

nt, Edward Stankiewicz

XII + 606 pp. f 70.—/\$ 20.00

s. Noss, Joseph K. Yamagiwa

XII + 537 pp. f 60.—/\$ 17.15

McQuown, Sol Saporta

1968. XVIII + 660 pp.

es A. Ferguson

H. Zide

in preparation

on T. Hodge, Herbert H. Paper

schramm

in preparation

berg

chter

in preparation

yen, George W. Grace,

Offprint from

CURRENT TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

4

*Ibero-American
and Caribbean Linguistics*

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

EUGENIO COSERIU

O. PRELIMINARIES

0.1. In these 'Perspectives' I intend to lay out the main lines of the recent development in Ibero-American [IAM] linguistics as well as its present situation, a general account of its results, and its possibilities for further development. Consequently, I shall consider the following points:

- (1) The external conditions — historico-cultural and others — which have determined and still determine the development of linguistics in Ibero-America [IAM];
- (2) The centers of linguistic research in IAM, and the amount and character of their work;
- (3) The principal IAM journals of linguistics and their characteristic features;
- (4) The information which is available for linguistic work in IAM, the influences which have shaped this work, and the theoretical and methodological trends which it displays;
- (5) The prevailing attitudes of IAM linguistics and two experiences which I interpret as attempts to overcome them;
- (6) The specific fields in which IAM linguists have worked and the positive results they have so far obtained;
- (7) The repercussion of IAM linguistics in the scientific world;
- (8) Perspectives for the future.

0.2. It would not be possible to avoid, in a survey such as this, overlappings with other sections in this volume devoted to single disciplines. I have tried, however, to limit overlappings to the indispensable minimum, restricting specific references to what seemed to be important from a theoretical or methodological point of view or, at any rate, what appeared to be symptomatic of linguistics in IAM. I have made more detailed references only with regard to linguistic theory and general linguistics and to those disciplines which are not considered in special chapters (stylistics, philosophy of language, history of linguistics).

0.3. A general survey of IAM linguistics would be incomplete and distorted, if Brazil were excluded. Thus I could not avoid referring to Brazil, although Brazilian linguistics is treated in a separate chapter. In this case too I have reduced references to what was apparently necessary for a coherent outline, particularly where the basic similarities and differences between Brazil and the rest of IAM were in question.

0.4. With a few exceptions, dictated by the nature of the subject, I shall exclusively consider the development of IAm linguistics during the last twenty-five years (1940-65). As to the material to be discussed, it seemed to be impossible to confine this survey to the newer trends (structural or functional linguistics). This would have seriously distorted the outline, since those newer trends are scarcely represented in IAm. I have consequently adopted a different delimitation by confining it to scientific or 'academic' linguistics, i.e. to linguistics commonly treated in university courses and academic publications with scientific aims and with a minimum of acceptable methodological and technical background, excluding only non-specialized and methodologically non-scientific linguistics. This delimitation implies a value judgement in a general sense, but not in each particular case. It does not necessarily mean that everything which has been produced with scientific aims and methods is valuable as such nor that non-specialized linguistics has only obtained results of no interest. Above all, it does not imply denying the usefulness of many non-specialist achievements. Indeed, the scientific linguists of IAm must very frequently turn to the material and the results obtained by non-specialist investigators, empirical grammarians, or amateur linguists. Non-specialized linguistics, however, continues a line of activity which is not at all in accordance with any present trend in our science. In addition, non-scientific linguistics is not characteristic of IAm, except perhaps from a quantitative point of view, since it is more or less the same everywhere.

0.5. Because of the situation stated in 7.1., it is likely that, in spite of my efforts, certain facts may have escaped me, for which I apologize in advance. The first hand data at my disposal concerning the southern part of the South American continent by far exceed my information about the northern part of South America and about Central America, which in addition is mostly second hand. I hope however that eventual involuntary omissions have not seriously affected the basic lines of the survey. For the same reason I had to refer to my personal experience in Montevideo, with a frequency that may possibly appear overstressed. For this too I apologize beforehand.

0.6. The information published so far about recent IAm linguistics is scarce and fragmentary. Homero Serís' *Bibliografía* — referred to in fn. 25 —, which could have supplied substantial information, cannot be trusted in this respect. The critical notices contained in the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937 ff.; later, 1951 ff., Gainesville, Fla.) are excellent but they concern the research on IAm languages (aboriginal and non-aboriginal), not properly linguistics in IAm. Other useful sources are the following: Ana María Barrenechea and Narciso Bruzzi Costas, 'Bibliografía lingüística argentina (1939-47)'; Serafim Silva Neto, 'A filologia portuguesa no Brasil (1939-48)'; Max Leopold Wagner, 'Crónica bibliográfica hispano-americana', all three included in *Os estudos de lingüística românica na Europa e na América desde 1939 a 1948: Suplemento bibliográfico da 'Revista Portuguesa de Filologia'*, I, Manuel de Paiva Boléo, Ed., pp. 147-74, 340-68 and 369-98, respectively (Coimbra, 1951); Rafael Heliodoro Valle, 'Bibliografía hispanoamericana del español',

Hispania 37.274-84 (1954); Hersley C. Woodbridge, 'Central American Spanish: a bibliography. 1940-53', *RIB*, 6, 2.104-15 (1956). Concerning Chile, we have the ample and well-balanced report by Ambrosio Rabanales, 'Pasado y presente de la investigación lingüística y filológica en Chile', *BFUCh*, 16.121-43 (1964). Concerning Brazilian linguistics: Zdeněk Hampejs, 'Filólogos brasileiros', *BFUCh*, 13.165-234 (1961, published 1962) and Sílvio Elia, 'Os estudos filológicos no Brasil', in *Ensaio de filologia*, 157-232 (Rio de Janeiro, 1963). On the particularly important activity of Amado Alonso in Buenos Aires: Ángel Rosenblat, 'Amado Alonso', *CU*, 31.61-71 (1952); Eugenio Coseriu, *Amado Alonso* (Montevideo, 1953); Guillermo Guitarte, 'Amado Alonso', *Fi*, 4.3-7 (1952-53). As for Serafim Silva Neto: Manuel de Paiva Boléo, 'In Memoriam Serafim da Silva Neto', *RPF*, 10.409-18 (1960) and Sílvio Elia, *RBF*, 5.9-13 (1959-60). Concerning the work done in Montevideo: Josef Dubský, 'Z jiho-americké lingvistiky', *Sborník prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University*, A 8, 9.140-41 (1960) and the reviews referred to below in section 7, fn. 171.

0.7. The term 'North American' will be conventionally employed here as an adjective referring to the United States; the terms 'Ibero-America' and 'Ibero-American' [IAm] refer to the Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries of America. 'Spanish America' [SAm] and 'Hispano-American' refer to the Spanish speaking countries. The expression 'modern linguistics' will be applied to all linguistic trends which have appeared and/or spread in the twentieth century (including dialect geography, Vosslerian idealism, etc.); the term 'traditional' refers to all pre-structural linguistics.

0.8. I may finally point out that I shall consider in this survey the linguistics done in IAm, not the linguistics which has IAm as its object.

1. EXTERNAL CONDITIONS

1.0. Elsewhere, particularly in Europe, the situation in linguistics, as in other sciences at a given historical moment, normally depends, above all, on the personalities of certain scholars and on the trends of ideas which they determine. Contrary to this, the present state of IAm linguistics, which is not ideologically and methodologically autonomous, rather depends on the environmental conditions under which it has developed. This fact radically distinguishes IAm linguistics from linguistics elsewhere, particularly from that of Western Europe. The problem of the DIRECTION in the development of IAm linguistics is not so relevant as the problem of the DEGREE of its development. A minimum knowledge of these conditions, which are historico-cultural as well as material, is therefore necessary for a well-founded appreciation of the achievements, deficiencies and possibilities of IAm linguistics.

1.1. The first condition to be named is the short tradition of IAm linguistics. The scientific tradition of Hispano-American linguistics revolves around four great names: the genial Venezuelan grammarian Andrés Bello (d. 1865), whose philological activity developed chiefly in Chile; the remarkable Hispanic philologist Rufino José Cuervo

(d. 1911), a Colombian; the Hispanist Federico [Friedrich] Hanssen (d. 1919) and the linguist and grammarian Rodolfo [Rudolf] Lenz (d. 1938), both Germans who were active in Chile (the former from 1889, the latter from 1890). Furthermore, this tradition has either been discontinuous or indirect, or both, in the Spanish-American countries, with the sole exception of Chile, where there has been a practically uninterrupted tradition beginning with Hanssen and Lenz, followed by R. Oroz and continued by younger linguists. The properly scientific tradition of Brazil, except for a few forerunners, is of an even more recent date; it was however steadier and more compact. While the generation of the initiators (Said Ali, Sousa da Silveira, Antenor Nascentes, Augusto Magne) was still active, a second generation successfully engaged in the battle for scientific linguistics (Ernesto Faria, Mattoso Câmara, Silva Neto, Sílvia Elia, Maurer Jr., Celso Cunha, etc.) and a third and fourth generation of younger linguists came into existence, without a breach of continuity. Apart from this feeble or late scientific tradition, almost the entire realm of older IAm linguistics is limited to pre-scientific linguistics: Spanish and Portuguese empirical grammar, essays on regional dialects (particularly from the lexical point of view and mainly with normative aims), and study of aboriginal languages on a non-specialized level.¹

1.2. As a second condition we can consider the relative newness and instability of academic linguistics. The oldest Institute of philology among those which have had a certain amount of continuity is that of Buenos Aires, which was founded in 1923. The others are all of a more recent date. The majority of the existing Institutes furthermore are Institutes of 'philology'. Departments or Institutes of linguistics only exist in Montevideo and in a number of universities in Argentina. In addition, the Institutes are not as numerous as one might suppose. As a matter of fact, there are fewer Institutes in the vast area of IAm than in a relatively small European country such as Italy for example.² The majority of IAm universities too are of recent origin, and most of the Faculties of Arts are even newer (e.g., in Brazil and Uruguay) and this is particularly true in the case of the professorships for linguistics. In many cases the latter do not exist at all, at least not on a specialized scientific level. And where they do exist, they are insufficient and often unstable, since they depend on local possibilities for finding qualified persons to fill these positions, as well as on the university

¹ I am leaving aside, of course, certain etymological and comparative enterprises (as e.g. attempts to relate the Quechua language to Sanskrit or Hebrew or to derive Spanish from Greek and the like) — by the way common everywhere among a certain type of amateurs — which do not even belong to the modest prescientific linguistics, but rather to pseudo-linguistics and to fanciful invention.

² It must also be pointed out that an institute does not necessarily imply the existence of a team of investigators. The team of Mendoza at the time of Corominas consisted of the director and two assistants. The Departamento de Lingüística of Montevideo was founded with a chief and a secretary and had no other staff members until 1962 (what was called in publications in Europe and America the 'school of Montevideo' actually was a group of enthusiasts and unselfish, voluntary collaborators). Similar was the situation of the Instituto de Filología Hispánica of Buenos Aires in 1960. In other cases the collaborators were and still are few in number, at least as far as linguistics is concerned (thus in Santiago and in Caracas). The Instituto Caro y Cuervo of Bogotá with its complex organization is in this respect unique in Spanish America.

curricula, which are frequently subject to reform in many countries.³ As far as I know, no university has the four professorships for General Linguistics, Romance Linguistics, Spanish and Hispano-American (or Portuguese and Brazilian) Linguistics and Amerindian Linguistics, which one would expect for an adequate linguistic curriculum in IAm, not to speak of Indoeuropean Linguistics or General Phonetics, the teaching of which is exceptional in IAm.⁴ Even in those countries where linguistics is most advanced the four professorships are not found. Thus the linguistic subjects commonly taught in Argentine universities — leaving aside the courses on foreign and classical languages and literatures — are General Linguistics, Grammar (General and Spanish) and History of the Spanish Language (the teaching of Romance Philology has been eliminated). The situation is similar in Chile (Santiago), where as a consequence of a recent reform Romance Linguistics is no longer taught. In Brazil there are chairs for Romance and Portuguese Philology, but no chairs for General Linguistics. The situation in Montevideo is probably the most favorable: the University there has chairs for General and Indo-European Linguistics and Romance Linguistics, besides a special chair for 'Ciencias del Lenguaje' devoted to the study of Spanish, and the curriculum of the Instituto de Profesores includes Introduction to Linguistics, History of the Spanish Language, Theory of Grammar (i.e. General and Spanish Grammar) and Philosophy of Language.

1.3 Owing to the newness of linguistics taught on a university level, there is an inevitably acute and lasting shortage of specialized teachers and particularly of research workers with a strictly scientific training.⁵ In many cases the first IAm professors of necessity were, and still are, either specialists in other subjects (for ex., in the Classical Arts), high school professors transferred to the university, self-trained persons with scientific interests,⁶ or young men with hasty or incomplete education — all these appointed to fulfill immediate needs of teaching rather than to promote research. Thus the number of centers of linguistic activity by no means corresponds to the number of universities (which in certain parts of IAm has increased rapidly during the last years), nor does it correspond to the number of those universities where linguistic subjects are taught. As a matter of fact, linguistics understood as research is either altogether lacking or scarcely represented in vast areas of IAm. Only in a few

³ Moreover the number of chairs does not correspond to the actual number of professors for linguistic subjects, since one person mostly occupies two or three — and here and there even four or five — different chairs, in the same or in different institutions (and sometimes even in two different countries).

⁴ Also because a specialization in linguistics as such does not exist. Commonly, the courses on linguistic subjects for the greater part belong to the curricula of Spanish Language and Literature (or Romance Languages and Literatures).

⁵ Such exceptions as Rodolfo Oroz, with his philological training received in Germany, or Ángel Rosenblat, who studied under Amado Alonso in Buenos Aires, then in Paris and Berlin, and collaborated in the Centro de Estudios Históricos of Madrid, before he came to occupy a university chair, are very rare and possible unique in IAm, in the older generation.

