces used 1968:285, 295.)

(1968:206-7/1959:92-93) No force in language can guarantee the maintenance of particular rules of grammar. Being a simple statement regarding the existing order of things, a synchronic rule reports a state of affairs.... Thus nothing is more rule-governed (cf. "fixé par une règle" 1968:154) than the synchronic principle underlying accentuation in Latin ... . We can talk about a rule only when a set of underlying facts respond to some same principle of reinterpretability.

(1968:219, 360) For example, the facts underlying German *Nacht/Nächte, Gast/ Gäste,* etc. can be stated by means of a purely synchronic rule of grammar:

"*a* is replaced by *ä* in the context of plural."

(Ap. Godel 1957:30) For the time being, the theory of language appears to me like a system of geometry. It leads to postulating theorems which need to be put to the proof.

(Ap. Engler 1968:50) Term: Constituents of a synchronic relation ... . Terminal term ≠ *initial term* ... . Terms are operational quanta, just as in a mathematical equation.

(1968:375-76. Cf. 1959:165) We must distinguish between the generative capacity

inherent in our unconscious knowledge of grammatical relations (*formes généra-trices*) and the product of a form generated in actual speech performance (*forme engendrée*).

It seems obvious that the model Saussure had in mind to represent the grammar of natural language must have been in the form of some kind of algorithm. Such a view concerning the nature of language compares rather favorably with Humboldt's preoccupations with language in terms of mere elements within some sort of system. I shall show elsewhere (forthcoming) that Humboldt regarded language synchronically as a 'Vorrath von Wörtern' (a store of word-like elements) and diachronically only as a 'System von Regeln' (system of rules) and that Chomsky's "brief sketch, largely in paraphrase" (1964:20) of the thoughts of Humboldt are in sharp contrast with what the latter actually said on the subject. There can be no doubt that any attempt to reduce *Geist* (mind) to a wholly definable algorithm would have shocked Humboldt (as most of his contemporaries) as utterly 'mechanistic'. It is precisely Saussure's mechanistic approach to mentalism that most confused his contemporaries. What FdS did was to provide us with a new intellectual paradigm ('in the Kuhnian sense' according to Koerner 1972:684), though his ideas were instilled into our linguistic thought screened by the antimentalistic or antimechanistic predilections of those who attempted to reconcile them with their own intellectual capacities. 'Transformational grammar' and similar conceptions of language restore these undercurrents back into their proper perspective.

3. ORGANIZATION OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHIES. *BS* is divided into three parts of unequal lengths and complexities:

I) Publications concerning Ferdinand de Saussure (45-214); II) Background sources of FdS's linguistic theory, 1816-1916 (215-351); III) Writings concerning the history of linguistics with particular reference to FdS and his work, 1916-1970 (353-93). The justification for such a tripartite organization appears in a preface (7-10) as well as in the introductory remarks of the various parts and their subsections. Pages xi-xliii (= 11-43) and 395-406 are taken up by a list of abbreviations and an index of authors, respectively.

Part I of *BS* attempts to be "exhaustive, as much as such an aim is feasible for a single researcher... ." (vii). It is organized into four subsections: 1) Biographical sources on FdS (46-50); 2) List of FdS's writings, including posthumously published work and their translations, 1877-1970 (51-65); 3) Reviews and general accounts on FdS's work (66-91); 4) Accounts of particular principles of Saussurean linguistic theory (92-214). The latter section is the longest and most complex chapter of this bibliography: a) The dichotomy of synchrony versus diachrony in linguistic description (92-110); b) The distinction between *langue* and *parole*, and its relation to *langage* (111-26); c) The concept

of the language sign, its bilateral nature and (alleged) arbitrary character; the notion of *valeur linguistique*; semantics and semiotics (127-79); d) Language as a system of relations: the *rapports syntagmatiques et associatifs*, and the opposition of system versus structure in language (180-96); e) The relation between form and substance in linguistics (197-203); f) Writings on further notions of Saussurean origin, such as opposition in language, and the distinctive, negative and (possibly) binary relation between its elements (204-14). The subdivisions of section I.4 seem to me very clear and self-explanatory.

