

# SCHOOLS OF LINGUISTICS

and Developments

## 语言学流派 与发展

编 著 蒋 平 张志栋 秦欢华



华东师范大学出版社

# 语言学流派与发展

蒋 平 张志栋 秦欢华 ◎ 编著



华东师范大学出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

语言学流派与发展/蒋平,张志栋,秦欢华编著. —上海:华东师范大学出版社,2010.10  
ISBN 978-7-5617-8171-5

I. ①语… II. ①蒋…②张…③秦… III. ①语言学派—研究 IV. ①H0-06

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2010)第 204739 号

江西省社会科学“十一五”(2010)规划重点资助项目

## 语言学流派与发展

编 著 蒋 平 张志栋 秦欢华  
策划编辑 李恒平  
责任编辑 李恒平  
审读编辑 龚 嵘  
特约编审 王馥芳  
责任校对 贺琳菲 冒晓丰  
装帧设计 高 山

出版发行 华东师范大学出版社  
社 址 上海市中山北路 3663 号 邮编 200062  
网 址 [www.ecnupress.com.cn](http://www.ecnupress.com.cn)  
电 话 021-60821666 行政传真 021-62572105  
客服电话 021-62865537 门市(邮购)电话 021-62869887  
地 址 上海市中山北路 3663 号华东师范大学校内先锋路口  
网 店 <http://ecnup.taobao.com/>

印 刷 者 苏州永新印刷包装有限责任公司  
开 本 787×1092 16 开  
印 张 15.75  
字 数 349 千字  
版 次 2011 年 3 月第 1 版  
印 次 2011 年 3 月第 1 次  
书 号 ISBN 978-7-5617-8171-5/H·550  
定 价 28.00 元

出 版 人 朱杰人

(如发现本版图书有印订质量问题,请寄回本社客服中心调换或电话 021-62865537 联系)

# 前言

语言的研究,在二十世纪初 **Saussure** 提倡的结构主义分析方法引起广泛的兴趣与借鉴之后,在许多地区,尤其是欧洲与北美,带来了语言学理论与方法的不断创新,开启了该世纪的语言学研究新潮。现代语言学本身所发生的连续不断的创新与变化,各阶段理论与方法的推陈出新是每个涉入语言研究的人需要搞清楚的重要内容,而门派之间的关系与相互借鉴也是每一个语言研究者语言学基础知识的必修环节。又由于语言学的研究并不是从二十世纪才开始的,**Saussure** 的思想是怎样发展而来的,其本身就是一个值得追究的问题。在 **Saussure** 之前的几千年有过什么样的语言学大事纪,对后来的研究有着什么样的影响,都是十分必要而有益的追问。因此,现代的研究者,尤其是青年学者,如果想在前人的研究基础上有真正的进展,光知道 **Saussure** 及其之后的现代人所反复讨论的东西还不够,还必须将语言研究的历史画册再行展开,看到画册上那一长串更早的琳琅满目的乃至气势蓬勃的面貌以饱眼福,并获得对语言学历史过程的全面了解。好比每一个读书人都需要学一点关于人类发展的历史,则每一个语言研究者和语言专业的学习者都需要了解一点语言学的发展历程。

本书按照语言学的流派与发展的思路进行撰写的一个重要原因是,想循着历史发展的过程对语言学的各个研究与代表人物进行分类论述,使读者能够从中看清它们之间的关系与联系。这一效果,作者们自己在写作的过程中就已有了深刻的亲身体会。经过亲历史料查找、认证与著述的过程,作者们才真正了解到 **Saussure** 语言学观点的思想理论背景以及这与他本人知识结构的关系。也正是在这一查找与探索的过程中,作者们才豁然看到了当今在一些国家和地区如火如荼的认知语言学是怎样逐渐酝酿而来的,看到了它如何从 **Chomsky** 形式主义研究的框架下突破框架,另辟蹊径,看到了它的必然性。

本书所论述和分析的语言学流派包括语言学产生以来的主要流派、代表人物、主要研究方式、研究内容、理论体系、重要影响、相互关系及其继承与发展的过程。内容从古印度、古希腊、古罗马以及中国古代的传统语法和语言哲学研究,到欧洲中世纪及文艺复兴时期的语言与语法研究、历史比较语言学、欧洲结构主义及各个流派(包括法兰西学派、布拉格学派、哥本哈根学派)、美国描写主义与结构主义学派、转换生成语法学派、伦敦学派、系统功能语法学派美国功能学派、以及当今日益盛行的认知语言学的研究等。