⁶ Some self-taught linguists have certainly proved to be excellent investigators and masters, particularly in Brazil, where the existence of good linguists partly preceded the creation of Faculties of Arts; but in this survey I am not concerned with individual cases and exceptions, but rather with a general IAm situation.

countries has noticeable progress been made, but there too scientific linguistics is concentrated in the capitals and only occasionally, as in Argentina and Brazil, in some other university towns.

For the same reason, many of the initiators and promoters of linguistic studies in America, following Hanssen and Lenz, were foreigners trained abroad (mainly Europeans). Among those who directed or created research centers and were particularly influential as to the development of linguistics in IAm, are the Spaniard Amado Alonso, in Buenos Aires, whose direct or indirect influence has been most conspicuous and partly continues to be effective today; the Spaniard Juan Corominas and the German Fritz Krüger, in Mendoza; the Italian trained Rumanian Eugenio Coseriu, in Montevideo. Others, whose temporary activity, independent of its intrinsic value, had a less directly noticeable influence were the Italian Terracini, the Dane Uldall, the Spaniard Tovar, all three in Tucumán; the Spaniard Zamora Vicente in Buenos Aires; the Rumanian Gazdaru (La Plata and Buenos Aires), the Spaniard Hernando Balmori (Tucumán and La Plata), the North American Swadesh (Mexico City), the Italian Ferrario (Montevideo) — although Terracini and Tovar have certainly been influential through their works published in Argentina, and Swadesh's activity has unquestionably had repercussion among students of native languages.⁷

The lack of teachers and specialized research workers is slowly being overcome in some countries. The number of linguists locally trained by national or foreign masters has increased to some extent (thus, particularly, disciples of Amado Alonso either occupied or are now occupying chairs in several universities), and younger linguists have specialized or have been educated in Europe or in the United States.⁸ But in many countries the situation has changed very little. As a rule, the number of specialists is still very limited in comparison with the number of universities and with the actual tasks of IAm linguistics.

1.4. The newness and instability of organized academic linguistics also determine the nature and size of the facilities, chiefly of specialized libraries. There are few linguistic libraries in IAm and they are for the most part very incomplete, particularly for certain types of research (thus e.g. for historical and comparative linguistics). This is partly due to the fact that the libraries were founded only recently and with very limited funds, partly to the conditions under which they developed.⁹ Either because

⁷ Among other IAm linguists and philologists of foreign origin — excepting the Spanish and Portuguese — I mention the Italian Bucca in Argentina; the Germans Bunse (Pôrto Alegre, Brazil), Moldenhauer (Rosario, Argentina), and Schulte-Herbrüggen (Santiago de Chile); the Yugoslav Marcovich (Mérida, Venezuela); the Poland trained Russian Altuchow (Montevideo); and the Italian Meo Zilio, who was active for several years in Montevideo. From 1938 to 1945 the German Ulrich Leo, a Romance Philologist, was active in Venezuela. I do not know what repercussions the temporary activity of the North American Norman McQuown in Mexico had or that of the German Gerold Ungeheuer in Colombia (Popayán).

⁸ Thus, e.g. in Germany, the Brazilian Dal'Igna Rodrigues and the Peruvian Escobar; in Spain, the Ecuadorian Toscano Mateus and the Argentinean Guitarte; in the United States, the Peruvian Martha Hildebrandt, the Argentinean Suárez and the Chilean Heles Contreras.

⁹ The library of the Mendoza Institute, for instance, about which concrete information was published, possessed 700 volumes in 1941 and 1010 volumes in 1944. The Departamento of Montevideo

of the lack or insufficiency of initial funds or because of the material difficulty in obtaining out of print books and journals, to which must be added the instability of the currency in several countries, it was generally impossible to build up organically designed libraries. These rather grew at random by means of donations, exchanges, and what could be found on the local market. An important exception is the library of the Instituto de Filología Hispánica of Buenos Aires, which was methodically enlarged at the time of Amado Alonso and later completed and partly kept up to date thanks to the untiring efforts of Guillermo Guitarte, secretary of the Institute for several years, in its most critical period. But normally the libraries grew haphazardly, judging from those which I personally visited.¹⁰ This situation affects especially expensive works, such as linguistic atlases and collections of journals. In spite of the interest in dialect geography in IAm, there is not one public library, as far as I know, which possesses *all* Romance linguistic atlases.¹¹ As for the journals, it is very common that in an Institute some collections are to be found, while others, equally important and relating to the same field, are lacking, simply because there are no exchange arrangements with them.¹² It should also be mentioned that normally an IAm Institute can only rely upon its own bibliographical sources, which is another basic difference between IAm and many European countries or the United States concerning research possibilities. In most cases the specialized libraries are scattered about different countries, hundreds or thousands of miles apart from each other, and exchange arrangements either do not exist at all or are very limited.¹³

began with no library at all and with a minimum annual fund for acquisitions; and this situation can be repeatedly encountered in IAm.

¹⁰ More organical sometimes are certain private libraries. Thus, that of Serafim Silva Neto in Rio de Janeiro, with the help of which several Brazilian linguists have worked. The work of Montevideo too was done mostly with the aid of the present writer's private library. A rather organical library with basic works of general and English linguistics was built up by Max Bertens in the Instituto Pedagógico of Concepción (Department of English).

¹¹ In 1959, the richest library in this regard was the private library of Silva Neto, followed by that of the Instituto de Filología Hispánica of Buenos Aires.

¹² Particularly such journals as *Language*, *IJAL*, *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* are (or not long ago were) bibliographical rarities in IAm.

¹³ Although my information about the libraries is incomplete and partly indirect, I give it here, as it could serve as a first hint to foreign scholars who want to work in IAm. The richest library for linguistic works and also for specialized journals (General and Indo-European Linguistics, Classical Linguistics and Philology, Romance Linguistics and Philology) still is that of the two Buenos Aires institutes, although several journal collections stayed incomplete since the transfer of Amado Alonso to the U.S.A. and of the *RFH* to Mexico. It is followed, although with specialization in more limited fields, by those of the Instituto Caro y Cuervo in Bogotá, the Colegio de México, the Instituto of Mendoza (presently possessing an important stock of journals of Romance linguistics) and the Instituto 'Andrés Bello' of Caracas (with a good Hispanic fund for Spanish and American Spanish studies). More limited are the stocks of the Instituto of Santiago de Chile and of the already mentioned Department of English of Concepción, and even more limited are those of the institutes of La Plata and Rosario, in Argentina, and of the Departamento de Lingüística of Montevideo, Uruguay. In Rio de Janeiro the National Library has a good supply in linguistics. Elsewhere too one can find linguistic stocks in the National Libraries (or in the general libraries of the universities or Faculties). Extraordinarily wealthy and complete as to Romance and Portuguese linguistics (including all major journals in these fields) was Silva Neto's private library. I do not know what happened to it.

1.5. The character of the basic information at the disposal of IAm linguists largely depends on the situation which has just been sketched, particularly in the case of general linguistics and linguistic theories. As for its quantity, this information is not scarce, but, in so far as it depends on local possibilities, it is unsystematic and fragmentary. If an IAm linguist quotes concepts of Brøndal or Jakobson, Frei or Hockett, this does not necessarily mean that he either adheres to one or another doctrine or that he has deliberately made a choice among several possibilities — it might simply result from a casual contact with some writing of the author quoted. Furthermore, the information as a whole is not homogeneous, i.e. it is not the same in the different research and teaching centers. The foreign teachers too contribute to this situation: they certainly open new horizons, but, at the same time, they determine the basic information of their pupils in accordance with their origin, their education, and their personal preferences, which can lead to unevennesses, especially if ONE linguistic theory is identified with linguistic theory as such, as is often the case. The heterogeneous character of the basic information is another feature which clearly distinguishes IAm linguistics from that of North America, at least from the descriptive linguistics which as a whole can be called 'Bloomfieldian'. Whereas two different North American descriptive linguists, independent of their specialization and their personal positions, possess to a certain extent the same basic information and therefore a common stock of concepts and terms, two IAm linguists trained in different centers may dispose of equally great (or even greater) but at the same time radically different bulks of information. This can certainly be the case also with two European linguists belonging to different schools or countries. In IAm, however, the difference often depends rather on the material conditions of information (e.g. whether or not the respective libraries contain certain books and journals), than on a coherent system of linguistic thought. So what elsewhere normally is a matter of orientation or of conception, can be a matter of information in IAm.

1.6. In another sense the intimate connection between Hispano-American and Spanish (and between Brazilian and Portuguese) linguistics must be taken into account. This connection is, in effect, the determining condition for what is homogeneous in the activity of the IAm research centers as to the basic information and the methodological orientation, in a positive as well as in a negative sense. That is to say, if the average Hispano-American linguist is acquainted with the essentials of the history of linguistics, this is due to the fact that a translation of the well-known short treatise by Thomesen appeared in Spain (*Historia de la lingüística*, Barcelona, 1945), as well as to Antonio Tovar's book, *Lingüística y filología clásica. Su situación actual* (Madrid, 1944). The fact that Stenzel and Bühler are almost universally known names among the Hispano-American linguists and are referred to by them with a frequency that is unusual in most European countries and inconceivable in the United States, is also due to Spanish translations (resp., *Filosofía del lenguaje*, Madrid, 1935, and *Teoría del lenguaje*, Madrid, 1950).¹⁴ If, on the other hand, structuralism reached Spanish America only

¹⁴ It is strange that these names are much more often quoted in IAm than in the German speaking

lately, one of the reasons for this fact is that it was also only lately introduced in Spain.¹⁵ And if North American descriptive linguistics is relatively unknown in Spanish-America, this is surely related to the very feeble response which this trend called forth among the Spanish linguists.¹⁶

1.7. Another condition which is effective in the same sense is the limited knowledge of languages among the average IAm linguists. In most parts of IAm (particularly in South America) French still is the best known foreign language. Thus the works of French linguists (or those published in the French language) are more widely spread than works in German or English. This explains the utmost importance of translations for the works written in the latter languages. If Vossler has been more influential in IAm than any other German scholar (e.g. Paul is still widely unknown there), this is due to the fact that his works were translated. And if stylistics has spread far in IAm, this is not only due to the orientation of many IAm linguists nor only to the writings of Amado Alonso, but also to translations and to the contributions of Vossler and Spitzer to IAm periodicals. In the same way, Jespersen's *Mankind*, which was translated into Spanish, is much better known and quoted more often than his *Language*; and Sapir is now becoming a generally known name, thanks to his being translated into Spanish and Portuguese.¹⁷

1.8. Finally, mention must be made of the influence of political situations on cultural life, which in some instances has been of serious consequence for teaching and research; e.g. the changes which the Buenos Aires Instituto de Filología has undergone and the lack of continuity in its work have been mainly for political reasons.

2. RESEARCH CENTERS

2.0. As has been indicated above (1.2.) most of the centers of linguistic work in IAm (and to some extent, all of them) are 'philological' centers. Linguistics prevails in

countries, where Bühler was influential to some extent, whereas the response to Stenzel was very limited among linguists. This is because they are just two among other theorists of language in the German speaking countries, while they are THE German theorists par excellence for most IAm linguists. The same also occurs in other fields of culture with translated authors.

¹⁵ It must be said that certain topics, such as the problems of the distinction between morphology and syntax or Hjelmslev's general grammar, have come to be known to the average Hispano-American linguist through Spanish books of a very low scientific quality, as are the two by Antonio Llorente Maldonado de Guevara, *Los 'Principios de gramática general' de Hjelmslev y la lingüística* (Granada, 1953) and *Morfología y sintaxis. El problema de la división de la gramática* (Granada, 1955). Generally, the Spanish publications enjoy a great prestige in Spanish America; from this follows that certain Spanish works on 'modern' linguistics were widely accepted, which, however, would rather deserve to be forgotten: cf. Coseriu, *Reseñas* 2.11-13 (Montevideo, 1954).

¹⁶ In this connection one can rather expect a spreading in the reverse direction — from Spanish America to Spain — as it was the case with other modern trends at the time of Amado Alonso.

¹⁷ It must further be stated that in teaching it does not matter which languages the teacher knows or uses, since the bibliography which can be given to the students, primarily (and sometimes exclusively) is that in the national languages (in Brazil, also the bibliography in Spanish).

some cases, but it is never exclusive. This is due to the old unity between linguistics and philology, which has been preserved up to the present day in particular fields, to the needs of teaching, and, above all, to a very deep-rooted Spanish and Portuguese tradition. Most of the IAm linguists are therefore philologists at the same time, i.e. besides linguistics they also cultivate cultural history in a broader sense, literary studies, or textual criticism. As for work in linguistics, the officially organized centers (those of Spanish America), as they do not have any specific delimitations except for a few cases, could actually cultivate any glottological discipline or language. In fact, they devote themselves especially to the study of Spanish and particularly to the study of local Spanish. In addition, they depend for their activity chiefly on the personalities and the specific interests of their directors.

2.1. Leaving aside the Language Academies, which have different aims, there are nine centers in Spanish America, where scientific linguistics is cultivated with certain diligence, as shown by more or less numerous publications. They are the following:

In ARGENTINA: the Instituto de Filología y Letras Hispánicas 'Dr. Amado Alonso' [IAA] and the Departamento de Lingüística y Literaturas Clásicas [DLLCI] of Buenos Aires, and the Instituto de Lingüística of the University of Cuyo [ILC], in Mendoza;

In CHILE: the Instituto de Filología of the University of Chile [IFUCh], in Santiago;

In COLOMBIA: the Instituto Caro y Cuervo [ICC], in Bogotá;

In MEXICO: the Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios of the Colegio de México [CdM], in Mexico City;

In PERU: the Departamento (formerly Instituto) de Filología of the University of San Marcos [DFL], in Lima;

In URUGUAY: the Departamento de Lingüística of the Universidad de la República (Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias), in Montevideo [DLM];

In VENEZUELA: the Instituto de Filología 'Andrés Bello' [IFAB], of the Universidad Central, in Caracas.