Contribution is essentially the French version of section I.4.c in *BS* 127-79, though it has a much enlarged introduction to the topic (11-31), a good number of additions in the main body of the bibliography (32-94), as well as a "supplément à la bibliographie" (95-103) not contained in *BS*. *Contribution* also has a wider range of coverage (1916-1971, 1972). The justification for a separate publication of *Contribution* appears in the author's findings (11) "que la définition du signe dit saussurien est la notion la plus souvent analysée et discutée de la théorie linguistique du maître genevois...." Indeed, *Contribution* with all the alterations, additions and minutiae it incorporates, is a publication that can stand very well on its own.

Part II of *BS* provides a listing of those 19th-century publications which might very well have constituted the background sources to FdS's linguistic theory. It takes into account not only writings in the field of linguistics and other aspects of the language sciences (220-326) but also publications in the fields of philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics, mathematics, and the natural sciences (327-51). Koerner thus attempts to establish the intellectual paradigm of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. References not contained in the 1916 edition of *CLG* but appearing for the first time in the 1968 critical edition have been incorporated as well. As such, it is certainly good news to see the listing of Humboldt in *BS* 328-30, items 1322-9, corroborated by Engler in his critical edition 1968:3 (mentioned alongside Schlegel and Bopp).

The list of part III intends to analyse writings pertaining to the history of linguistics with regard to their reflection and appreciation of FdS's theory. Koerner is particularly good at demonstrating, in his introduction as well as in various notes, that recognition bestowed upon Saussure appears to have been, if not subject to distortions, more often covert than overt in nature. There is also the surprising revelation of an apparently 'immense influence' of FdS on Japanese linguistics (370, item 2389).

4. SOME CRITICAL COMMENTS. Given the wealth of information to be found in *BS* and *Contribution*, there is very little to be said by way of criticism. I shall limit my comments to the discussion of a few omissions here and there.

One would have liked to see a more systematic inclusion of the writings of Gustave Guillaume and his followers, self-avowedly Saussurean in outlook,

though they are now accessible in a separate bibliography (Veyrat 1971). After all, it was Guillaume, and not Postal 1964, who reinterpreted the signans/signatum dichotomy in terms of a 'psychosystematic' interplay between underlying structure (*structure sous-jacente,* the psychic level) and superficial structure (*structure superficielle,* the semiotic level) (see Valin 1955:40; 1971:69-70). Saussure himself, as widely noted (cf. *BS* 180), had a strong antipathy for the word "structure".

André Martinet is, admittedly, a very prolific writer, a circumstance to which bibliographies of this scope must be vulnerable. Yet, Koerner might have included some of Martinet's work on the topic of 'function' (the deep structure aspect of the double articulation), some of which is included in the 1962 monograph, a notion that deeply influenced members of the so-called Linguistic Circle of New York. The very important paper of 1952 was developed into a theory of sound change (phonologie diachronique). This paper, and the 1955 book which in part resulted from it, have exerted much influence in certain circles (e.g. Moulton 1962; Labov 1963, 1965; cf. also item 2506 of *BS* 391). Notions such as 'internal equilibria' and 'hole in the pattern' or 'gap' (*case vide*) in Saussure (1968:276, 115) are essential to a linguistic theory that wishes to preserve the (paradigmatic) geometry of phonological space. Yet, it is rather certain that Saussure (similarly to King 1969) would have objected somewhat to 'push-chains' and 'drag-chains' (cf. FdS 1968:15).

Greimas' 1966 *Sémantique structurale* appears in the "supplément" to *Contribution* (97), but not in section I.4c of *BS.* In general, the discussion of the topic would have gained from a comparison of structural semantics with the interpretative and generative variants of the transformational approach to the problem. After all, Katz and Postal motivated their quest into the relationship of the semantic versus the phonological components via syntax as the descriptive analogue (1964:2) to "Saussure's dictum that the connection between form and meaning is arbitrary", which means that they had some understanding, however dim it might have been, of what that 'dictum' is supposed to say.