本书是在深入了解和参考国内已出版的语言学流派著述的基础上,通过大量查阅国外语言学流派的著作、语言学历史书籍、语言学各个理论的介绍与专论和语言学百科全书、大英百科全书的基础上撰写而成。本书的撰写力求全面、客观而有系统地论述语言学的发展历史,内容上多处具有新颖之处,包括了国内较少提到的几家语言学研究派别和人物、主要

思想、一些学派的后续研究及其发展与变化、某些学派之间的联系、以及语言学的最新发展动向及其思想理论基础。例如,关于法兰西学派及其研究与继承的介绍在国内目前出版的同类著作中较少提到。关于美国功能学派的研究在国内尚未有系统的介绍。认知语言学的各种研究由于是新近发展起来的研究范式,则更少在语言学流派的著作中占一席之地。另外,将伦敦学派与系统功能语法学派根据体系的变化分为两个派系进行分章讨论,并在系统功能学派的讨论中增加了 Martin 的评价理论这一重要的后续发展,以及对美国功能学派的人物与认知语言学研究的人物之间的划分,都是根据各家的研究特点与后续的发展与延伸的具体情况,经过细致的分析和反复的思考而确定下来的。进行这样的编排与考虑,旨在为国内语言学学习者和研究者提供更为清楚的关于语言学历史与发展脉络的文献资料。由于它所覆盖的范围和对各个流派主要内容的详细梳理,本书将成为目前国内一本更全面的关于语言学流派与研究的著述。

本书采用英文撰写,为的是读者能够通过英语直接了解语言学的历史知识,获得更具体更准确的信息。在分类上,除了以时代和地域作为基本的脉络之外,更注重考虑了各学派的研究特性、学派之间的关系、观点的延续性和拓展性,使得整个书目编排具有高度的清晰性。目前,国内语言学研究经过改革开放之后的大量引进与自我发展,正进入一个新的阶段,中青年学者脱颖而出,对于语言学资料有了更高的要求。本书除了可作为语言学研究的重要参考文献外,也适合作为英语专业学生语言学概论学习之后的语言学高级选修课教材、语言学专业研究生考试复习用书以及研究生开设现代语言学课程、理论语言学课程、语言学史或语言学流派课程的主要教材和必读文献。

作者  
2009年6月

# CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction: Linguistics and Schools of Linguistics</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 What Is Linguistics?	1
1.2 Schools of Linguistics	2
<b>Chapter 2 Traditional Grammar</b>	<b>6</b>
2.0 Introduction	6
2.1 Sanskrit Grammar in Ancient India	7
2.2 Grammar in Ancient Greece	9
2.3 Grammar in Ancient Rome	12
2.4 Grammar in the Middle Ages	14
2.5 Linguistics from the Renaissance to the 18th Century	16
2.6 Linguistic Tradition in the Middle East and China	18
2.7 Summary	21
<b>Chapter 3 Historical and Comparative Linguistics</b>	<b>23</b>
3.0 Introduction	23
3.1 Early Development of Historical Linguistics	24
3.2 Rask, Grimm and Bopp	25
3.3 Wilhelm von Humboldt	29
3.4 Historical Linguistics in the Mid – 19th Century	31
3.5 The Study of Ablaut	33
3.6 Neogrammarians	34
3.7 Jespersen and International Phonetic Alphabet	36
3.8 Summary	38
<b>Chapter 4 Schools of European Structuralism</b>	<b>39</b>
4.0 Introduction	39
4.1 Saussure and <i>Course in General Linguistics</i>	40
4.1.1 Historical Background and Sources of Saussure's Ideas	40
4.1.2 Saussure's Contributions to General Linguistics	41
4.1.2.1 Langue vs. Parole	42
4.1.2.2 Signifier vs. Signified	43
4.1.2.3 Arbitrariness	44
4.1.2.4 Linear Nature (Syntagmatic vs. Paradigmatic)	45
4.1.2.5 Synchronic Linguistics vs. Diachronic Linguistics	46