2.1.1. The IAA is a continuation of the former Instituto de Filología of the University of Buenos Aires. It was founded in 1923 — with the assistance of the Centro de Estudios Históricos of Madrid — under the honorary direction of Ramón Menéndez Pidal and with Américo Castro as acting director. This Institute was at first the only center of importance and later (until 1946) the most important of all the philological and linguistic research centers in Ibero-America. During the first years of its existence — a period in which it changed direction several times — this Institute already did excellent work and published a number of valuable contributions. But especially from 1927 to 1946, under the direction of Amado Alonso, it displayed an intensive and manifold activity, becoming one of the most important centers of the Hispanic world and even the foremost at the time when philological and linguistic activity decreased in Spain. Between the years 1930 and 1946 it published the deservedly famous *Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana* [BDH] (6 volumes and three supplements);¹⁸ in 1931 it initiated a *Colección de estudios indigenistas*; between

¹⁸ Volume 7, already prepared at the time of Amado Alonso, was not published until 1949.

1932 and 1942 it published a *Colección de estudios estilísticos* (three volumes and one supplement),¹⁹ and between 1939 and 1946 the *RFH* (and two supplements of it, with a literary character), along with other works issued outside of these collections or outside of the University. About 1941, during the most splendid period of the Institute, Amado Alonso gathered around it a large number of collaborators: Pedro Henríquez Ureña (d. 1946), Eleuterio Tiscornia (d. 1945), Ángel Battistessa, Ángel Rosenblat, Marcos Morínigo, Raimundo Lida, María Rosa Lida, Berta Elena Vidal de Battini, Ana María Barrenechea, and others, a number of whom had been his own pupils. In 1946, however, Amado Alonso was compelled to move to the United States. Many of his team dispersed²⁰ and the Institute entered a critical phase of its existence, which it has not yet completely overcome. Associated at first with the Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas, as the Sección Románica of a new Instituto de Filología directed by Enrique François, it practically ceased to operate. The Sección Románica was changed to Instituto de Filología Románica in 1950, then in 1953 to Instituto de Filología Hispánica, which assumed its present form in 1962. In these successive forms the Institute had another period of rather intensive activity, although very short-lived (1949-51), under the direction of Alonso Zamora Vicente; then another period of inactivity or limited activity (from 1954 to 1958 it was completely unproductive). Since 1959 it has been in a process of recovering, but because of the difficulties it passed through, it does not today have a team of collaborators comparable to that of its former times. In Amado Alonso's days, the Instituto de Filología was a center open to various modern linguistic trends; under the direction of Zamora Vicente, it was a good center for Hispanic studies in the Spanish tradition; in its last form, under the guidance of Ana María Barrenechea, it seems to have turned its attention toward structural grammar, although without abandoning other interests. Journal: *Fi*.

2.1.2. The DLLCI is a continuation of the former Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas. The DLLCI also underwent several transformations, before it reached its present state: Sección Clásica of the Instituto de Filología, Instituto de Filología Clásica (with a Section for Linguistics), Departamento de Filología Clásica y Lingüística. It was directed for many years in its various phases and up to its penultimate phase by the Latinist Enrique François (d. 1956?). At present it is directed by Salvador Bucca. Under the direction of François the DLLCI had a period of somewhat assiduous activity — although of a rather informative character — particularly between 1944 and 1949. During this period the DLLCI published, in addition to a number of Latin texts and works on literary history, a linguistic series including translations of Pernot, Vendryes, Lejeune, and Marouzeau and Antonio Tovar's important book *Estudios sobre las primitivas lenguas hispánicas* (1949). From 1950 to 1955 the DLLCI displayed a more limited activity²¹ and later, until 1959, was altogether silent. This Institute was

¹⁹ Another supplement and a further volume were issued in 1948 and in 1951, respectively.

²⁰ María Rosa Lida (d.1962) and Morínigo went to the United States, Rosenblat to Venezuela, and Raimundo Lida to Mexico.

²¹ In 1955 it published: Giacomo Devoto, *Los fundamentos de la historia lingüística*, translated by Carlos Alberto Ronchi March, and Romualdo Ardissonne, *Aspectos de la glotogeografía argentina*.

for many years a center for classical philology, also interested in historical and comparative (Indo-European) linguistics. In its new form, it seems to turn towards general and Amerindian linguistics and has shown interest for structuralism.²² Journal: *AFCl*.

2.1.3. The ILC was founded in 1940 and had a first period of activity until 1945, under the direction of the Hispanist Juan Corominas. After an interruption of several years, it again took up activity in 1949, under the direction of the well-known Romance philologist Fritz Krüger.²³ In its first phase the ILC above all engaged in the study of (Hispanic) etymology. Under the direction of Krüger it turned towards linguistic-ethnographical Romance and Argentine studies. Journal: *AIL*.

2.1.4. The IFUCh was founded in 1943 (as a continuation of the Sección de Filología of the Instituto Pedagógico, which has been in existence since 1935) and has been directed from the beginning by Rodolfo Oroz. It is a research institute exclusive of teaching. In 1949 it became a section of a larger Instituto de Investigaciones Histórico-Culturales. The IFUCh has devoted itself particularly to the study of Spanish in Chile. Its collaborators are: Luis Cifuentes (d. 1956), Ambrosio Rabanales, Lidia Contreras — all of them Hispanists — and Anselmo Raguileo, a student of native languages. The general orientation of this Institute is traditional, but among its collaborators a certain interest for structuralism has been shown. Journal: *BFUCh*.

2.1.5. The ICC, officially founded in 1942 (but actually organized only in 1944), has continually developed and enlarged, particularly in the last years. From 1944 to 1948 it was directed by Félix Restrepo (1887-1965; honorary president from 1948-1965); since 1948 it has been directed by José Rivas Sacconi, with Rafael Torres Quintero as associate director. It is now, in structure, the most powerful organism devoted to linguistics in IAm. Although it does not exclusively dedicate itself to linguistic research, it has among its five departments two linguistic departments: a department of lexicography and another of dialectology (directed by Fernando Antonio Martínez and Luis Flórez, respectively), besides a department of classical philology (directed by Jorge Páramo Pomareda) and a large team of industrious collaborators. Among these, besides those already named, José Joaquín Montes deserves special mention.²⁴ The Seminario 'Andrés Bello', a teaching section of the Institute, created in 1958, organizes postgraduate courses, partly with the collaboration of foreign teachers and lecturers, in which scholarship holders from different countries participate. Since the old group of Buenos Aires dispersed, the ICC has become the leading center of America for Spanish American studies, although it lacks the continental orientation of the Instituto de Filología (in fact, it has concentrated its attention almost exclusively on the

²² During recent years it published some informative pamphlets (cf. fn. 48) and began a series of *Cuadernos de lingüística indígena* (2 numbers in 1964).

²³ Concerning his activity in Germany and in Argentina see: Gerardo Moldenhauer, *Fritz Krüger. Notice biographique et bibliographique* (Louvain, 1959). The University of Cuyo published two huge volumes of an *Homenaje a Fritz Krüger* (Mendoza, 1952 and 1954), with important foreign (mainly European) contributions.

²⁴ From 1940 to 1949 the Spaniard Pedro Urbano González de la Calle was also active in Colombia and collaborated with the ICC since its foundation. Later he went to Mexico.

Spanish of Colombia) and has not reached in certain aspects the rigor and technical perfection of the work done in Argentina. Besides two bibliographical series, it is publishing: *Publicaciones del ICC*, *Publicaciones del ICC. Series Minor*, *Filólogos colombianos*, *Clásicos colombianos* (19, 9, 3, and 4 volumes, respectively, until 1964).²⁵ The ICC has also taken care of a facsimile reprint of the published part of Cuervo's *Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana* (2 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1953-54) and is now publishing its continuation (under the direction of Fernando Antonio Martínez and with Corominas acting as an adviser). It is also preparing the *Atlas Lingüístico-Etnográfico de Colombia* [*ALEC*] (under the direction of Luis Flórez). The general orientation of the linguistic work done by the ICC is traditional, as is usual in the fields of lexicology and dialectology. However, through foreign participation in the Seminario 'Andrés Bello', the ICC has helped to spread structural ideas and methods. Some of its collaborators have also manifested some interest in structuralism. Journal: *BICC*.

2.1.6. The principal interests of the CdM — an institute for post-University studies, founded in 1943 — are more of a literary and historico-cultural nature. Among its collaborators in the field of linguistics Juan M. Lope Blanch (also at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) deserves special mention.²⁶ In the comprehensive and philologically important series of its publications only occasionally does a work appear related to linguistics.²⁷ The linguistic interests of the CdM are more readily expressed in its journal: *NRFH*.

2.1.7. The DFL, partly in conjunction with the Riva-Agüero Institute of the Universidad Católica, is displaying a rather manifold activity, although it is primarily philological in nature and not on a strictly academic level. The following belong to the Lima group of philologists: Fernando Tola Mendoza (Classical Philology, Sanskrit), José Jiménez Borja and Luis Jaime Cisneros (General and Spanish Linguistics), Teodoro Meneses (native languages), Martha Hildebrandt (Phonetics and native languages; after several years of activity in Venezuela she again joined the DFL in 1962), Alberto Escobar (Romance languages). The DFL published a comprehensive

²⁵ In this series there appeared in the domain of linguistics works of exceptional interest, as the published and unpublished writings of Cuervo: very useful handbooks, as Rohlf's *Manual de Filología hispánica* (1957); valuable studies, as Delos Lincoln Canfield's *La pronunciación del español en América* (1962) and the dialectological works of Flórez; useful popularizing books (also by Flórez); but unfortunately also a few works which are close to amateur linguistics, as Homero Serís' *Bibliografía de la lingüística española* (1964) — very rich to be sure, but unsystematic, careless and arbitrary in the selection and arrangement of the material and full of naive affirmations and of serious inaccuracies — as well as some works far beneath the level of scientific acceptability, as Celia Hernández de Mendoza's *Introducción a la Estilística* (1962).

²⁶ The linguistic contributions of Raimundo Lida — who was active in the Colegio between 1946 and 1952 and since 1953 has been a teacher at Harvard — mostly belong to his activity in Buenos Aires, prior to 1946.

²⁷ The same can be said about the series *Publicaciones de la NRFH*, also edited by the Colegio, into which linguistics enters only partially, in the form of stylistics. Some linguistic works were in turn published by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México in the series *Publicaciones del Centro de Estudios literarios*.

series of pamphlets mainly designed to be used in teaching. Journal: *Sphinx*.

2.1.8. The DLM, founded in 1951, was directed by the present writer from its beginning until March, 1963. Following my transfer to Germany, it remained in charge of my former pupil José Pedro Rona, who, after some attempts in the Indo-European field, has been specializing in Hispano-American dialectology. The DLM — in addition to those materials designed for its own use — is publishing two series of *Publicaciones*, one printed and one mimeographed, and a series of *Cuadernos de Filosofía del Lenguaje* (17, 14, and 2 items, respectively, until 1964). The DLM has also published 2 volumes of the series *Filología y Lingüística* of the Facultad de Humanidades. From 1952 to 1962 the DLM was the most active linguistic center in IAm and the most modern in its orientation, being at the same time the only IAm center for research in general linguistics. Concerning its aims and collaborators see 5.1.2. No journal.

2.1.9. The IFAB, founded in 1947, has been directed from its beginning by the Argentine Ángel Rosenblat (in Venezuela since 1946; cf. fn. 20), the first and the most famous of Amado Alonso's disciples.²⁸ Unfortunately, because of external circumstances, the IFAB does not have a large group of collaborators. In spite of this it has accomplished important work. Spanish, American Spanish, and especially Venezuelan Spanish are its subjects of research. The IFAB has so far published two volumes of a major series of publications as well as a series of excellent *Cuadernos* — partly of a popularizing character, but nevertheless with a serious scientific foundation and on a high level — almost all written by its director.²⁹ In his personal activity Dr. Rosenblat has remained true to his traditional linguistic education; but among the collaborators of the Institute structural orientation is also found.³⁰ No journal (but cf. fn. 37).

2.2. It may be said that about four-fifths (or more) of scientific Hispano-American linguistics during the last twenty-five years — i.e. with a few exceptions (cf. 1.1., 2.1.1., and 2.1.4.), of ALL scientific linguistics in Spanish America — has been accomplished in or by the Institutes just enumerated. Outside of these Institutes and independent of several other less active or recently founded Institutes, there only remains to be mentioned the individual and more or less isolated activity of a limited number of linguists. In certain cases, the activity of these linguists coincides with that of the centers they represent and, to a certain extent — apart from such countries as Argen-

²⁸ Professor Rosenblat presently is the leading figure in Hispano-American linguistics. Among other things, he is the best connoisseur of American Spanish and at the same time the best IAm connoisseur of the history of Spanish. About his activity in Venezuela, see María Rosa Alonso, 'Ángel Rosenblat y el español de Venezuela', *CU* 64.74-78 (1958).

²⁹ The most extensive work, a *Diccionario de venezolanismos*, still is in preparation. Specimens of this dictionary are found in Rosenblat's two volumes *Buenas y malas palabras en el castellano de Venezuela. Primera Serie*² and *Segunda Serie* (Caracas, 1960; the first edition of the first series appeared in 1956).

³⁰ From 1953 to 1961 the Peruvian structuralist Martha Hildebrandt was a collaborator of the Instituto (cf. 2.1.7. and fn. 8) and was moreover dealing with native languages in the Comisión Indigenista Nacional. One can further mention the young Hungarian Esteban Emilio Mosonyi, who has also devoted himself to the study of native languages applying structural methods.

tina, Chile and Mexico — with THE scientific linguistics of their respective countries.

Thus, in ARGENTINA, the activity of the well-known structuralist Luis Jorge Prieto (Córdoba); of Gerardo [Gerhard] Moldenhauer and Germán Fernández Guizzetti (Rosario); and of Clemente Hernando Balmori (La Plata) (d. 1965) should be mentioned. In Tucumán the successive presence of several linguists (cf. 1.3.) has not led to the establishment of a permanent research center; nevertheless, Terracini published two important works there³¹ and initiated a collection of students' pamphlets, of which two items were issued. In Buenos Aires, where he established himself after World War II, the Romance philologist Gazdaru has displayed a significant activity while collaborating intermittently with the two Institutes of the University.³²

For CHILE we still have to mention: in Santiago, the activity of the grammarian Claudio Rosales (d. 1951) and that of the linguist Heinz Schulte-Herbrüggen; in Concepción, the activity of the Anglicist Max Bertens Charnley (who has also done some work in the field of American Spanish) and the very recent and somewhat hurried but nevertheless promising activity of Heles Contreras. It is possible that Concepción will in time become a second important center of linguistic research in Chile: there are encouraging signs for it.

