

1: William Dwight Whitney - Wikipedia

How the Whitney-Max Müller debates in the 19th century connect to the intellectual disparity between Chomsky's linguistic and political writings. Read more Read less Prime Book Box for Kids.

Biography[edit] He was born in Geneva in 1819. Saussure showed signs of considerable talent and intellectual ability as early as the age of fourteen. There he lived with the family of a classmate, Elie David. Saussure was not pleased, as he complained: After this he studied for a year at the University of Berlin under the Privatdozenten Heinrich Zimmer , with whom he studied Celtic, and Hermann Oldenberg with whom he continued his studies of Sanskrit. Soon, he relocated to the University of Paris , where he lectured on Sanskrit, Gothic and Old High German and occasionally other subjects. Even his few scientific articles are not unproblematic. Thus, for example, his publication on Lithuanian phonetics [18] is grosso modo taken from studies by the Lithuanian researcher Friedrich Kurschat, with whom Saussure traveled through Lithuania in August for two weeks and whose German books Saussure had read. Saussure, who had studied some basic grammar of Lithuanian in Leipzig for one semester but was unable to speak the language, was thus dependent on Kurschat. It is also questionable to what extent the Cours itself can be traced back to Saussure alone. Saussure lectured on Sanskrit and Indo-European at the University of Geneva for the remainder of his life. It was not until that Saussure began teaching the Course of General Linguistics, which he would offer three times, ending in the summer of 1891. In turn, his son was the psychoanalyst Raymond de Saussure. Saussure attempted, at various times in the 1840s and 1850s, to write a book on general linguistic matters. His two currents of thought emerged independently of each other, one in Europe, the other in America. According to him, linguistic entities are parts of a system and are defined by their relations to one another within said system. The first is the langue, the abstract and invisible layer, while the second, the parole, refers to the actual speech that we hear in real life. His idea was that all myths have an underlying pattern, which form the structure that makes them myths. In Europe, the most important work in that period of influence was done by the Prague school. Most notably, Nikolay Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson headed the efforts of the Prague School in setting the course of phonological theory in the decades from 1920 to 1940. Elsewhere, Louis Hjelmslev and the Copenhagen School proposed new interpretations of linguistics from structuralist theoretical frameworks. Trager , Rulon S. Systemic functional linguistics is a theory considered to be based firmly on the Saussurean principles of the sign, albeit with some modifications. This has the effect of highlighting what is, in fact, the one point of arbitrariness in the system, namely the phonological shape of words, and hence allows the non-arbitrariness of the rest to emerge with greater clarity. An example of something that is distinctly non-arbitrary is the way different kinds of meaning in language are expressed by different kinds of grammatical structure, as appears when linguistic structure is interpreted in functional terms [27] Course in General Linguistics[edit] Main article: Its central notion is that language may be analyzed as a formal system of differential elements, apart from the messy dialectics of real-time production and comprehension. Examples of these elements include his notion of the linguistic sign , which is composed of the signifier and the signified. A science that studies the life of signs within society and is a part of social and general psychology. Saussure believed that semiotics is concerned with everything that can be taken as a sign, he called it semiology. Laryngeal theory[edit] While a student, Saussure published an important work in Indo-European philology that proposed the existence of ghosts in Proto-Indo-European called sonant coefficients. It has been argued that the problem that Saussure encountered, trying to explain how he was able to make systematic and predictive hypotheses from known linguistic data to unknown linguistic data, stimulated his development of structuralism. The neutrality of this subsection is disputed. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please do not remove this message until conditions to do so are met. It is necessary to be rather more finely nuanced in the positions attributed to Saussure and in their longterm influence on the development of linguistic theorizing in all schools; for a more recent rereading of Saussure with respect to such issues, see Paul Thibault. His term for the field was "semiology. He believed that the relationship that exists between the signifier and the signified is purely arbitrary and analytical. Equally crucial but often overlooked or misapplied

is the dimension of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes of linguistic description. Saussure did not do anything but reform an ancient theory in Europe, according to the modern conceptual exigencies". Sechehaye, with the collaboration of A. Riedlinger, Lausanne and Paris: Baskin, Course in General Linguistics, Glasgow: Gautier, Lausanne and Geneva:

2: From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the History of American Linguistics - Google Books

how the Whitney-Max Müller debates in the 19th century connect to the intellectual disparity between Chomsky's linguistic and political writings. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences,].