4. 1. 3	Saussure's Impact and Legacy .....	47
4. 2	French School .....	47
4. 2. 1	French Post-Saussurean Linguistics .....	47
4. 2. 2	Martinet's Structural-Functional Linguistics .....	48
4. 3	Prague School .....	50
4. 3. 1	Mathesius and Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) .....	51
4. 3. 2	Trubetzkoy and <i>Principles of Phonology</i> .....	53
4. 3. 3	Jakobson and Distinctive Features .....	55
4. 3. 4	Markedness Theory .....	57
4. 4	Copenhagen School .....	59
4. 4. 1	Introduction to the Copenhagen Linguistic Circle .....	59
4. 4. 2	Hjelmslev and Glossematics .....	60
4. 5	Summary .....	61
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Schools of American Descriptivism and Structuralism .....</b>	<b>63</b>
5. 0	Introduction .....	63
5. 1	Early Period; Boas and Sapir .....	64
5. 1. 1	Boas and his Linguistic Views .....	64
5. 1. 2	Sapir and his Linguistic Method and Theories .....	66
5. 1. 2. 1	Sapir the Man .....	66
5. 1. 2. 2	Sapir's Linguistic Method and Theories .....	67
5. 1. 3	The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis .....	69
5. 2	Bloomfieldian Age .....	71
5. 2. 1	Bloomfield and the Stimulus-Response Theory .....	71
5. 2. 2	Immediate Constituent Analysis (IC Analysis) .....	74
5. 3	Post-Bloomfieldian Age .....	76
5. 3. 1	Harris and his Linguistic Views .....	77
5. 3. 2	Hockett and his Linguistic Views .....	79
5. 4	Summary .....	82
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Generative Schools .....</b>	<b>84</b>
6. 0	Introduction .....	84
6. 1	Chomsky and the Innateness Hypothesis .....	85
6. 2	Transformational-Generative Grammar .....	87
6. 2. 1	The Classical Theory .....	89
6. 2. 2	The Standard Theory .....	91
6. 2. 3	The Extended Standard Theory .....	93
6. 2. 4	Government and Binding Theory .....	95
6. 2. 4. 1	Phrase Structures and X-bar Theory .....	96
6. 2. 4. 2	C-Command and Government .....	98
6. 2. 4. 3	Binding Theory .....	102
6. 2. 5	Minimalism .....	104
6. 3	Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory .....	106
6. 3. 1	Generative Phonology .....	106
6. 3. 2	Optimality Theory .....	110

6.3.2.1	Input and GEN; the Candidate Set	111
6.3.2.2	CON; the Constraint Set	111
6.3.2.3	EVAL; Definition of Optimality	112
6.4	Generative Semantics	116
6.5	Summary	117
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>London School</b>	<b>119</b>
7.0	Introduction	119
7.1	Malinowski's Theories	120
7.2	Firth's Theories	121
7.2.1	Firth's Study of Meaning	122
7.2.2	Firth's Prosodic Analysis	124
7.3	Neo-Firthian Age	126
7.3.1	Randolph Quirk and his Linguistic Studies	126
7.3.2	Robins and his Linguistic Studies	128
7.3.3	Sinclair and his Linguistic Studies	129
7.3.4	John Lyons and his Linguistic Studies	130
7.4	Summary	131
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>Systemic-Functional School</b>	<b>133</b>
8.0	Introduction	133
8.1	Halliday and his Linguistic Views	133
8.1.1	Halliday the Man	133
8.1.2	Halliday's Linguistic Views	134
8.1.3	Halliday's Early Study: Scale and Category Grammar	136
8.2	Systemic Grammar	136
8.2.1	Entry Condition	138
8.2.2	Meaning Potential and Realization	138
8.3	Functional Grammar	139
8.3.1	Ideational Function	140
8.3.1.1	Material Processes	141
8.3.1.2	Mental Processes	141
8.3.1.3	Relational Processes	142
8.3.1.4	Verbal Processes	143
8.3.1.5	Behavioural Processes	143
8.3.1.6	Existential Processes	143
8.3.2	Interpersonal Function	144
8.3.3	Textual Function	146
8.4	Register and Genre	147
8.4.1	Context of Situation: Register	148
8.4.1.1	Field	148
8.4.1.2	Tenor	148
8.4.1.3	Mode	149
8.4.2	Context of Culture: Genre	149
8.5	Cohesion and Coherence	151