In MEXICO the activity of Morris Swadesh and of the Spanish archeologist and Indoeuropean scholar P. Bosch-Gimpera in the Instituto de Historia of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma (Mexico City) and the activity of Juan A. Hasler (Veracruz) ought to be mentioned; in ECUADOR, that of Humberto Toscano Mateus (Quito, d. 1966); in COSTA RICA, that of Arturo Agüero Chaves (San José). In PUERTO RICO besides the vast lexicographical work done by Augusto Malaret, the activity of Manuel Álvarez Nazario in the same field should also be remembered.

In other centers and countries there has been some sporadic work worth mentioning, but no extensive or continuous linguistic activity. The above can thus give an idea of the vast empty areas shown by the map of scientific linguistics in Spanish America.

2.3.0. In Brazil linguistic work has not usually been concentrated in research Institutes. It rather centered around professorships and university courses and generally has a strictly individual character. Consequently, 'center of linguistic activity' will mean in this case concentration of individual activity in a single town.

2.3.1. Rio de Janeiro has been and still is the major center of linguistics in Brazil. As far as the first generation of Brazilian linguists is concerned (cf. 1.1.), the activity of Manuel Said Ali (1861-1953) and of Álvaro Fernando Sousa da Silveira (born 1883) belongs for the most part to the period preceding that considered in this survey; but Antenor Nascentes (born 1886) and Augusto Magne (born 1887) continue to be productive in the present period. The activity of most of those linguists whom I called the second Brazilian generation — Joaquim Mattoso Câmara Jr., Ernesto Faria (1906-62), Serafim da Silva Neto (1917-60), Sílvio Elia, Celso Ferreira da Cunha —

³¹ *¿Qué es la lingüística?* (1942) and *Perfiles de lingüistas. Contribución a la historia de la lingüística comparada* (1946).

³² See Nydia G. B. de Fernández Pereiro, 'Dimitrie Gazdaru', *Orbis* 11.393-404 (1962).

is also concentrated in Rio. Ismael de Lima Coutinho (d. 1965), Gladstone Chaves de Melo, Antônio Houaiss too, and perhaps some others, can be included in this group. Mattoso Câmara (born 1904), the oldest of this generation, has also been the most modern in his orientation, since he introduced structuralism in Brazil (and indirectly even in Portugal). In turn Silva Neto, an indefatigable promoter of all kinds of linguistic studies, who was recognized as a master by the linguists of his own generation and also by older ones, has been the main representative of historical linguistics in his country and is so far the most outstanding figure in Brazilian linguistics in more than one sense. The main subjects of research for this and the preceding generation have been Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese (history, phonetics, grammar, lexicology, dialectology, stylistics, critical text editions). Other topics, however, were not ignored; thus, general linguistics (Mattoso Câmara), Romance linguistics (Silva Neto), Latin studies (Faria), history of linguistics (Silva Neto, Sílvia Elia) and Amerindian linguistics (Mattoso Câmara).

In other Brazilian centers too there has been a notable or at least promising development in linguistics. For São Paulo, we can mention the activity of Francisco da Silveira Bueno, a student of Portuguese, and particularly that of the Latinist and Romance philologist Theodoro Henrique Maurer Jr. Elsewhere, the following names, among others, have to be remembered: Rosário F. Mansur Guérios (Curitiba), Heinrich Bunse and Albino de Bem Veiga (Pôrto Alegre), Florival Seraine and R. Valnir C. Chagas (Fortaleza), Ângela Vaz Leão (Belo Horizonte). A promising new center was until recently that of Brasília, including Aryon Dall'Igna Rodrigues (Native languages), Adriano Da Gama Kury (Portuguese) and Nelson Rossi (Romance languages); this center dispersed however in 1965. Some linguistic activity has also been recorded in Recife, Salvador and Florianópolis.

2.3.2. While most linguistic publications in Spanish America are issued by the universities and research institutes, the situation is different in Brazil in this respect too, which seems to indicate a greater public interest in linguistics. Although a number of works were published by institutions (such as the Instituto Nacional do Livro, Casa de Rui Barbosa, Rio de Janeiro Faculty of Arts, São Paulo University), most of them are issued by commercial publishing houses, as in Western Europe and the United States.³³

2.4.1. In order to complete this survey, we must also remind the reader of those centers primarily devoted to the study of native languages. Important centers for this field exist in Mexico City, Guatemala, Caracas, Asunción, São Paulo and Brasília. These centers are radically different from the linguistic-philological centers considered above — from which, by the way, they are totally separate — and represent, so to say, 'another' linguistics in IAm. In these centers linguistics is not associated with philology, but rather with anthropology and ethnology (by the way, they are not exclusively

³³ In this connection there must be mentioned above all the *Biblioteca Brasileira de Filologia* of the Livraria Acadêmica, the publications of the Livros de Portugal Press as well as the meritorious, although very variable *Coleção 'Rex'* of the Organização Simões (all three in Rio de Janeiro).

linguistic centers, but indeed anthropological and ethnological centers). Strangely enough, these centers are sometimes more advanced than are the philological-linguistic centers. The students of native languages generally have less philological training than other IAm linguists and know much less about traditional historical linguistics, but they are in certain cases better acquainted with modern descriptive techniques, and the influence of North American descriptivism has in several instances proved to be decisive among them.³⁴ At any rate, independent of its occasional intrinsic value, the activity in the field of native languages is marginal in the whole of IAm linguistics and has so far scarcely affected its general development. The leading centers of IAm linguistics are the philological-linguistic centers, not only because they are much more numerous and have more resources, but also because the linguistics which they represent is that which predominates (or is exclusive) in teaching and has infinitely greater possibilities for both national and continental diffusion, whereas the native language work, owing to its very subject, can only call forth a local and limited response. A description of the Guajiro language awakens very little interest in Chile or Argentina and, vice versa, a description of Araucanian is not likely to arouse interest in Colombia or Venezuela. This is particularly true if one considers the present situation in IAm linguistics, in which the facts investigated are of more interest than the methods which are used. Even in those countries where the studies of indigenous languages are carried out, they mostly remain confined to the circles of native lore students.³⁵

2.4.2. In the same connection we must remember the intensive and indefatigable activity displayed by the Summer Institutes of Linguistics, i.e. by Pike and his collaborators, an activity at first limited to Mexico, but later extended to Peru, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, and, recently, to Brazil (Rio, Brasília, Belém). Unfortunately this activity has not had repercussion in IAm linguistics either (except in some centers for native language studies). This is due partly to its character, partly to what has been said in 2.4.1. and to the fact that it was displayed above all in Central America and in the northern countries of South America, whereas IAm linguistics, from Rio to Santiago de Chile, is concentrated mainly in the southern part of the Continent.

2.5. In another sense, the activity of several linguistic associations should be mentioned, which are however not oriented towards research but rather towards information and discussion. In Uruguay a 'Centro Lingüístico de Montevideo' was founded in 1951; in Chile a 'Círculo Lingüístico de Santiago' arose in 1957, and similar circles were set up in Valparaíso and in Concepción in 1959. I have also had notice of such a circle in Buenos Aires, and it is possible that there are other similar associations elsewhere. Finally in 1962 an 'Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de América Latina' was organized on an Inter-American level. This association held its first congress in

³⁴ The union between linguistics, anthropology, and ethnology is also typical in this sense.

³⁵ Certain ties — mostly fragile and of a local character — between the non-native and the native language studies were established with the help of those linguists who worked in both fields, such as Mattoso Câmara, Mansur Guérios, Hernando Balmori, Ferrario or Cisneros, who were ALSO concerned with native languages, or Martha Hildebrandt, Dall'Igna Rodrigues, Fernández Guizzetti, who were PRIMARILY concerned with native languages.

Viña del Mar (Chile) in January 1964. Several people have placed much hope in it, but its possibilities to stimulate effectively the progress of linguistics in IAM, once the first moments of enthusiasm are passed, seem to be doubtful.

3. JOURNALS

3.0. Two general facts have to be taken into account concerning the IAM linguistic journals. The first is that all journals like the Institutes are journals of 'philology', i.e. alongside with linguistics they also publish historical and literary articles, which often prevail over the linguistic part (the same is true of course of the book reviews).³⁶ The second is that articles published in the IAM journals exceed the limits of what has actually been worked out in IAM. Indeed, whereas the contributions of IAM linguists to journals other than IAM are relatively few, foreign contributions are abundant in the principal IAM journals, and in some of them (*NRFH*, *AIL*, *Ibérica*) they even prevail. Except for the general characterization of the journals, only their linguistic part and only the IAM contribution thereof will be considered here.

3.1.0. There are seven outstanding journals of linguistics (and philology) among those published in IAM. These will be examined here in the chronological order of their foundation.

3.1.1. The *Boletín de Filología* [*BFUCh*] published under this name since volume 5, 1947-49 (volume 4, 1944-46 appeared as *Boletín del Instituto de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*), 16 volumes until 1964, directed since its foundation by Rodolfo Oroz, can be considered the oldest of the seven journals as it continues, even in the enumeration of its volumes, a former *Sección de Filología* in the University of Chile *Anales de la Facultad de Filosofía y Educación*, of which 3 volumes were issued between 1936 and 1943. Since volume 10, 1958, the *Boletín* appears regularly at the rate of one volume annually. It included for many years abundant foreign (European) contribution, but during recent years IAM and particularly Chilean contributions have increased. The book reviews, of an informative character especially during the last years, vary greatly from one volume to another — numerous in some of them, they are lacking completely in others. The linguistic studies published by the *BFUCh* mainly deal with Chilean dialectology and lexicology and Spanish grammar. The general outlook of this journal is traditional. Nevertheless, it was the first to publish studies which employ North American descriptive methods (cf. 4.2.1.) and a review by Heles Contreras of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* (14.251-7, 1962). Particularly important is volume 8, *Homenaje a Rodolfo Oroz* (1954-55).

3.1.2. The *Revista de Filología Hispánica* [*RFH*], 8 volumes published, Buenos

³⁶ The only exclusively or almost exclusively linguistic journal, *Investigaciones Lingüísticas* (5 vols., Mexico City, 1933-8), belongs to a period prior to that considered here. From a journal *Folia Linguistica Americana* offprints of contributions to no. 1 (announced for 1952) were distributed, but the journal itself, as far as I know, was not issued.

Aires, 1939-46, continued as *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* [*NRFH*], Mexico City, 1947ff. (16 vols. until 1962), is the most important among IAM philological journals and the principal Hispanic organ in America, owing to its wealth and variety of content as well as to its scientific and technical level. Founded by Amado Alonso in its two forms, it was directed by him until his death (1952), then by Alfonso Reyes (d. 1959) and since 1962 by Antonio Alatorre and Ángel Rosenblat.³⁷ Since its foundation it included important foreign contribution which has considerably increased in the *NRFH*. The *RFH* was mainly an organ of the Buenos Aires Instituto de Filología and of Hispanists or Romance philologists, either Argentine or resident in Argentina. The *NRFH* has become an organ of continental Hispanic studies (including North America). Under the direction of Amado Alonso it kept, in its two forms, a certain balance between linguistics and philology. In the following period the interest for literature prevailed. Only during recent years does it seem to have regained a balance between philology and linguistics, particularly in the book review section, thanks to Lope Blanch. The articles it publishes deal mainly with Spanish (European and American), but general linguistics, Romance linguistics, and philosophy of language are also represented, above all in the book reviews. It has always been an organ open to the various trends of modern linguistics, including structuralism to a certain extent (but cf. 4.2.1.). Most useful is its *Bibliografía* elaborated in systematic connection with that of the *Revista Hispánica Moderna*. Particularly important are the volumes in honor of Amado Alonso (7, 1953) and of Alfonso Reyes (15, 1961).

3.1.3. The *Anales del Instituto de Lingüística* of the University of Cuyo [*AIL*], Mendoza, 1942ff. (with an interruption from 1946 to 1949), first directed by Juan Corominas (vols. 1-3, 1941-43, issued 1942-45) and then by Fritz Krüger (1950ff.), 8 volumes until 1962, represent in a certain sense two different journals as to favorite topics and to the origin of the contributions. In the first phase the *Anales* were almost a single accomplishment of Corominas and Spitzer, with interests chiefly for etymology. In their second phase they became an international journal devoted to the study of Romance languages and folklore (particularly Hispanic, as well as Hispano-American and Argentine), with predominantly European collaboration. As to its orientation it practically is a continuation of the journal *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen* formerly edited by Krüger in Hamburg. Local contribution was relatively limited in both phases (if one excludes that of its directors). The book reviews, mostly due to Krüger himself, are numerous in the second period.

3.1.4. The *Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* [*BICC*], Bogotá, 1945ff. (since volume 7, 1951 called: *Thesaurus. Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*), very regularly published (19 volumes until 1964), and directed by José Rivas Sacconi, includes an almost equal

³⁷ The *RFH* was edited by the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires and the Instituto de las Españas (Hispanic Institute) of the Columbia University, New York; the *NRFH*, by the CdM (1947-57) and later by the CdM and the University of Texas, Austin, Texas (1958-61); since 1962 it is edited by the Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios of the CdM and the IFAB. In the periods, when the direction was interrupted, the appearance of the *NRFH* was secured by its secretaries (at first, Raimundo Lida; later, Antonio Alatorre).

amount of philological and linguistic articles, considered on the whole, although philology is prevalent in certain volumes. European and North American collaboration is abundant, but IAm and, in particular, Colombian contribution have gradually increased. The topics of its local contributions are Colombian dialectology and lexicology (practically lacking is historical linguistics). Other linguistic topics are found almost exclusively in the book reviews. The latter have recently become numerous and varied owing above all to José Joaquín Montes. The general outlook of the journal is traditional, sometimes open to structuralism through the foreign collaboration and a few reviews. Special mention should be given to volume 5 (1949, issued 1950), *Homenaje a Félix Restrepo*.