Some of the essays in Chomskyan Revolutions examine the sources, the nature and the extent of the theoretical changes Chomsky introduced in the field. Other contributions explore the key concepts and disciplinary alliances that have evolved considerably over the past sixty years, such as the meanings given to "Universal Grammar", the relationship of Chomskyan linguistics to other disciplines in Cognitive Science, Psychology, Evolutionary Biology, and the interactions between mainstream Chomskyan linguistics and other linguistic theories active in the late 19th century: Functionalism, Generative Semantics and Relational Grammar. The broad understanding of the recent history of linguistics points the way towards new directions and methods that linguistics can pursue in the future. Joseph University of Edinburgh The Oxford English Dictionary defines Modernism as a "movement characterised by a deliberate break with classical and traditional forms or methods". It showed how "a deliberate break with classical and traditional forms or methods" could be brought about by, not ignoring traditional methods, or taking an ironic distance from them, but reinterpreting them with a greater time depth. Resemblance to grandparents or more remote ancestors rather than to parents. Movement characterised by a deliberate break with classical and traditional forms or methods. A single act of rotation round a centre. An instance of great change or alteration in affairs or in some particular thing. Modernism and ancestry For over a quarter of a century E. Koerner, has not merely led the charge in denying that what is commonly referred to as the Chomskyan Revolution in linguistics was a revolution at all. He has been the charge, a one-man brigade, with others gradually lining up safely in the rear. Lagging still further behind to clear up after the horses, I argued in Joseph, that no revolution, whether political or academic, would ever qualify as such by the strict criteria Koerner was demanding. Revolutions are above all rhetorical, a matter of belief and linguistic performance, always with partial continuity of methods, agenda, institutions, even personnel. My inclination in such a case is to follow common usage and continue to speak of a Chomskyan Revolution. As defined above, it implies a deliberate break with traditional methods – with the emphasis on deliberate, since, again, the break will never be more than partial. If to call something revolutionary implies not just great change but scientific progress, labelling it modernist does not. It designates a limited period, a few decades either side of the two World Wars. The style and thought of the period embodied an ideology of progress, but today the term is a historical designation and implies no judgement as to whether any enduring progress was actually achieved. Certainly Chomsky has been neither a traditionalist in the usual sense, nor a post-modernist, whatever that means. So Chomskyan Modernism would seem an apt term – except that modernist is a label we associate with the generation before his, that of Edward Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield, those contemporaries of Le Corbusier and Stravinsky. This is despite the fact that Sapir never broke from the methods of his teacher Franz Boas to the same extent as Chomsky did from the Bloomfieldians and Sapirians. As for Bloomfield, he effectuated a very modernist break through his behaviourist-framed distributionalism, yet insisted privately that the influence of Ferdinand de Saussure was on every page of his book *Language*. Further on I shall consider in more detail how these figures and others relate to the previous linguistic tradition. It was the Bloomfieldians, in his view, who were the modernists, and who had set linguistics on the wrong track. One thinks of the pre-Raphaelites, those supreme early modernists who broke with contemporary practice by a deliberate return to the style of pre-modern masters. This ambivalence toward historical authorities is what makes intellectual atavism a powerful means for a modernist break – again a revolution in the literal sense, regardless of whether we choose to call it one metaphorically. Looking across the wide range of journals and books in a range of academic fields, both humanistic and scientific, the normal state appears to be one in which individuals situate their enquiries within some framework that is already in wide use, sometimes in direct competition with an alternative framework though more often simply ignoring rival approaches. This is in line with the positivist ideal of a steady accumulation of rigorously controlled observations gradually adding either to the scope of the model, by