8.5.1	Cohesion .....	151
8.5.2	Coherence .....	153
8.6	Grammatical Metaphor .....	155
8.6.1	Ideational Metaphor .....	156
8.6.2	Interpersonal Metaphor .....	157
8.6.2.1	Metaphor of Modality .....	158
8.6.2.2	Metaphor of Mood .....	158
8.6.3	Textual Metaphor .....	158
8.7	Martin and Appraisal Theory .....	159
8.7.1	Attitude: Ways of Feeling .....	160
8.7.1.1	Affect .....	160
8.7.1.2	Judgment .....	161
8.7.1.3	Appreciation .....	162
8.7.2	Engagement .....	163
8.7.2.1	Disclaim .....	165
8.7.2.2	Proclaim .....	165
8.7.2.3	Entertain .....	165
8.7.2.4	Attribute .....	165
8.7.3	Graduation .....	165
8.7.3.1	Force .....	166
8.7.3.2	Focus .....	166
8.8	Summary .....	167
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>American Functional Schools .....</b>	<b>169</b>
9.0	Introduction .....	169
9.1	Pike and Tagmemics .....	169
9.1.1	Pike and his Linguistic View .....	169
9.1.2	Tagmemics .....	171
9.2	Case Grammar .....	172
9.3	Lamb's Stratificational Grammar .....	176
9.4	Kuno's Functional Syntax .....	177
9.5	Chafe Grammar .....	182
9.6	Role and Reference Grammar .....	183
9.7	West Coast Functionalism .....	188
9.8	Summary .....	189
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>Cognitive Linguistic School .....</b>	<b>191</b>
10.0	Introduction .....	191
10.1	Some Basic Concepts .....	193
10.1.1	Categorization and Prototype .....	193
10.1.2	Figure and Ground .....	195
10.1.3	Frame, Domain, Script and ICM .....	197
10.1.3.1	Frame .....	197
10.1.3.2	Domain .....	198
10.1.3.3	Script .....	200

10. 1. 3. 4	Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs)	200
10. 1. 4	Image Schemata	201
10. 2	Langacker and Cognitive Grammar	202
10. 2. 1	The Relation of Grammar to Cognition	203
10. 2. 2	Cognitive Grammar in Operation	204
10. 2. 3	Construction Grammar	205
10. 3	Cognitive Semantics	206
10. 3. 1	Embodied Realism	207
10. 3. 2	Prototype Theory	207
10. 3. 3	Lexical Network Theory	208
10. 3. 4	Lakoff, Johnson, and Conceptual Metaphor Theory	209
10. 3. 5	Conceptual Metonymy Theory	212
10. 3. 6	Cognitive Pragmatics	213
10. 3. 7	Fauconnier and his Mental Space Views	214
10. 3. 7. 1	Mental Space Theory	214
10. 3. 7. 2	Blending Theory	216
10. 4	Iconicity	219
10. 5	Grammaticalization	222
10. 6	Summary	224

## Chapter 1

# Introduction: Linguistics and Schools of Linguistics

## 1.1 What Is Linguistics?

Before defining linguistics, we have to have a word about language. As is widely known, **language** makes us human. It is “a form of human communication by means of a system of symbols principally transmitted by vocal sounds.” (Poole 1999: 5) It is one of the defining characteristics of human beings and its use lies at the center of most human activities and interactions. Widely accepted, **linguistics** is defined as the scientific study of language, which seeks to describe and explain this human faculty. It is concerned with three things: discovering precisely what it means to “know a language”; providing techniques for describing this knowledge; and explaining why our knowledge takes the form it does (Smith 2006: 341). These concerns seem too obvious to need discussion, but our knowledge of language is found limited when we are confronted with the facts that some people lose their ability of language after they have suffered a stroke, or when we observe an infant who has to acquire the faculty of language that we present so easily. To understand these three concerns, we need a theory, and that is what linguistics is called for.

Like the difference between language and linguistics, **knowledge of linguistics** is also different from **knowledge of a language**. One cannot be called a linguist just because he can speak one or several languages. Just as a person who can drive a car without understanding the inner workings of the engine, so a speaker can use a language without any knowledge of its internal structure. Converse to that, a linguist can know and understand the internal structure of a language without actually speaking it.