3.1.5. *Filología [Fi]*, Buenos Aires, 1949 ff. (with an interruption between 1954 and 1958), directed successively by Alonso Zamora Vicente (1-3, 1949-51), Arturo Berenguer (4, 1952-53), Marcos Morfnigo (5-6, 1959-60), and finally by Ana María Barrenechea (1961 ff.), 8 volumes until 1962, reflects the ups and downs of the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires after what happened in 1946 (cf. 2.1.1.). Under the direction of Zamora Vicente this journal had a good period and presented a clearcut physiognomy. The following period was rather one of decay and disorientation. Since the last volumes the *Fi* has been recovering to some extent and is at the same time gaining a definite character. Its contributions are mostly Hispano-American and Argentine (a good number of the collaborators remain those trained in the school of Amado Alonso and who belonged to the *RFH* group). Its content was more linguistic than philological during the first years; later, the reverse. In the latest volumes it seems to aim at a balance between linguistics and historico-literary erudition. The linguistic articles mostly deal with European and American (Argentine) Spanish, and to some extent with Romance linguistics (Gazdaru). Linguistic book reviews are numerous in the three first volumes, much less however in the following. The general outlook of *Fi* is traditional, approaching structuralism in the recent years. Volume 8 (1962), *Homenaje a María Rosa Lida de Malkiel*, deserves particular mention.

3.1.6. The *Revista Brasileira de Filologia [RBF]*, Rio de Janeiro, 1955 ff., founded by Serafim Silva Neto and directed by him until volume 4 (1958), since volume 6 by a committee (Nascentes, Lima Coutinho, Mattoso Câmara, Sílvio Elia), 6 volumes until 1961, is the leading philological-linguistic journal of Brazil. It appeared regularly under the direction of Silva Neto and less regularly after his death. In some volumes there is an abundance of foreign contribution; generally however, Brazilian contributors (linguists belonging to the Rio, Pôrto Alegre and, to a smaller extent, to the São Paulo groups) prevail. Its content is to a much greater extent linguistic than philological. The topics of the *RBF* are European and Brazilian Portuguese, but it also publishes articles and book reviews concerning general and Romance linguistics. Together with the *RFH-NRFH* it is the IAm journal which devotes most interest to historical linguistics. Its book reviews are numerous and generally extensive. Although its orientation is fundamentally traditional (historical), it is the IAm journal which grants most space to structuralism, in its articles as well as in its review section

(the *Crônica lingüística* by Mattoso Câmara ought to be mentioned in this respect). Vol. 4, dedicated to the 100th anniversary of José Leite de Vasconcelos, is of particular importance.

3.1.7. *Ibérica*, Rio de Janeiro, 1959 ff., directed by Celso Cunha, Antônio Houaiss, and Israël Salvador Révah (in the beginning only by the former two), is a properly 'IAm' journal, in the sense that it grants almost equal space to the Portuguese and the Spanish languages in its philological parts (which prevail) as well as in the linguistic parts (concerned mainly with historical linguistics). Its foreign collaboration, particularly Spanish, is very abundant. Local contribution is however scarce. Its review section is almost exclusively of a philological character. Volume 1 of *Ibérica* was dedicated to Menéndez Pidal; Volume 3, to Sousa da Silveira; Volumes 5-6, to Marcel Bataillon.

3.2. Among the remaining philological journals in IAm worth mentioning are above all the Buenos Aires *Anales de Filología Clásica [AFCl]* (under this name since volume 4, 1947-49; the first volumes, 1939-46 appeared as: *Anales del Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas*), directed at first by Enrique François and since 1960 by Salvador Bucca, 7 volumes until 1960 — a journal for Greek and Latin philology, which, however, between 1949 and 1954 (vols. 4-6) published a number of valuable linguistic articles by foreign contributors (Chantraine, Marouzeau, Pisani, Tovar), numerous linguistic reviews (mainly on historical and comparative linguistics) and important contributions by Gazdaru on the history of linguistics in the nineteenth century (cf. 6.3.7.).

Other journals are either of less interest from the point of view of scientific linguistics or of a very recent date. *Sphinx* (Lima), a yearbook of the DFL, which reached vol. 15 in 1962, in its second phase, is a philological journal of a very general nature, publishing articles on classical and oriental philology, translations, literary studies, etc., and occasionally articles on Spanish, Romance, or Amerindian linguistics. The *Jornal de Filologia*, São Paulo, 1953 ff., directed by Francisco da Silveira Bueno, publishes articles on philology and linguistics (in particular on Brazilian Portuguese) at rather different scientific levels; its review section seems to be above all a personal mouthpiece of its director. The *Boletín de Filología [BFM]*, Montevideo, 1936 ff., issued by the Sección de Filología of the Instituto de Estudios Superiores, under the direction of Adolfo Berro García, is a review of quite irregular appearance (it reached vol. 9, nos. 58-60, in 1962); although very erratic as to its quality (for the most part pre-scientific), it deserves to be mentioned for the materials it has published (lexical and others); in the last volume it initiated a good review section. Of very irregular appearance and of limited interest is the *Boletim da Sociedade de Estudos Filológicos* of São Paulo (3 issues published from 1943 to 1959). I do not know the *Anuario de Filología* of Maracaibo (Venezuela). *Indianoromania*, published by the Seminario de Filología of the Riva-Agüero Institute (Catholic University of Peru, Lima) under the direction of Luis Jaime Cisneros (one issue in 1962, with mainly foreign contributions), is too new to have a definite character. In Concepción, Chile, a *Revista de Lingüística*

aplicada began to appear in 1963, which I have not yet been able to see.³⁸

Among the journals of the Academies mention should be made of the *Boletín de la Academia Argentina de Letras*, Buenos Aires, 1933 ff., which often publishes linguistic articles (mainly of a lexicological nature), as well as linguistic book reviews; also of the *Revista Filológica*, published by the Academia Brasileira de Filologia.

Among those journals which are no longer published the *Boletim de Filologia [BFR]*, Rio de Janeiro, 1946-49 (10 issues) particularly deserves to be remembered. It was edited by Nascentes, Mattoso Câmara, Silva Neto and Sílvio Elia, including articles mostly by the same, especially on Portuguese. The first reviews of structural works (Swadesh, Jakobson, Trubetzkoy) which appeared in Brazil were published in this journal by Mattoso Câmara. It also published the first articles on Portuguese phonemics by the same author.

3.3. The journals so far enumerated can be considered as specialized organs. Linguistic studies are in addition published by non-specialized journals, above all by periodicals of the Faculties of Arts such as: *Humanidades* (La Plata), *Humanitas* (Tucumán), *Letras* (Curitiba), *Letras* (Lima), *Revista de la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias* (Montevideo); and more recently: *Revista de Letras* (Assis, Brazil), *Revista de la Facultad de Humanidades* (San Luis Potosí, Mexico), *Anuario de Letras* (Mexico City). The general journals of several universities also publish linguistic articles — e.g. *Atenea* (Concepción, Chile), *Anales de la Universidad de Chile* (Santiago), *Cultura Universitaria [CU]* (Caracas) and the journals of several Argentine universities — and so do several broader cultural journals, as the *Mercurio Peruano* (Lima), *Revista Nacional* (Montevideo), *Revista Nacional de Cultura [RNC]* (Caracas)³⁹ and the modest yet meritorious *Revista de Cultura* of Tomás Fontes (Rio de Janeiro), as well as journals devoted to other disciplines, e.g. the excellent *Revista de Antropología* of Egon Schaden (São Paulo), and of course the bulletins and journals for native studies.

4. INFORMATION, INFLUENCES, AND TRENDS

4.0. As has been pointed out above in 1.5., speaking about IAm linguistic trends does not mean dealing with conceptions and methods which arose in IAm, but rather with conceptions which spread and methods which were adopted in IAm, i.e. with the ideological and methodological bases of IAm linguistics. If we would confine ourselves, as has been done before in the *Current Trends in Linguistics*, to the new and specific views of IAm linguistics (i.e. to views different from those known in Europe and the

³⁸ The periodical series *Cuadernos del Sur* published by the Instituto de Humanidades of the Universidad Nacional del Sur (Bahía Blanca, Argentina), in which among others a few contributions relating to linguistics appeared, is not properly a journal. I do not know the series *Lenguaje y ciencias* of Trujillo, Peru (which reached no. 12 in 1964).

³⁹ Numbers 112-113 of this journal (1955) constituted an *Homenaje a Andrés Bello*.

United States) or to the original IAm contribution to linguistic theory and methodology, this survey would have no reason to be written or it would have been a very limited one. As to its trends, the outlook of IAm linguistics is determined by what it received, not by what it could offer. For this very reason the problem of orientations for IAm coincides to a high degree with the problem of information and will be considered here from this point of view.

4.1.0. In what follows I shall consider primarily what has been produced in the field of information in IAm and then the general results so far obtained in this field.

4.1.1.1. The first vein of general linguistic information in IAm undoubtedly is translations.

A true program of linguistic translations expertly prefaced and annotated, was developed by Amado Alonso in Buenos Aires, with the assistance of Raimundo Lida. This program was carried out partly by the Instituto de Filología and partly through the series *Filosofía y Teoría del Lenguaje* directed by Alonso himself and issued by Losada Publishers. In the Instituto series two selections of articles appeared: K. Vossler, L. Spitzer, and H. Hatzfeld, *Introducción a la estilística romance*, translation and notes by A. Alonso and R. Lida (1932), and Charles Bally, Elise Richter, A. Alonso, R. Lida, *El impresionismo en el lenguaje* (1936). To the Losada series belong: Ch. Bally, *El lenguaje y la vida* [Le Langage et la vie], transl. by A. Alonso (1941); K. Vossler, *Filosofía del lenguaje* [Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprachphilosophie], translation and notes by A. Alonso and R. Lida (1943); F. de Saussure, *Curso de lingüística general* [Cours de linguistique générale], transl. by A. Alonso (1945).⁴⁰ These translations, several of which were printed more than once,⁴¹ have enjoyed a wide diffusion and have been highly influential, not only in Spanish America but also in Brazil, Spain and Portugal.

Except for this enterprise, there has not been a regular or rational translation program in IAm. Yet University and above all commercial presses published several important works, such as: *Psicología del lenguaje* [Psychologie du langage = *Journal de psychologie*, 30. 1933; an incomplete translation] (Buenos Aires, 1952); Jespersen, *Humanidad, nación, individuo desde el punto de vista lingüístico* [Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View] (Buenos Aires, 1947); Sapir, *El lenguaje* [Language] (Mexico City, 1954); Bertil Malmberg, *La fonética* [La Phonétique] (Buenos Aires, 1964). In Brazil Mattoso Câmara excellently translated Sapir, *A linguagem. Introdução ao estudo da fala* [Language] (Rio de Janeiro, 1954) and *Lingüística como ciência* (a selection of 9 articles; Rio de Janeiro, 1961). Works of

⁴⁰ After the death of Alonso, a further volume appeared in this collection: K. Vossler, *Cultura y lengua de Francia* [Frankreichs Kultur und Sprache], transl. by Elsa Tabernig and Raimundo Lida (1955). At the time of Alonso the following were moreover announced as being in preparation: Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, and Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*; from what I heard, a translation of Trubetzkoy's *Grundzüge* had also been planned.

⁴¹ The translation of de Saussure reached its 4th impression in 1961.

good⁴² or less good⁴³ philosophy of language also circulated as translations and were influential among linguists.⁴⁴ Translations of works by Bertrand Russell were not so readily received by linguists and there are not yet any signs of an influence of logical semanticists.⁴⁵

Unfortunately, those translations neither done nor directed by specialists, are inconvenient in two ways: on the one hand they often are deficient, particularly as to their linguistic terminology (thus, among others, the translation of Jespersen's *Man-kind*), and on the other hand they are not selected with sound criteria.⁴⁶ The latter implies a rather serious danger, as a book having been translated is often interpreted by non-specialists as a guarantee of excellence.⁴⁷

4.1.1.2. Another vein of information is represented by the book reviews and chronicles published in journals and particularly by a number of works with historical-informative aims. Among these last the following have a general character: the two works by Terracini cited in fn. 31 (especially the former); *Panorama de la lingüística moderna* by the Spaniards Antonio M. Badía Margarit and José Roca Pons — published as introduction to the second Spanish edition of Vendryes' *El lenguaje* (Mexico City, 1958) —, unfortunately a fragmentary and hardly trustworthy or critical survey, particularly concerning more recent trends (glossematics, North American descriptive linguistics), and hardly more than an enumeration of names and titles as far as the latest developments of linguistics in Italy, Germany, England, etc. are concerned; Sílvio Elia's *Orientações da lingüística moderna* (Rio de Janeiro, 1955) — particularly on Vossler, dialect geography, Hjelmslev, Trubetzkoy and European phonemics; and Silva Neto's excellent *Manual de filologia portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro, 1952; 2nd ed., 1957), which supplies ample information concerning the methods of historical linguistics and the dialectology. Especially on dialectology: Silva Neto, *Guia para estudos dialectológicos* (Florianópolis, 1955; 2nd ed., Belém, 1957), and Coseriu, *La geografía lingüística* (Montevideo, 1956). Very detailed information on a particular problem of

⁴² Thus: Cassirer, *Mito y lenguaje* [Sprache und Mythos] (Buenos Aires, 1954) — and among those works not exclusively on philosophy of language: *Antropología filosófica* [Essay on Man] (Mexico, 1945) and *Las ciencias de la cultura* [Zur Logik der Kulturwissenschaften] (Mexico, 1951); Wilbur Marshall Urban, *Lenguaje y realidad* [Language and Reality] (Mexico, 1952).

⁴³ Such as Ogden & Richards, *El significado del significado* [The Meaning of Meaning] (Buenos Aires, 1954).