Item 295a of page 85 in *BS* (N. A. Sljusareva 1967; her own handwriting shows *ss* rather than *s*) should not have been included. Her paper had been cancelled and I know of no other place where it could have appeared since. (It has; cf. Sljusareva 1968, *Ed.*). Instead, some of her other publications in Russian (other than item 923, *BS* 169) might have been included. I also would have made appropriate mention of Lacan 1966 and Millet & Varin d'Ainvelle 1970. As to Firth's suggestions concerning 'collocation' (*BS* 181), it would have helped to know where he discussed the matter.

The typographical presentation of the bibliographies is a neat and conscientious one. There are few misprints or other inconsistencies. *BS* 157, item 829 and *Contribution* 68 should have been *Éléments de linguistique générale* and not *Éléments de la linguistique générale.* Item 053 of *BS* 52 should have the

tologie linguistique in italics in order to go with the *Essai de paléon-*. There is a
rather liberal use of *ibid.* in *BS* where one would have preferred a more con-
temporary way of dealing with the underlying problem. One wonders, for
example, why in items 045-093 of *BS* 51-55 the *MSLP's* of the same
year—➤—*ibid.*, whereas the 46 *Recueil's* of the same passage never rewrite in any
other way. Why should *BS* 1-43 use Roman numerals whereas the pagination of
45 ff. is in Arabic?

I also noted Koerner's apparent assumption on page 111 of *BS* that Saussure's
syntagmatics is some sort of sketch for a theory of performance (*parole*). It
is true that in earlier versions of his theory he somehow considered major
syntagms to be part of both *langue* and *parole*, but he later came to distinguish
more sharply between sentence formation in competence and sentence produc-
tion (or recognition) as part of performance. However, these and other matters
should best be left to a review of Koerner's 1973 major discussion on the
subject.*

Reviewer's address:

Professor Henri Wittmann
Département des Lettres
Université du Québec
Boulevard des Forges
TROIS-RIVIÈRES, P.Q., CANADA.

REFERENCES

Chafe, Wallace L. 1970. *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago:
Univ. of Chicago Press.
Chomsky, Noam. 1964. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. The Hague: Mou-
ton.

*) For other reviews of *Bibliographia Saussureana* (at times in conjunction with *Contribu-
tion*), published or in press, consult Tullio De Mauro in *Paese Sera* (Rome, 21 July 1972);
Rudolf Engler in *VR* vol. 32; Daniele Gambarara in *CFS* 28; Kiyozo Kazama in *GK*
63.88-96 (May 1973), Giulio C. Lepschy in *Linguistics*; Luigi Romeo in *GQ* 47; J[ochen]
Sch[indler] in *Sprache* 19:1, p.84 (1973); Herman Parret in *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 35,
p.658 (1973); Maurice Gross in *Bulletin des Bibliothèques de France* 18:7, p.624 (1973);
Francis J. Witty in *American Reference Books Annual* 4, p.444 (1973); N. A. Sljusareva in
VJa 23:4; Rulon Wells in *Lg*, and Peter Wunderli in *Kratylos* 17; others have not yet been
brought to my attention. *Contribution* has recently been reviewed by Sebastiano Timpa-
naro in *Critica storica* 10:3.529-32 (Sept. 1973).   *Ed.*

Engler, Rudolf, comp. 1968. *Lexique de la terminologie saussurienne.* Utrecht & Antwerp: Spectrum.

Godel, Robert. 1957. *Les sources manuscrites du Cours de linguistique générale de F. de Saussure.* Geneva: Droz. (2nd printing, 1969.)

Greimas, A. J. 1966. *Sémantique structurale: Recherche de méthode.* Paris: Larousse. (2nd printing, 1969.)

Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1969. "Some Recent Developments in American Linguistics". *NphM* 70.192-227.

Katz, Jerrold J., and Paul M. Postal. 1964. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Description.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. (2nd ed., 1967.)

King, Robert D. 1969. "Push Chains and Drag Chains". *Glossa* 3.3-21.