**Linguistics** is a new science branch but with a long history. The term was first used in the middle of the 19th century to emphasize the difference between a new approach to the study of language and the more traditional approach of philology. The differences were and are largely matters of attitude, emphasis, and purpose. The philologist is primarily concerned with the historical developments of languages, as is reflected or found in written texts and in the context of the associated literature and culture. The linguist, though interested in written texts and in the development of languages through time, tends to give priority to spoken languages and to the problems (tasks) of analyzing them as they are spoken at a given point in time.

**Linguistics** is concerned with describing and explaining the nature of human language. Relevant to this concern are the questions of what is universal to language, how language can vary, and how human beings come to know languages. All humans achieve competence in whatever language spoken around them when growing up, with apparently little need for explicit instruction. Non-humans do not. Based on such difference, many linguists assume that the ability to acquire and use language is an innate, biologically-based potential of human beings,

similar to the ability to walk. However, there is no agreement as to the extent of this innate potential with some theorists claiming that there is a very large set of highly abstract and specific binary settings coded into the human brain, while others claiming that the ability to learn language is a product of general social activities and human experience.

The **field of linguistics** may be divided in terms of three dichotomies: synchronic versus diachronic, theoretical versus applied, microlinguistics versus macrolinguistics.

A **synchronic description** of a language describes the language as it is at a given time. A **diachronic description** is concerned with the historical development of the language and the structural changes that have taken place.

The goal of **theoretical linguistics** is the construction of a general theory of the structure of a language or of a general theoretical framework for the description of languages. The aim of **applied linguistics** is the application of the findings and techniques of the scientific study of languages to practical tasks, especially to the elaboration of the improved methods of language teaching.

The terms **microlinguistics** and **macrolinguistics** are not yet well established. They are often used for theoretical convenience. The former refers to a narrower and the latter to a much broader view of the scope of linguistics. In the microlinguistic view, languages should be analyzed for their own sake and without reference to their social functions, the manner in which they are acquired by children, the psychological mechanisms that underlie the production and reception of speech, the literary and the aesthetic or communicative functions of languages, and so on. Linguistics in this sense includes at least six different disciplines, namely, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. In contrast, macrolinguistics embraces all of the interdisciplinary aspects of a language. Various areas within macrolinguistics have been given terminological recognition: psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, dialectology, mathematical and computational linguistics, and stylistics. Attention should be paid to the difference between macrolinguistics and applied linguistics which is narrowly the application of linguistic methods and concepts to language teaching and broadly may well involve other disciplines, yet the purpose is to apply theory to practice.

## 1.2 Schools of Linguistics

Although linguistics is still considered as a young science branch, study about language goes back to thousands of years. **In India**, nearly 2500 years ago, religion provided the motivation for the study of language. Around that time, Hindu priests noted that the language they spoke had changed since the compilation of the ancient sacred texts, the Vedas, starting at about 1000 B.C. For the religious ceremonies based upon the Vedas to succeed, the priests needed to learn to reproduce the language of the Vedas precisely. Pānini, an ancient Indian grammarian (lived about 400 B.C.), made the first description of the rules of Sanskrit, an ancient language of India.

**Ancient Greek philosophers** in the 5th century B.C. who debated on the origins of human languages were the first in the West to be related to linguistic theory. They also discussed the rules that govern language, or grammar, and by the 3rd century B.C. they had begun to classify words into parts of speech and give names to different forms of verbs and nouns. The first complete Greek grammar, written by Dionysus Thrax in the 1st century B.C., became a model for later Roman grammarians whose works then brought about the medieval and Renaissance

vernacular grammars.

**The Romans** used Greek grammars as models for their own work on Latin, adding commentary on Latin style and usage. In the 1st century B.C., Marcus Tullius Cicero wrote on rhetoric and style. Later grammarians Aelius Donatus (4th century A.D.) and Priscian (6th century A.D.) compiled some detailed Latin grammar books. Roman works served as textbooks for the study of language for more than 1000 years.