⁴⁴ In this field even a Russian work was translated: D. P. Gorskij, Ed., *Pensamiento y Lenguaje* [Мышление и язык] (Montevideo, 1958), which certainly is not the most adequate to represent the thinking of the best Soviet theorists of language.

⁴⁵ They are nevertheless represented by a good *Antología semántica*, compiled by Mario Bunge (Buenos Aires, 1960).

⁴⁶ In fact, besides important or at least useful works, also other works of doubtful utility were translated, such as the superficial booklets on semantics, stylistics, and grammar by Guiraud or works which from the point of view of present day linguistics are not useful at all, such as *La Vie du langage* and *La Philosophie du langage* by Albert Dauzat. And a Buenos Aires publisher reissued Max Müller, *La ciencia del lenguaje* [The Science of Language] in 1944, without indicating to which epoch this work belongs.

⁴⁷ Thus, Max Müller and Dauzat are listed in some IAm bibliographies next to Saussure and Bloomfield, and Dauzat even figures as a philosopher of language (!).

historical linguistics (Vulgar Latin) is given in Silva Neto's *História do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957).⁴⁸

4.1.1.3. Thirdly, the introductory handbooks of linguistics can be considered as informative compendia. The first of them, Mauricio [sic] Swadesh, *La nueva filología* (Mexico City, 1941), also the first work to introduce the principles and methods of North American descriptive linguistics to IAm, was not very influential, partly on account of what is said in 7.1., but especially because it is a book unfortunate in many ways (primarily, because it is written in a manner inappropriate to be accepted by IAm linguists and because it contains expressions of political passion altogether out of place).⁴⁹ Almost simultaneously with this unsuccessful attempt appeared Mattoso Câmara's book *Princípios de lingüística geral* (Rio de Janeiro, 1941), which since its second edition (Rio, 1954) has become the best handbook for the introduction to linguistics so far published in a Latin country.⁵⁰ These two handbooks are now joined by Heles Contreras' modest and imperfect course *Elementos de lingüística descriptiva* (Concepción, 1963), which is not more than a summary of some aspects of North American descriptive linguistics, but which can claim the merit of being the first IAm handbook to contain a section on transformational techniques.

4.1.2. The preceding refers to the properly informative work achieved in IAm. There must be added, of course, information spread by popularizing publications (relatively numerous) or by research and critical publications, and by the teaching activity of IAm linguists, as well as what was derived from the two countries traditionally influential in IAm: Spain and France (and also Portugal, as far as Brazil is concerned).⁵¹

4.1.3. Owing to the facts just stated, the general level of linguistic information considerably increased in IAm, particularly in such countries as Argentina and Brazil and above all among young linguists, who usually are better informed than the old.

⁴⁸ During recent years the DLLCI of Buenos Aires too (cf. 2.1.2.) began to contribute to the diffusion of information by a series of either translated or original pamphlets. I have seen two of them: Robert A. Hall, Jr., *Lingüística norteamericana, 1925-1950* [American Linguistics, 1925-1950, *ArchL* 3.101-25, 1951, and 4.1-16, 1952] (1960), and Ivonne Bordelois, *Perspectivas de la estilística* (1962), in which, curiously enough, just the very recent trends are lacking, particularly all the North American efforts in stylistics, glossematic stylistics and Antoniò Pagliaro's most important 'critical semantics'; I do not know the second pamphlet, *Cuatro artículos de lingüística estructural* (1962). Among other significant translations I mention: Kurt Baldinger, *La semasiología* [Die Semasiologie] (Rosario, 1964). I am leaving aside, of course, the translated articles published in journals. Among the articles, the following is not specified as, but probably is, a translation: John van Horne, *En torno a la gramática descriptiva*, *BFUCh* 8.101-26 (1954-5); it presents a rather superficial and partially distorted view of North American descriptivism.

⁴⁹ Bloomfield, *Lg.* 19.168-70 (1943), perhaps praised too much the positive aspects of this work, although he did not fail to allude to its negative aspects.

⁵⁰ Based on sound, well selected, and well elaborated information, this book keeps an intelligent balance between traditional and structural linguistics and, within the latter, between European and North American structuralism, which seems to be very reasonable for an introductory handbook.

⁵¹ Among the bibliography originated in Spain the *Biblioteca Románica Hispánica* (Editorial Gredos, Madrid) has been very important and spread all over the IAm countries (including Brazil, where it spread even more than in some of the Spanish speaking countries).

The first results are partly tangible: such names as Vendryes, de Saussure, Vossler, Spitzer, Bally, Bühler are well known to IAm linguists and are usually included in the lists of readings in those universities where linguistics is taught, alongside with the leading Spanish linguists (and Portuguese linguists in Brazil). These are followed by names such as: Humboldt,⁵² Meillet, Sapir, Trubetzkoy,⁵³ Wartburg,⁵⁴ and some others.

4.1.4. Less directly known are other linguists and so are entire trends of present-day linguistics.

North American descriptive linguistics (Bloomfieldian and post-Bloomfieldian) [NAL] still is the great unknown, in spite of Swadesh's book and of some recent efforts.⁵⁵ Indeed, if one excludes some native language students, it is known only in a few centers (such as Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Concepción) and there rather to isolated persons, and not to all those working in the field of scientific linguistics. There are several reasons for this situation: The external conditions pointed out in 1.6. and 1.7., the limited possibilities to apply the new North American methods to the traditional and specific domains of IAm linguistics (lexicology, lexical dialectology, philology),⁵⁶ the general resistance to antimentalism and to its consequences for linguistics (e.g. the scarce or very recent attention devoted by NAL to semantics and stylistics), the fact that most of the foreign teachers in IAm have been Europeans (possibly representatives of very different views), the fact that many IAm linguists were trained in Europe, and last but not least, the fact that NAL mostly ignores the European tradition⁵⁷ or is opposed to it. IAm linguistics was and still is

⁵² Who, however, is known almost exclusively through the very imperfect and questionable selection included in the booklet of José María Valverde, *Guillermo de Humboldt y la filosofía del lenguaje* (Madrid, 1955).

⁵³ Known above all through the French translation by Cantineau and through Alarcos Llorach's *Fonología española*.

⁵⁴ Known for his *Einführung in Problematik und Methodik der Sprachwissenschaft*, a book which circulated in IAm in its French translation (*Problèmes et méthodes de la linguistique*, Paris, 1946), as well as in the Spanish translation (*Problemas y métodos de la lingüística*, Madrid, 1951). I point out that, when I speak of a more or less ample knowledge, I refer to the works of a general character by the listed authors, not to their investigations in particular fields (I do not refer e.g. to Vendryes as a Celtist or to Trubetzkoy as a Slavist or as a Caucasiologist).

⁵⁵ NAL is ignored in Terracini's *¿Qué es la lingüística?* (where Sapir, *Totality* is incidentally quoted). Thirteen years later NAL is not treated either in Silvio Elia's *Orientações* (in which, however, some North American works are quoted).

⁵⁶ Symptomatic in this connection is the case of Martha Hildebrandt, who, a structuralist in her native language studies, employs, however, traditional philological methods in *La lengua de Bolívar, I. Léxico* (Caracas, 1961).

⁵⁷ Thus, e.g. an identification of Wilhelm von Humboldt with Alexander von Humboldt, as can be found in Harry Hoijer, Ed., *Language in Culture* 93 and 286, is simply inconceivable among the well-informed IAm linguists. Equally — independent of the practical justification it may have in the United States — the well-informed IAm linguist is vexed by the fact that the North American handbooks so often ignore the great European linguists whom he knows and esteems, e.g. that neither Gilliéron nor Bartoli are quoted in connection with dialect geography, as is the case in Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* 484 (where, instead of Bartoli's well-known norm of the lateral areas, only an unpublished formulation by Isidore Dyen is quoted about this same norm) or that the name of de Saussure simply does not appear in this same book.

basically an extension of European linguistics; consequently, to the extent NAL deviated from European linguistics, it also remained distant from IAm linguistics as a whole.⁵⁸

English linguistics and untranslated German linguistics are also little known; Soviet linguistics is almost completely unknown,⁵⁹ and so is linguistics exclusively published in less widespread European languages, due to what is said in 1.7.

Strangely enough and contrary to what one might suppose, even Italian linguistics does not enjoy a wide acquaintance. Undoubtedly, the activity of Terracini in Argentina, the reviews of Bucca (*AIL*), Ronchi March (*AFCI*), Montes (*BICC*) and others, and the translation of Devoto's book quoted in fn. 21 must have contributed to its diffusion; however, judging from the publications, it does not seem that specific ideas of Italian linguistics have penetrated into IAm linguistics, excepting Montevideo (where Bartoli, Pagliaro, Terracini, Pisani, Devoto are frequently used) and, to some extent — particularly as far as historical linguistics is concerned — Rio de Janeiro. Croce has certainly been remarkably influential in many cases, but mostly through Vossler.⁶⁰ Finally, glossematics did not spread far either.⁶¹ Some information in this field was provided by the following: Salvador Bucca, 'Consideraciones sobre la glosemática', *AIL* 5.17-21 (1952), based on a few articles by Hjelmslev and Uldall and on Martinet's review, *BSL* 52.19-42; Martha Hildebrandt, 'La glosemática', *RNC* 104.119-29 (1954), based on lectures held by Hjelmslev and Eli Fischer-Jørgensen in the United States; Silvio Elia, *Orientações* 145-66 (where glossematics is treated under the name of 'structuralism'). The first and so far only attempt at a critical and ample discussion of glossematics published in IAm is found in Coseriu, *Forma y sustancia en los sonidos del lenguaje* (Montevideo, 1954).

4.1.5. The varying familiarity with the latter fields implies perceivable differences as to information levels in the various IAm centers, in spite of what can be considered as more or less uniform. Relatively high levels of information are recorded above all in Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, Buenos Aires and Santiago, still judging from the

⁵⁸ Certainly, this situation is gradually changing with the growing knowledge of the English language and the specialization of a number of young people in the United States, and there already are a few signs of a change in attitude. Thus the subscriptions to *Language*, few until 1959, rapidly increased in recent years (doubling between 1960 and 1963), although chiefly among the native language students and teachers of English. This change of attitude, however, has not yet led to a general trend of interest for NAL. In addition, several North American centers have started a policy of approach to IAm linguistics. This policy, although welcome as such, in my opinion will not be successful, however, if it only is an attempt to transplant NAL and if the own traditions and peculiarities of IAm linguistics are ignored.

⁵⁹ In this respect one can only mention a few reviews by Montes (*BICC*). Some Russian bibliography was used by Schulte-Herbrüggen in his book cited in 4.2.2.

⁶⁰ In one South American bibliography, which can be regarded as well informed, I find: 74 French titles (and 10 translations from the French), 24 English (and 11 translations) [12 North American titles in both categories], 4 German (and 16 translations), 3 Italian titles (and 2 translations), and 124 Spanish titles, 78 of them Hispano-American (45 among these by local authors). Except for the English titles, which normally are less numerous, these proportions seem to be typical for linguistics in Spanish America.

⁶¹ A little better known is the preglossematic Hjelmslev, although mostly indirectly; cf. fn. 15.

publications. An optimum of information, including all those fields referred to as less known in 4.1.4. and such disciplines as history of linguistics and philosophy of language, was achieved in Montevideo between 1952 and 1962.⁶²

4.2.0. In connection with the diffusion of information, I spoke of 'influences' exerted on IAm linguistics. But this calls for an explanation. It is certainly possible in some cases to speak properly of influences, implying the critical incorporation of borrowed elements to new or at least organic and definable conceptions. In this sense one can trace direct influence of Vossler and Husserl in Amado Alonso, of Jakobson and Sapir in Mattoso Câmara, of Martinet and glossematics in Luis Jorge Prieto, of Italian linguistics, a number of language philosophers and several forms of European structuralism in the theoretical works of Montevideo. In most cases, however, one cannot speak of influences in this sense, but rather of a total or partial adherence to a certain doctrine or even of an occasional application or use of views and methods for particular or circumscribed aims. In the following I shall not, however, insist on this distinction, which, strictly speaking, can only be made for each particular linguist and sometimes only for single works. I shall rather refer to those views, methods, and techniques of modern linguistics which were either accepted or applied and used in IAm, without implying in each case a total adherence on the part of the cited linguists. Indeed, the most general feature of IAm linguistics in this connection is its eclecticism: the simultaneous presence of different views and methods in the activity of the same linguists and sometimes in the same work.

4.2.1. Chronologically linguistic idealism in its Vosslerian form was the first of modern linguistic trends to spread in IAm, and it has been widely accepted by IAm linguists as a theory as well as in the first of its applied forms, i.e. stylistics. Amado Alonso basically was an idealist in his general view of language, and some of his idealism was passed on to all of his disciples. Jiménez Borja⁶³ and Escobar in Peru, and Silvio Elia in Brazil also profess to be idealists. Idealistic principles, even if they are eventually not identified as such, can further be found in most IAm linguistics and have also penetrated into the teaching of language and grammar in schools. A peculiar form of idealism, closer to Hegel and Humboldt than to Vossler and stylistics, is found in the theoretical works of Montevideo.⁶⁴

Idealism was followed by dialect geography, which was widely adopted during recent years, particularly in the form of onomasiology, a field in which the geographical method coincides and combines with the Wörter und Sachen method and with ethnographical linguistics. Dialect geography continues to spread and presently seems to constitute the most vital trend of IAm linguistics; see 6.2.1.

As a third trend, although noticeably distant from the two first trends — chronologically separate from the former and quantitatively from the latter — structuralism

⁶² In part, and especially since 1957, the DLM has been active in different ways also as a center for the diffusion of linguistic information to several other IAm centers.

⁶³ Cf. his booklet *El idealismo en la lingüística y su derivación metodológica* (Lima, 1931).