showing how it accounts for new data and cases, or to its precision, by excluding data and cases previously assumed to be covered by it. This is not to say that Kuhn has become some sort of bible, its every statement exactly what one would repeat today as truth. It is, for example, oddly uniformitarian – ahistorical, in other words – in its assumption that we could or would want to apply a single model of development to all of science, across vastly different cultural contexts. Kuhn was not a trained historian, but a physicist who became a philosopher. His aim was to break the stranglehold which a single, simple idea of positive science had in the modernist period, and to do so he harked back to Copernicus as his perfect model. It worked because of the way in which the Copernican revolution had been singled out and idealised in modern science, as one of a handful of paradigm cases along with Newton, Darwin and maybe Einstein, though there was still some residual nervousness about Einstein in that time of nuclear paranoia. The most revered figures will be those who rethought the framework itself or made discoveries of such magnitude that they validated or reshaped the framework. Their importance relative to one another is a balance between the impact they had and their point on the timescale, so that, of two figures who had a roughly equal impact, the more recent one will be treated as more authoritative, except among antiquarians, or unless nationalistic or other identity motives are in play, or if the figure has achieved fame well beyond the field that claims him or her as its identity marker. We face the paradox that our work is considered particularly valuable insofar as it is original and novel – yet is evaluated within a system that exists in order to keep novelty to a critical minimum, so as to limit the imagination and fantasy of any individual and constrain it to the shared dream of the group. So how do practitioners in an academic field manage this economy of dreams? In part, rhetorically, through how they position their findings and conclusions relative to the field as a whole. It is here that the ancestral giants play a crucial double role. Secondly, as figures who, by virtue of being remote in time, both allow and demand that much more interpretation to make their work meaningful in the present context. The remoteness is, as noted above, generally viewed as signifying distance from the truth as built up by later methods. But this creates a sort of rhetorical release valve in the plumbing system of dreams. Texts written by that figure can usually be interpreted and contextualised in a way that appears to support whatever present-day view one is upholding. To continue with my dubious plumbing metaphor, this sort of atavism is a lead-pipe cinch; but the softness that makes lead so pliable is also what makes it so poisonous. Ironic distance In the modernist period, atavistic rhetoric faced a further obstacle in the imperative to detach practice from tradition. In academic terms, the rejection of tradition can take a number of forms, all of which amount to a sharp and deliberate revaluation of the currency of scholarly work. The old does not become worthless, but its value is adjusted downward relative to the new. At the same time, what was marginalised in the past is sometimes brought to the centre, and vice-versa, which is another way of revaluing the currency. The need for detachment complexified the paradox. It did not eliminate the motives for appealing to the past, but required practitioners to perform rhetorically their simultaneous understanding of how the past was both right and wrong. Sarcasm is in fact one possible way of achieving the distance, though not the one most commonly found in academic discourse in the modernist period. Returning to the analogy of pre-Raphaelite painting, there was never any question of mistaking it for work from the 15th century. The melodies may be borrowed, the harmonies authentic, but the driving rhythm, strongly contrasting dynamics and rich orchestration create the ironic distance that makes Pulcinella an unmistakably modern composition. The lack of awareness of how ironic distance functions in academic writing can be seen in an exchange between Margaret Thomas and a foursome led by Susan Gass. SLA ignores the wide range of studies from earlier decades and centuries which supply it with an impressive pedigree. In a highly defensive response, Gass et al. The argument offered by Gass et al. Without that criterion of having "played an informing role in the development of the field", interest in the past can be simply antiquarian – not a bad thing to be, though neither is it the same as being historicist in a continuist way, something which Gass, Thomas and I all agree is much richer. But what do Gass et al. To deny that they exist? That would be lunacy. The authors are first of all introducing a surreptitious distinction of modern and pre-modern, treating it as a given when it is in fact not only subjective but circular within a discussion of historicity. This shallowness of time depth is precisely what Thomas means by ahistoricism. The criteria for continuity are evident in the rhetoric used by Gass et al.: We can see that history begins for them with an

institutional recognition extending into the present time, which is a perfectly modernist view. It is as though the past of an academic field divides into a preterite like English wrote and a present perfect have written, where the former is used in the context of a time period that does not include the present, the latter in one that does. I wrote five pages this morning is what one says in the afternoon, a time when one might also say I have written five pages this afternoon. For the continuist Thomas, history starts at daybreak, and ahistoricity means imagining that it only started at noon. For the discontinuist Gass, until noon there is nothing coherent to write a history about, so to speak of ahistoricity is absurd. To substantiate their insistence on disciplinary coherence, Gass et al. Pit Corder, and they point to work since then that recognises this lineage. However, they fail to appreciate how even those within the lineage they trace ironically distance themselves from Corder, even while claiming to extend his heritage. One can look into any work on linguistics from the late 19th century onward that contains discussion of historical predecessors and find instances of ironic distance. Linguistics came into being, he writes, by the suggestive and inciting deductions and speculations of men like Leibniz and Herder, by the wide assemblage of facts and first classifications of language by the Russians under Catherine and by Adelung and Vater and their like, and by the introduction of the Sanskrit to the knowledge of Europe, and the intimation of its connections and importance, by Jones and Colebrooke. No one thing was so decisive of the rapid success of the movement as this last; the long-gathering facts at once fell into their proper places, with clearly exhibited relations, and on the basis of Indo-European philology was built up the science of comparative philology. Yet even this tip of the hat to his predecessors calls for the requisite modernist ironic distancing. But while Germany is the home of comparative philology, the scholars of that country have, as was hinted above, distinguished themselves much less in that which we have called the science of language. There is among them not less than elsewhere such discordance on points of fundamental importance, such uncertainty of view, such carelessness of consistency, that a German science of language cannot be said yet to have an existence. The young man in a hurry was so impelled by the double imperative, first to locate his system at the endpoint of the evolution of the discipline, and secondly to establish its complete originality, that he badly mismanaged the economy of dreams. The result was a life-long alienation from the German linguistics establishment that helped shipwreck his career. This is a danger inherent in distancing oneself too far from the immediately preceding generation, as Chomsky would rediscover 80 years later, though in career terms he would stay nicely afloat however stormy the seas. Early on he displays a scholarly humility absent from Whitney and Saussure before him, and most other linguists after. One gets the impression that his decision to discuss a particular predecessor already reflects a judgement that his work is valuable, and the ironic distance comes in quite matter-of-factly. Of Whitney, he says that "today they seem incomplete, but scarcely antiquated, and still serve as an excellent introduction to language study" Bloomfield Yet when the next sentence delivers the ironic distancing, it is pitiless: I should differ from de Saussure chiefly in basing my analysis on the sentence rather than on the word; by following the latter custom de Saussure gets a rather complicated result in certain matters of word-composition and syntax. The essential point, however, is this, that de Saussure has here first mapped out the world in which historical Indo-European grammar the great achievement of the past century is merely a single province; he has given us the theoretical basis for a science of human speech. But the compliment turns somewhat back-handed when one realises how little importance Bloomfield accorded to a "theoretical basis" divorced from practical applications see Joseph Again, examples from the modernist period could be multiplied ad infinitum. Sapir though shows an awareness displayed by none of the others, least of all the young Saussure, that the first and perhaps most valuable lesson gained from historicity is the realisation that any sense we may possess of being the first to arrive at the truth is an illusion that will last only until the next generation falls victim to it. The exceptional Mr Chomsky All these modernists reject tradition either by ignoring their predecessors or keeping an ironic distance from them, in varying degrees and using a range of rhetorical devices. It is so much a part of the fabric of modernist discourse that to find it virtually absent in the writings of just one linguist is stunning. But it does this in an unprecedented way, by wholeheartedly embracing tradition, as represented by a series of figures prior to Bloomfield whose approaches he perceives as being closer to his own understanding of language than what was being professed in the s and s. Not a ray of ironic sunlight separates Chomsky from his claimed ancestors.