It was not until the end of **the 18th century** that language was researched and studied in a scientific way. In the West, during the 17th and 18th centuries, modern languages such as French and English replaced Latin as the means of universal communication. This occurrence, along with developments in printing, meant that many more texts became available. At about the same time, the study of phonetics, or the sounds of a language, began. This investigation led to the comparisons of sounds in different languages, and then, in late 18th century the findings of correspondences among Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek gave birth to the field of Indo-European linguistics.

European linguists during **the 19th century** focused on philology or the historical analysis and comparison of languages. They studied written texts and looked for changes over time or for relationships between one language and another.

In **the early 20th century** linguistics expanded to include the study of unwritten languages. In the United States, linguists, mainly anthropologists, began to study the rapidly disappearing spoken languages of Native North Americans. Because many of these languages were unwritten, researchers could not use historical analyses in their studies. In their pioneering research on these languages, anthropologists Franz Boas and Edward Sapir developed the techniques of descriptive linguistics and theorized the view that language shapes our perceptions of the world.

An important outgrowth of the same period was a theory known as **structuralism**, which assumes that language is a system with a highly organized structure. Structuralism began with the publication of the work of Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure — *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (1916). This book, compiled by Saussure's students after his death, is considered as the foundation of modern linguistics. In the book, Saussure made a clear distinction between actual speech, or spoken language, and the linguistic knowledge that speakers share. Speech, he said, represents instances of grammar, and the linguist's task is to find the underlying rules of a particular language from evidences found in speech. To the structuralist, grammar is a set of relationships that account for speech, rather than a set of instances of speech, as it is to the descriptivist.

When some linguists began to study language as a set of abstract rules that account for speech, other scholars also began to take an interest in it. They drew analogies between language and other forms of human behavior, based on the belief that there is a shared structure under many aspects of a culture. **Structuralism** in the United States was greatly promoted by Leonard Bloomfield and his followers with the major aim to develop methods of linguistic analysis.

In Europe, structuralism did not remain a monolithic linguistic monopoly. **The Prague School** was a branch of it though with some difference. The members of this school held language to be a system of functionally related units and were more interested in language change than in maintaining a strict dichotomy of langue and parole (linguistic system versus linguistic utterance), which is a key tenet of Saussure. The starting point of the Prague School is to clarify the function of the various elements of actual utterances. The School has made a lasting impact upon many areas of modern linguistics, particularly with regard to the analysis of the sounds of

language and their literary effect.

Another noteworthy school is **the Copenhagen Linguistic Circle**. One of its leading theoreticians was Louis Hjelmslev (1899 – 1965), whose *Prologomena* (1943) is meant to be a series of preliminary statements essential for the formulation of any theory of language. Hjelmslev was opposed to the confusion of philosophy of language with theories of language. He viewed language as a self-sufficient totality of its own and forecast the emergence of an “algebra of language”, which he called “glossematics”. This novel linguistic approach, which strongly emphasizes form, is designed to distinguish the ideas of the Copenhagen School from more traditional forms of structural linguistics, such as those of the Prague School. While adhering to Saussure’s basic principles of structuralism, Hjelmslev attempted to make his own theory more axiomatic, having been influenced by the logical empiricism of Whitehead, Russell, and Carnap.

With further development of linguistics in the 20th century, a notion became prevalent that language is more than speech — specifically, it is an abstract system of interrelationships shared by members of a speech community. The publication of *Syntactic Structures* (1957) by the American linguist **Noam Chomsky** initiated what many view as a **scientific revolution in linguistics**. Chomsky sought for a theory that would account for both linguistic structure and the creativity of language — the fact that we can create entirely original sentences and understand sentences never uttered before. He proposed that all people have an innate ability to acquire a language. The task of a linguist, he claimed, is to describe this universal human ability, known as language competence, with a grammar from which the grammars of all languages could be derived. He termed the resulting model transformational-generative grammar.