⁶⁴ Concerning the stylistic application of idealism, see 6.2.3.

can be mentioned. European structuralism of the Prague School came to be known in IAm only after 1940 and began to spread with certain continuity, although very slowly, only since 1950. North American structuralism, if one excludes Swadesh's book cited in 4.1.1.3., began to be known even later and did not show signs of diffusion until about 1960, except for a few isolated cases. Silva Neto pointed to Trubetzkoy's *Grundzüge* in 1941 and Terracini reviewed it in the *RFH* in 1942. In 1944 and 1945 Amado Alonso published articles on phonemics: 'La identidad del fonema', *RFH* 6.280-3, and 'Una ley fonológica del español', *HR* 13.91-101; he also successively employed phonemic concepts in his works on historical phonemics. This did not provoke, however, a structuralistic trend in Spanish America, and even in Buenos Aires this line of activity was interrupted. The *BFUCh* published the first review on a structuralistic work along with the first structuralistic article in 1953, but this did not change the orientation of the Institute either, nor caused broader repercussions. The first reviews on structuralistic works were published by the *NRFH* only in 1955 and 1957; these reviews were by the way written by North American linguists, and up to the present day this same journal has not published any structuralistic article by a Hispano-American linguist. The first research center to have a structuralistic orientation and to be continually active in this field in Spanish America was the Departamento de Lingüística of Montevideo, where structuralist works have been published since 1952. A structuralist since the beginning of his activity (1952) Luis Jorge Prieto, however, has published most of his contributions in Europe. The first structuralistic work about American Spanish published by a Hispano-American was Washington Vázquez' *El fonema /s/ en el español del Uruguay* (Montevideo, 1953), followed in the same year by Ismael Silva Fuenzalida's 'Estudio fonológico del español de Chile', *BFUCh* 7.153-76 (1952-53). The first critical discussion of the foundation of Bloomfieldian linguistics in comparison with other forms of structuralism is found in Coseriu, *Forma y sustancia* 13-21 (1954). In Buenos Aires the structuralistic line was again taken up by Guillermo Guitarte, although with a single article: 'El ensordecimiento del zeísmo porteño', *RFE* 39.261-83 (1955, issued 1956). Somewhat different is the situation in Brazil, where since 1946 we observe Mattoso Câmara's activity in the field of structuralism,⁶⁵ whose orientation was transmitted to some of his pupils and partly penetrated as far as school grammars.⁶⁶ All in all, between 1950 and 1960, if one excludes a few native language students, there was no other continuous structuralistic activity in IAm than that displayed by Mattoso Câmara, by Coseriu and some of his disciples and collaborators, and by Luis Jorge Prieto and Silva Fuenzalida (the latter by the way residing in the United States and thus removed from IAm

⁶⁵ In 1946, Mattoso Câmara published reviews of structural works in the *BFR*, an activity which he continued in the following years; in 1949 he began to publish in the same journal his first studies on Portuguese phonemics (the first phonemic contributions in the Luso-Brazilian world), which culminated in his book: *Para o estudo da fonêmica portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro, 1953).

⁶⁶ See Adriano Da Gama Kury, *Pequena gramática para a explicação da nova nomenclatura gramatical* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959).

linguistics). This situation has somewhat changed during the last years, although not much. The following have since then directed their attention towards structuralism: Ana María Barrenechea, Mabel Manacorda de Rosetti, Fernández Guizzetti and Jorge Suárez in Argentina; Rabanales and Heles Contreras in Chile; and a certain interest for structuralism also appeared in Colombia (Patiño Rosselli, Montes). European structuralism (including Jakobson) generally met with broader acceptance and sometimes also penetrated into non-structuralistic works, especially in the form of phonemics. North American methods were applied by: Silva-Fuenzalida, Martha Hildebrandt, Fernández Guizzetti, Jorge Suárez and Heles Contreras. But North American structuralism was by no means assimilated and incorporated into IAm linguistics, so that the contributions of these latter linguists are for the time being rather foreign bodies in it: they are pieces of North American linguistics casually produced in IAm.

4.2.2. Certain trends as well as certain methods and techniques of very recent linguistics have not been recorded so far in IAm or they are found only sporadically. Thus there has not been any adherence to glossematics (although glossematical concepts were used here and there) nor to Guillaumism, which is strange, when one considers its recent diffusion in France. The only representative of Weisgerber's Neo-Humboldtism — and thus also of what is called in the U.S.A. the 'Sapir-Whorf hypothesis' — is Schulte-Herbrüggen, with his book *El lenguaje y la visión del mundo* (Santiago de Chile, 1963).⁶⁷ Heles Contreras is the only one who has been dealing with generative grammar.⁶⁸ No activity is recorded in the field of mathematical linguistics or machine translation.⁶⁹ Swadesh's glottochronology has not been widely received either, and this time one may say fortunately. This technique certainly aroused interest and some naive expectations among native language students and ethnologists and was applied in Mexico, and here and there in Brazil, where it was received with uncritical enthusiasm in one case,⁷⁰ and with sympathy, although not without reservations, in another.⁷¹ But beyond this it was either explicitly opposed as lacking rational foundation,⁷² or considered with welcome scepticism⁷³ or, as in most cases, simply ignored.

⁶⁷ Juan Corominas' 'Rasgos semánticos nacionales', *AIL* 1.1-29 (1941, publ. 1942) is rather connected with Vossler's linguistic characterology.

⁶⁸ Cf. 4.1.1.3. and see Heles Contreras and Sol Saporta, 'The Validation of a Phonological Grammar', *Lingua* 9.1-15 (1960) and Sol Saporta and Heles Contreras, *A Phonological Grammar of Spanish* (Seattle, Wash., 1962).

⁶⁹ In this field I only know a small book translated from the Russian: S. A. Lebedev and D. I. Panov, *La máquina electrónica de calcular y la traductora automática* (Buenos Aires, 1957).

⁷⁰ Aryon Dall'Igna Rodrigues, 'Eine neue Datierungsmethode der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft', *Kratylos* 2.1-13 (1957).

⁷¹ Joaquim Mattoso Câmara, Jr., 'Glotochronologia e estatística léxica', *RBF* 5.209-15 (1959-60). In its moderated and less unreasonable form represented by Sarah Gudschinsky, glottochronology has been applied by Professor Mattoso Câmara to native languages of Brazil, in collaboration with Sarah Gudschinsky herself.

⁷² Eugenio Coseriu, 'Critique de la glottochronologie appliquée aux langues romanes', *Actes du X^e Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes. Strasbourg 1962* 87-96 (Paris, 1965).

⁷³ Olaf Blixen, *La glotochronología. Examen crítico de su validez* (Montevideo, 1964) (= *Cuadernos de Antropología*, 2).

5. TYPICAL ATTITUDES AND NEW EXPERIENCES

5.0. IAm linguistics as a whole can be characterized by two basic attitudes which constitute, so to speak, its typical style: the attitude it assumes concerning linguistic theories and methodology and the attitude it reveals in the delimitation of its objective field of activity.⁷⁴ These attitudes have been implicitly or explicitly opposed, particularly by the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires and the Departamento de Lingüística of Montevideo, which can therefore be considered as representatives of a different style.

5.1.0. As far as the former attitude is concerned, IAm linguistics is characterized by its RECEPTIVITY. In this respect it resembles, to a certain point, Soviet linguistics during the years immediately following Marrism: it is inclined to absorb information and to adopt and apply methods which have already been tried elsewhere, however without the intention to participate in the international dialogue of linguistics, but rather for immediate and local purposes. By the way, the adopted methods are not necessarily selected because of their newness or intrinsic quality. The foremost problem of IAm linguistics is to overcome its backwardness in the general field of scientific linguistics as such. Thus, everything which appears to be scientific is in principle equally good and worth adopting. One often hears or reads the phrase: 'In IAm we have not yet this or that type of study'; a typical aspiration of most IAm linguists is therefore to accomplish such investigations as are lacking in IAm, conforming to European and recently also to United States models.⁷⁵ All this can undoubtedly be justified by the actual objective situation, as was seen above, but at the same time it implies a previous renunciation to carry imported theories and methods further. IAm linguists certainly want to contribute to the qualitative progress of LINGUISTICS IN IAm and to elevate it to the level of European or North American linguistics, but they are usually not inclined to contribute to qualitative progress — theoretically and methodologically — of LINGUISTICS AS A WHOLE. In this respect they rather aim at a quantitative progress, i.e. to extend already existing scientific linguistics to fields either unexplored or barely explored. Thus, IAm linguistics is a linguistics which generally does not strive for originality and which has no theoretical or methodological ambitions.⁷⁶ Its motto is absorbing and applying, rather than creating and renovating. During the last years a methodological advance has been perceivable, but, strictly speaking, through the importation of new methods, rather than through an internal methodological renovation or development of original methods. For the same reason

⁷⁴ Strictly speaking these two attitudes could be reduced to just one, since in both cases we have to do with what is regarded by IAm linguistics as its specific task. It is, however, proper to examine them separately.

⁷⁵ In certain cases this leads to the explicit adaptation of particular models, e.g. of a certain European book.

⁷⁶ Sometimes this lack of interest is presented as a virtue and eventual theoretical and methodological speculations are considered as inopportune or as not corresponding to the proper task of IAm linguistics.

theoretical and critical discussions are relatively rare in IAM: facts and opinions are discussed on the basis of theories already there, but usually not theories as such and their epistemological foundations. In this sense the book reviews published in the journals, which are primarily informative, as was shown above, are symptomatic. Their critical part, if it exists at all, is usually limited to information and facts (possibly to IAM facts ignored by the author being reviewed), and when dealing with a theoretical or methodological work of some importance (particularly with a European or North American work), the review tends to be a mere summary.⁷⁷

5.1.1. A remarkable exception within the general picture of IAM linguistics in this respect too was the activity of the Buenos Aires Instituto de Filología at the time of Amado Alonso. Although this Institute did not renounce the task of informing and spreading information — on the contrary (cf. 4.1.1.1.) —, it strove to elevate the level of linguistics in IAM, setting an example of original and critical work. Thus the *RFH* was a journal with an international tenor, which did not accept European linguistics in a passive manner but rather established the dialogue with it on its own level. And more generally the entire activity of Buenos Aires did not consist in adopting and adapting; it rather was an autonomous activity often showing theoretical and methodological initiative. This is explicitly revealed in a few theoretical works,⁷⁸ but is above all implicitly expressed in the entire work of the Institute, in its attitude and its way of facing problems. Thus, the activity of the Instituto de Filología was a factual and — given the early period in which it developed — an almost ante litteram overcoming of the receptive attitude still prevailing in IAM linguistics today.

5.1.2. Another effort in the same sense — and this time always explicit and more systematical and more deliberately ideological than that of Buenos Aires — was made by the present writer in the DLM, which in fact is characterized especially by its critical, methodological, and theoretical activity. Since this effort was an attempt unique in its kind in IAM, I shall consider it in some detail.

The DLM did not disdain the task of informing and training either but treated it almost exclusively as an ancillary task in view of its own research activity.⁷⁹ As regards to this activity, the DLM strove first of all to embrace as many linguistic fields as possible. Thus it dealt with the following disciplines: linguistic theory (Coseriu), theory of grammar (Coseriu, Luis Juan Piccardo), phonemics (Coseriu, Washington Vásquez), stylistics (Coseriu, Carlos M. Rey), philosophy of language (Coseriu, Arnaldo Gomensoro, Mercedes Rein), historical linguistics (Coseriu, José

⁷⁷ In this connection one can even observe a regress parallel to the rapid methodological advances of linguistics in Europe and in the United States: the linguistic book reviews in the *RFH* were on the whole much more critical than those in the *NRFH*, and the reviews by Oroz in the first volumes of the *BFUCh* were more critical than the reviews published by his collaborators in the last volumes of the same journal. Also in linguistic polemics — frequent especially in Brazil — the information complex is prevailing: one does not discuss what the adversary thinks, but rather what he knows concerning facts as well as conceptions and methods.

⁷⁸ Cf. above all Amado Alonso's preface to his translation of de Saussure's *Cours*.

⁷⁹ With this aim in view a great number of texts by European and American linguists were translated and/ or multiplied for the internal use of the Departamento.

Pedro Rona), dialectology (Coseriu, Rona), besides several particular problems such as translation (Olaf Blixen), interlinguistic contacts (Rona, Juan Meo Zilio), extra-linguistic expressive activities (Meo Zilio), and the teaching of grammar (Piccardo). As to languages the following were included: Romance languages (Coseriu), Spanish of Uruguay and America (Rona, Vásquez, Meo Zilio), Italian (Meo Zilio), native languages (Benigno Ferrario [d. 1959], Blixen, Vásquez), Sanskrit (Nicolás Altuchow).⁸⁰ Secondly the DLM undertook to discuss critically the main trends of modern linguistics and the respective methods, examining their value in each case. The formula characterizing the critical activity of Montevideo is: 'scope and limits', since it tried in each case to determine the validity and at the same time the limitations of the various views and methods under discussion. Thus Coseriu examined the distinction between language and speech and the validity of Saussureanism in this connection (*Sistema norma y habla*, 1952); the relation between form and substance in the sounds of language, the interrelation between phonetics and phonemics and the scope and limits of the various phonemic theories and of glossematics (*Forma y sustancia en los sonidos del lenguaje*, 1954); the range and limits of dialect geography (*La geografía lingüística*, 1956); the foundations of grammar and the scope and limits of grammatical logicism, psychologicism and formalism (*Logicismo y antilogicismo en la gramática*, 1957); the relation between functioning and change in language and between description and history in linguistics, the rational sense of phonetic laws and the foundations and possibilities of diachronical structuralism (*Sincronía, diacronía e historia*, 1958). Coseriu and Vásquez outlined a scheme for the unification of the phonic sciences, fixing their application levels (*Para la unificación de las ciencias fónicas*, 1953). Piccardo critically examined two basic points of grammatical theory: the problem of word categories (*El concepto de 'partes de la oración'*, 1952) and the problem of sentence (*El concepto de 'oración'*, 1954); Rona, partly developing ideas of Coseriu, examined the specific problems of Hispano-American dialectology and established a number of new methodological principles for this discipline (*Aspectos metodológicos de la dialectología hispanoamericana*, 1958). Thirdly the DLM undertook to elaborate a linguistic theory in accordance with the reality of language, in its functioning as well as in its historical development, a task undertaken by Coseriu, who performed it simultaneously with his critical activity.⁸¹ The basic principles of this theory are that the first condition of any linguistic theory is its adequacy to its object and that its basis must necessarily be the 'original knowledge', i.e. the knowledge which man possesses about himself as a speaker. It follows from the latter that the different lin-

⁸⁰ Among the collaborators of the Departamento the following deserve special mention: Luis Juan Piccardo, Washington Vásquez — who, unfortunately, abandoned linguistics — Nicolás Altuchow, Juan [Giovanni] Meo Zilio and José Pedro Rona. I should like to underline particularly the excellent work done by Professor Piccardo, whose *Concepto de oración*, as a synthesis as well as an original contribution, ranks among the best written on this topic, and not only in IAM.