FROM WHITNEY TO CHOMSKY pdf

He first presents his own work as fitting within "the classical Saussurian framework" Chomsky Subtly, Chomsky comes to detach Saussure from his earlier linkage of him to Humboldt, and to associate him instead with Whitney and the anti-Cartesian-Humboldtian-Chomskyan line. Finally Chomsky will cut himself off from Saussure absolutely:

3: Ferdinand de Saussure - Wikipedia

Abstract. What is 'American' about American linguistics? Is Jakobson, who spent half his life in America, part of it? What became of Whitney's genuinely American conception of language as a democracy?

4: Project MUSE - From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the history of American linguistics (review)

From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the History of American Linguistics Volume of Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Volume of Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science: Studies in the history of the language sciences.

5: From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the history of American linguistics | John E. Joseph

â€¢ how Whorf was directly influenced by the mystical writings of Madame Blavatsky; â€¢ how the Whitney-Max MÃ¼ller debates in the 19th century connect to the intellectual disparity between Chomsky's linguistic and political writings.

6: Chomsky's Linguistics

From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the history of American www.enganchecubano.com John E. Joseph. (Studies in the history of the language sciences).

7: From Whitney to Chomsky : John E. Joseph :

In J's view, these two developments are joined, and this allows J to see direct connections to Chomsky's political work, in which 'the idea of "manufacturing consent" is the outcome of the loss of faith in the human will, a faith Whitney was already trying to shore up in his debates with Max MÃ¼ller' ().

Obamas mythic dreams Conserving our fish and wildlife heritage, annual report, fiscal year 1976 Pimsleur vietnamese ing booklet R.O.D, read or dream. Geometry Measurement: Inventive Exercises to Sharpen Skills and Raise Achievement (Basic, Not Boring: Mid Hiring home caregivers Nonlinear dynamics and chaotic phenomena Civil service reform Selected Poems Tacar Danta (Goldsmith dual language) Stratford-upon-Avon Blue Motor Services remembered Dinosaurs at the bottom of the world The basis of combination in chess Lost, one pair of legs Helping others manage their careers Living in Sonshine! A vindication of the character and condition of the females employed in the Lowell mills Its a go-to-the-park day The body and its functions The subjective mind. Embattled shadows Turbomachines a guide to design selection and theory balje Psychology of dementia praecox Electrical conductivity of materials Cogs in the great machine Time saver standards book Saint George and Saint Christopher Bulk-mineable gold resources Honda accord manual 2009 The dream stalker When Jesus confronts the world Wasteland of strangers Colters woman A crash course in cells and development Looking for Genigraphics, and Vice Versa City and regional highlights Charlotte Hucks Children Literature with Literature Database CD-ROM Jim Bridgers alarm clock and other tall tales Energy supply and demand Foreword by the President Daniel F. Sullivan Planting leadership processes