The **effect of Chomsky’s ideas** has been phenomenal. It is not an exaggeration to say that there is no major theoretical issue in linguistics today that is debated in terms other than those in which Chomsky has chosen to define it, and many schools of linguistics tend to define their positions in relation to his. Among the rival schools are Tagmemics, Stratificational Grammar, and so on. **Tagmemics** is a system of linguistic analysis developed by the U. S. linguist Kenneth L. Pike and his associates based on their work as Bible translators. Its foundations were laid during the 1950s when Pike departed from the post-Bloomfieldian structuralists. Tagmemic analysis has been used for analyzing a great many previously unrecorded languages, especially in Central and South America and in West Africa. **Stratificational Grammar**, developed by the U. S. linguist Sydney M. Lamb, has been seen by some linguists as an alternative to transformational grammar. Not yet fully expounded or widely exemplified with different languages in its analysis, Stratificational Grammar is characterized as a radical modification of post-Bloomfieldian linguistics, yet it also has many features that link it with European structuralism.

Another important development in linguistics in the 20th century is **the study of language functions**. Functionalist theories of language have most often been contrasted with formalist ones, particularly those developed by Chomsky. **London School of Linguistics** occurred in Britain in the 1940s. Its main view of language is characterized by the key roles it assigned to context. Firth, the first chair of general linguistics in Britain at the University of London, defined “meaning” as “function in context”: not only words and sentences, but even phonetic units have meaning (Graffi 2006). The main contribution of London School is its context of situation theory and prosodic analysis.

**Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)**, developed by Halliday, has its roots in Firth’s

work, with influence also from Hjelmslev, Malinowski, and the Prague School. Halliday (1978) made it clear that his aim is to give an account of linguistic communication, or “language in use”, and that languages are as they are because of the functions they have evolved to serve. Halliday took a very strong stand on functional motivation: in principle, everything in the grammar can be motivated through function. As might be expected from the antecedents of SFL in the work of Firth and Malinowski, Halliday has been concerned more with social and cultural motivations than with those related to psychological/cognitive processes. This is particularly apparent in the theory of social context developed by Halliday and his colleagues in the 1960s and since.

In recent thirty-odd years, **Cognitive Linguistics**, with the pioneering work of scholars such as Langacker, Lakoff and Johnson, has emerged as an energetic approach to the study of language. It seeks to understand general human cognitive processes through the analysis of language. As Fauconnier (2003: 1) stated, **Cognitive Linguistics** recognizes that the study of language is the study of language use and that when we engage in a language activity, we draw unconsciously on vast cognitive and cultural resources, call up models and frames, set up multiple connections, coordinate large arrays of information, and engage in creative mappings, transfers, and elaborations for that activity. In the cognitive view, language does not “represent” meaning; it prompts for the construction of meaning in particular contexts with particular cultural models and cognitive resources.

To string the discussion together and for the convenience of analysis and understanding, this book will make an introduction of linguistic schools and their studies in the sequence of time from Traditional Linguistics, Historical and Comparative Linguistics, to modern schools such as Schools of European Structuralism, Schools of American Descriptivism and Structuralism, Generative Schools, London School, Systemic-Functional School, American Functional Schools, and Cognitive Linguistic School.



### Questions

1. What is linguistics?
2. What are the differences between the three dichotomies in the field of linguistics: synchronic vs. diachronic, theoretical vs. applied, micro-linguistics vs. macrolinguistics?
3. What are the important schools and developments in linguistics?

# Chapter 2

## Traditional Grammar<sup>①</sup>

### 2.0 Introduction

It is well-known that contemporary linguistics is developed from a continuous European intellectual tradition traced to ancient Greece that was later influenced by the ancient Indian tradition of linguistics due to the study of Sanskrit grammar by European linguists from the 18th century.

At the early stage of traditional linguistics, the use and the study of language for practical purposes preceded the reflective process of scholarly study. In some society, linguistic analysis was applied to serve religious purpose, particularly for the determination of the religiously preferred spoken and written forms of sacred texts in Sanskrit, Hebrew and Arabic. **In ancient India**, for example, the need to keep alive the correct pronunciation of ancient religious texts led to the investigation of articulatory phonetics.

**In ancient Greece** the need for a technical and conceptual vocabulary<sup>②</sup> in the logical analysis of propositions brought about the establishment of a system of parts of speech. The Greeks were the first grammarians in Europe. To them, grammar was a tool that could be used in studying literature. The Alexandrians of the 1st century B.C. further elaborated on Greek grammar in order to preserve the purity of the language. In a treatise titled *The Art of Grammar* (2nd century B.C.), Dionysus Thrax of Alexandria analyzed literary texts from the perspectives of word letters, syllables, and eight parts of speech.