Koerner, E. F. K. 1971. Review of Engler 1968. *Lg* 47.447-50.

––––––. 1972. Review of Saussure 1968. *Lg* 48.682-84.

––––––. 1973. *Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and development of his linguistic theory in western studies of language.* Braunschweig: F. Vieweg & Sohn.

Labov, William. 1963. "The Social Motivation of a Sound Change". *Word* 19.273-309.

––––––. 1965. "On the Mechanism of Sound Change". *MSLL* 18.19-114, and 131-32.

Lacan, Jean. 1966. *Ecrits.* Paris: Seuil.

Martinet, André. 1952. "Function, Structure, and Sound Change". *Word* 8.1-32.

––––––. 1955. *Economie des changements phonétiques: Traité de phonologie diachronique.* Berne: A. Francke. (3rd ed., 1970.)

––––––. 1962. *A Functional View of Language.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Millet, Louis, and Madeleine Varin d'Ainvelle. 1970. *Le structuralisme.* Paris: Editions universitaires.

Moulton, William G. 1962. "Dialect Geography and the Concept of Phonological Space". *Word* 18.23-32.

Postal, Paul M. 1964. "Underlying and Superficial Linguistic Structure". *HER* 34.246-66.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics.* Transl. by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library. (2nd ed., 1966.)

––––––. 1968. *Cours de linguistique générale.* Critical ed. by Rudolf Engler. Tome I. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.

Sljusareva, N. A. 1968. "Glavnoe v lingvističeskoj koncepcii F. de Sossjura". *IJaŠ* 1968/4.18-28.

Valin, Roch. 1955. *Petite introduction à la psychomécanique du langage.* 2nd ed. Québec: Presses de l'Univ. Laval.

––––––, ed. 1971. *Leçons de linguistique de Gustave Guillaume, 1948-1949.* Série A: *Structure sémiologique et structure psychique de la langue française I. Ibid.* & Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Veyrat, Christel. 1971. *Bibliographie des écrits d'inspiration guillaumienne.*

Québec: Fonds Gustave Guillaume.

Wittmann, Henri. 1970 [1967]. "Saussure's Theory of Language". *Actes de Xe Congrès international des Linguistes* II, 279-83. Bucharest: Ed. de l'Acad. de la R.S.R.

————. Forthcoming. *The Semantic Structure of the Formative.*

*****

English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800. By Ian Michael. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970. Pp. xvi, 622. £ 10.20 / $ 32.50.

Reviewed by JEFFREY F. HUNTSMAN, *Indiana University*

> Q: Are the Parts of Speech the same in
> English as in all other Languages?
> A: Well, every one after their own Way
>
> *Bellum grammaticale* (1712)

For most critics and defenders alike, traditional grammar flows unchangingly forward from its classical sources, and vagaries, if any, are attributed to obstacles which alter its course in no significant way. The assumption that this Latin or Latinate grammar represents a coherent and undifferentiated tradition is so strongly held that it has seldom been examined in any particular detail and never exhaustively. In *English Grammatical Categories* (hereafter EGC) Dr. Ian Michael, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malawi, challenges this assumption with a series of questions:

> Just what *is* the compact, agreed and established grammatical tradition which we are said to have inherited? What is meant by saying that Latin grammar was 'applied' to English? In what circumstances, with what deliberation and agreement, was it applied? Was there any protest, any anticipation of our own criticisms? (2)

Michael begins his study with a survey of the tradition as it is found in some five dozen grammatical works from Protagoras (5th century B.C.) to Sanctius (d. 1601). In six chapters, he discusses the sources themselves (9-23); the nature of grammar as the various grammarians conceived it (24-47); the systems of parts of speech and the classification of linguistic forms within the major systems (48-106); terms describing morphological differentiations ('Accidents') such as *comparison, number, inflection,* and *mood* (107-21), and (in a mixed bag curiously titled 'Syntax') concepts like *correctness, agreement, subject* and *predicate, apposition,* and *usage* (122-43). He finds that the tradition