**The Romans** adopted the grammatical system of the Greeks and applied it to Latin. Most Latin grammarians had no attempt to alter the Greek system except Varro (1st century B.C.), who believed that grammarians should discover structures instead of dictating them. The works by Donatus (4th century A.D.) and Priscian (6th century A.D.), two of the most important Latin grammarians, were widely used to teach Latin grammar during the European Middle Ages.

**In medieval Europe** education was conducted mainly in Latin, and Latin grammar became the foundation of the liberal arts curriculum. During this time, many grammatical books were written for students. **The *modistae***, grammarians of the mid-13th to mid-14th century who viewed language as a reflection of reality, looked to philosophy for explanations of grammatical rules. They also proposed to have one “universal” grammar that would serve as a means of understanding the nature of being.

---

① In linguistics, “traditional grammar” is a cover name for the collection of concepts and ideas about the structure of language that Western societies have borrowed from ancient Greek and Roman sources. The term is used to distinguish these ideas from those of contemporary linguistics, which are intended to apply to a much broader range of languages, and to correct a number of errors in “traditional grammar”.

② Greek philosophers found it necessary to use appropriate conceptual vocabulary to discuss such problems as the structure of meaningful utterances: If a proposition was true or false, in which of its parts did its truth or fallacy reside?



In 17th-century France a group of grammarians from Port-Royal were also interested in the idea of universal grammar. They claimed that elements of thought could be discerned in grammatical categories of all languages. Unlike their Greek and Latin counterparts, **the Port-Royal grammarians** did not study literary language but claimed instead that usage should be dictated by the actual speech of living languages. Seeing this repeated emphasis on linguistic universals, the 20th-century linguist Noam Chomsky (1966) has recognized the Port-Royal group as the first transformational grammarians.

Several other important trends have been noted during the 17th and 18th centuries: the breakdown of Latin as a universal medium of communication with a replacement by modern languages; the many proposals for universal languages, shorthand systems, and secret codes; the beginning of a systematic approach to phonetics; and the elaborations of traditional grammar in schools. Then, as the 19th century approached, the first proposal about the historical relationship between Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin was made, leading in the science of comparative philology as the most important study of the coming century.

To obtain a comprehensive picture of how and why languages were studied in the past, we should look into all these various traditions, different as they are from the present-day notions of what linguistics is.

## 2.1 Sanskrit Grammar in Ancient India

Linguistics, as the notion practiced today, has its first origin in Iron Age India in the study of Sanskrit, which dated back to at least two and a half millennia and which culminated in the occurrence of Pāṇini's grammar in the 5th century B.C.

Linguistics in ancient India derived its impetus from the practical needs of religious ritual (to correctly recite and interpret the Vedic texts). **The Vedas**, the memorized oldest of the Sanskrit religious texts, can be dated from around 1200 B.C. Sanskrit, as the sacred language, was changing and developing through time, but religious rituals required exact verbal performance. Therefore, rules of grammar were set up for learning and understanding the archaic language. At the most profound level of the practice, the Vedic hymns acknowledged the mysterious nature and power of speech: "Speech was divided into four parts known to inspired priests. Three parts, placed in hiding, mortals do not rouse to action; the fourth part of speech they speak" (from the oldest Indian text, *The Rigveda*, cf.). And yet, despite their fascination with the spiritual nature of speech, Ancient Indians committed themselves to studying the **physical aspect of language** far earlier than Europeans did. (Law 2005:448)

Indian linguistics first established its reputation in the field of phonetics and phonology (刘润清等 2006: 21). **The Vedic hymns and prayers** used in Brahmin rituals had been given definitive form at the beginning of the first millennium B.C. Handed down from father to son, the text began to sound old-fashioned, and then downright archaic, as the Sanskrit language gradually underwent change. Instead of updating the text, the Brahmins felt it necessary to maintain its traditional form as accurately as possible. To counteract the sloppy pronunciation of the younger generation — the usual response the world over to the effects of language change — they started formal training, supported by lists of the legitimate **assimilatory features** (*sandhi*) found in each collection of Vedic hymns, prefaced (or finished) by a summary of the theoretical notions underlying the practical instruction. Although very brief, usually only three or four pages in length, the outlines in these texts equal to an introduction to the principles of articulatory