⁸¹ Especially in *Sistema, norma y habla*; *Forma y sustancia*; *Sincronía, diacronía e historia*. The two former were reprinted in Eugenio Coseriu, *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general* (Madrid, 1962).

guistic theories are necessarily based on valid intuitions, although they will eventually become partialized, distorted, and dogmatized in the course of further elaboration. In the construction of his theory, Coseriu therefore starts by noticing the essential exactness of two traditional intuitions: the intuition referring to the dynamic, i.e. creative character of language, affirmed since Humboldt by linguistic idealism, and the intuition concerning the systematic character of language, also already expressed by Humboldt, but developed above all by linguistics of positivistic origin (Saussure, Bloomfield and their followers).⁸² Consequently, he tries to reconcile these two equally correct intuitions and to justify rationally their unity, and thus he comes to a conception in which language is regarded as a creative activity implying at the same time a systematic technique, and in which any essential difference between the functioning and the change of language is denied. This leads him furthermore to distinguish between external and internal structures of historical languages and between several structure levels of the linguistic technique (norm — system — linguistic type), as well as to a theory of contexts and of the use of non-linguistic instruments on behalf of linguistic technique.⁸³ The theory developed by Coseriu as a whole is structuralistic and functionalistic, but not formalistic. It is equally removed from those formalizations which ignore the substance in the two sides of language as also from those which exclude the meaning as uninvestigable or try to reduce it to different phenomena (situation, distribution, etc.).⁸⁴

5.1.3. Besides these two main efforts, which by the way were rather different, the anti-receptive attitude, i.e. the aspiration to contribute originally to linguistic theory and methodology is only to be seen in a few individual cases. Thus in the first place in the isolated but important activity of Luis Jorge Prieto, whose distinction between opposition and contrast and whose contributions designed to establish a functional discipline of the content plane (noology) parallel to what phonemics is for the expression plane (cf. 6.3.4.) are well known and have been favorably received in international circles. In the same connection mention should be made of Félix Martínez Bonati (Chile) concerning linguistic theory of literature (cf. 6.2.3.). Some signs to overcome the purely receptive attitude are also to be found in the activity of Ana María Barrenechea, Rabanales, and some Brazilian linguists (Mattoso Câmara).⁸⁵

5.2.0. As to the latter attitude, IAm — or rather Hispano-American — linguistics

⁸² Basically it is the same assumption which transformational theory — starting from other premises and with different aims in view — would maintain years later.

⁸³ The latter in 'Determinación y entorno. Dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar', *RJb* 7.29-54 (1955-6).

⁸⁴ Particularly the thesis that 'linguistics without meaning is meaningless' — which today is beginning to gain ground even in the North American linguistics of the strictest antimentalist tradition (cf. Roman Jakobson, in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists* 1141) — has always been a basic norm of the work of Montevideo, not only as a mere preferential option, but as a theoretically founded principle; cf. *Forma y sustancia* 17-8; *Logicismo y antilogicismo* 14-6.

⁸⁵ I am excepting, of course, those European or North American linguists who worked more or less in isolation in IAm.

(cf. 5.4.) is characterized by its LOCALISM. This means that it tends to limit itself to the study of local material and to be IAm or even regional IAm (Chilean, Colombian, etc.) also in its research subjects. This limitation too can be partly justified by external circumstances;⁸⁶ it is, however, at the same time a matter of attitude, even of a deliberate attitude.⁸⁷ Indeed, the studies of a local character are often presented in Hispano-American writings as the immediate aim and as the leading or even exclusive task of linguistics in IAm. This would be strange if said elsewhere: Nobody would maintain indeed that the leading or exclusive task of German linguistics should be the study of German and its dialects or that North American linguistics should confine itself to English spoken in the United States. The factual and even deliberate localism is however normal among most Hispano-American linguists, and it is also characteristic of the activity of some of the research institutes.

Localism is often joined by what could be called DIFFERENTIALISM or PECULIARISM, i.e. the tendency to record among local facts only those which are differential or peculiar for the respective region.⁸⁸ This radically distinguishes the native language studies from the studies on the regional varieties of Spanish. Whereas the native language studies aim at a total description of the languages dealt with or at least at a description of partial systems of these languages, the studies on Spanish are mostly limited to recording and discussion of single facts which differ from general Spanish or from standard Spanish of Spain. Such a procedure, if useful for certain ends, nevertheless implies a serious limitation from the point of view of descriptive linguistics, since the recorded facts usually are not examined within that system in which they function, but rather in relation to another more or less ideal system.⁸⁹ In addition, the localistic limitation even affects the validity of the statements about the peculiarity of these facts: as the comparison is normally made only with one level of Spanish spoken

⁸⁶ In fact, certain investigations are difficult to carry out in Spanish America (cf. 1.4). The fields, which offer less material difficulties, are general linguistics, American Spanish and native languages, and of course American Spanish is the field of easiest access.

⁸⁷ One could assert that other types of studies would not arouse interest in local environments. But this would be a vicious circle, since, if there is not any interest, it is because it was not created. Cf. e.g. the different situation found in Brazil concerning historical studies (5.4.).

⁸⁸ Thus at least three of the six items in the program of the Instituto de Filología of Santiago have a localistic character: 'b) the study of the peculiarities of Chilean Spanish (pronunciation, grammatical forms, vocabulary, anthroponymy, toponymy); c) the elaboration of a linguistic atlas for Chile and a complete dictionary of Chileanisms; d) the elaboration of a Chilean linguistic bibliography' (*BFUCH* 4.5, 1944-6); two of these items show at the same time a peculiaristic orientation ('peculiarities', 'Chileanisms'). The history and description of non-American Spanish are not included in this program.

⁸⁹ For this reason most investigations on American Spanish are rather collections of material complementary to the Gramática of the Spanish Academy and particularly to its dictionary, than studies properly speaking. Even the general contributions about the Spanish of this or that country do not present the whole Spanish language of the respective country (or at least systematic examples of it), but in fact single aspects considered as differential. In reality one can say that there are many comparative examinations of American Spanish (as far as it differs from General Spanish and from the Spanish of the Real Academia), but that genuine descriptions of the varieties of American Spanish are lacking.

in Spain, the possible diffusion of these same facts in other levels of the same Spanish or in other regions of America is left out of consideration.⁹⁰

5.2.1. The exceptions, at least the deliberate exceptions, are not very numerous in this case either. Peculiarism seems to be slowly overcome by dialect geography and by a few systematic local studies. The reactions to localism are, however, fewer. European students as Corominas, Terracini, Krüger, Gazdaru, Ferrario and others were not localists, of course: they simply continued in IAm an earlier activity, already directed towards other interests; and due to the very nature of their object, the grammarians usually are not localists either, as they are concerned with Spanish grammar as such rather than with Hispano-American grammar. A clearly non-localistic attitude has been characteristic for the DLM, as is shown by the languages it has dealt with (cf. 5.1.2.) and by other signs.⁹¹ Nor would it have been possible for the old Instituto de Filología Clásica of Buenos Aires to be localistic, given its specialization (cf. 2.1.2. and 3.2.). Non-locally limited interests are also shown by the DFL (cf. 2.1.7.) and by some isolated scholars.

5.2.2. The great exception in this respect was, however, the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires, which since its beginning was a center for Hispanic, not simply Argentine studies. Amado Alonso kept up and stressed this orientation, always working on a general Hispanic level, even when dealing with American and local problems, which permitted him to correct a number of errors committed because of the narrow localistic outlook.⁹² This same attitude to overcome localism by viewing local Hispano-American facts in a broader Hispanic perspective,⁹³ is revealed moreover in all the publications of the Instituto, especially in the *BDH* and the *RFH*. Amado Alonso's attitude was transmitted to his disciples, first of all to Ángel Rosenblat, who even in his studies on local facts, proceeds as a Hispano-Americanist and a Hispanist (not

⁹⁰ The differentialistic attitude seemingly continues the tradition begun by Cuervo, who, in fact, often examined local peculiarities. It must be observed, however, that Cuervo usually regarded the peculiarities from a general Hispanic point of view, and that local facts were for him mainly starting points for true Hispanic monographies. It is indeed possible to investigate peculiarities without adopting a peculiaristic attitude.

⁹¹ In dialectology, Rona, *Aspectos metodológicos* 18-22, stressed the necessity of overcoming localism by studying single phenomena characteristic for the entire Spanish of America; cf. 6.2.1.

⁹² Cf. e.g. his famous article 'Examen de la teoría indigenista de Rodolfo Lenz', *RFH* 1.313-50 (1939).

⁹³ This does not imply, of course, any concession to peculiarism. On the contrary, Amado Alonso expressed his opposition to such an attitude in terms which deserve to be fully quoted: 'I suppose that a word such as *yapa* is as common in Peru as *padre* or *mano*. But the compilers of vocabularies include *yapa* and not *padre* nor *mano*. Why is this so? Because *yapa* is a curiosity in Madrid. In other words, the guiding principle for the inclusion of a word is a fact which is external to the system being studied; it is included because it is unusual in another area. All the pieces that make up the machine and how they work do not matter, only those individual pieces which seem surprising somewhere else.' (*RFH*, 3. 162, 1941). Further on Alonso observes that such a proceeding is legitimate only, if one wishes to establish a supplement to the Dictionary of the Academy, but not, if one has to describe a modality of American Spanish. Many Hispano-American dialectologists consider Amado Alonso as their ideal master, but his teachings in this respect were not faithfully followed indeed.

simply as an Argentineanist or a Venezuelanist). This attitude has partly been kept up also as a proper tradition of the IAA (cf. 2.1.1. and 3.1.5.).

5.3. In the development of IAm linguistics the parallelism between the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires and the DLM, the two centers which had the ambition to open new ways for language studies in IAm, is symptomatic, particularly if one considers that there never existed a direct relationship between them.⁹⁴ Undoubtedly, there are also perceptible differences between these two centers. In Buenos Aires philology was maintained along with linguistics, whereas the DLM has been almost exclusively linguistic; in Buenos Aires much attention was directed towards stylistics, whereas the DLM paid more attention to the methodology of descriptive linguistics, grammatical theory, and philosophy of language; the Instituto de Filología has been a center for Hispanic linguistics, whereas the DLM has been orientated towards general and Romance linguistics. Yet this does not make the similarities between the two centers less conspicuous. Both centers have displayed an intensive critical activity, striving to overcome both the receptive attitude and localism, although the work in Montevideo has above all been directed towards the former aim, in Buenos Aires more towards the latter (the amount of descriptive and historical publications of Montevideo cannot of course be compared to what was achieved in Buenos Aires in these fields). And, above all, the activity displayed in both cases reveals coherent linguistic conceptions. The leading conception in Buenos Aires is implicit in the practice of research and has been manifested only in part or in connection with particular problems;⁹⁵ in Montevideo, on the contrary, there has been an effort to develop properly a linguistic theory, i.e. an explicit and critically founded conception.

5.4. In Brazil, the situation concerning the two basic attitudes just considered is different. Whereas the receptive attitude in methods and conceptions is also prevailing among Brazilian linguists, this is not the case with localism. Certainly, local and differential studies were published in Brazil too, although much less than in Spanish America, but Brazilian scientific linguistics considered as a whole never was localistic. On the contrary, Brazilian linguists have always considered the whole tradition of the Portuguese language as their own and thus have dealt with Medieval Portuguese and Portuguese etymology, have written historical grammars and histories of the language, so that their activity is a section of Portuguese linguistics in general, only separating from the common Luso-Brazilian body in the dialectological studies and in the studies on contemporary Brazilian Portuguese. This is also the reason why Brazilian linguistics presents itself above all as historical linguistics, while Hispano-American linguistics presents itself more as dialectology.

⁹⁴ None of the members of the Montevideo group was a pupil of Amado Alonso. Moreover, the activity of Montevideo began when that of Buenos Aires had ceased.

⁹⁵ It would be interesting to single out in a synthesis all of Amado Alonso's general ideas on language. Such a synthesis in my opinion would comprise much more than what is contained in Diego Catalán Menéndez-Pidal, *La escuela lingüística española y su concepción del lenguaje* (Madrid, 1955).

6. WORK FIELDS: RESULTS SO FAR OBTAINED

6.0. In this section I shall enumerate and examine shortly the topics on which IAm linguists have concentrated. I do not intend to give a complete list of all the works published or to dwell on their analysis. I shall only mention their general features and their amount in the different fields, in order to stress the focuses of interest of IAm linguistics and to outline a balance of its results. I shall only refer to the theoretical and methodological aspects and to the general results of those linguistic disciplines treated in separate chapters of this book. Consequently, the account sketched in this section must be completed by what is contained in these other chapters. For the same reason I shall not deal with the studies on native languages, except for a reference to general works. The enumeration of the topics will not strictly follow a systematic classification of the linguistic disciplines but will be adapted to a compromise between such a classification and the work fields characteristic of IAm linguistics.

6.1.0. In the pre-scientific as well as in the scientific tradition of IAm linguistics the two favorite and almost exclusive work fields are: that of national languages (subdivided into a) lexicology; b) dialectology; c) problem of the standard language; d) school grammar), and that of native languages. During the period we are dealing with a number of works of synthesis have appeared for these fields, which constitute at the same time starting points for further studies.

6.1.1. The first Hispano-American synthesis in lexicology (i.e. the collecting of lexical Americanisms), Augusto Malaret's *Diccionario de americanismos* (Mayagüez, P. R., 1925), belongs to a prior period; but the third revised and enlarged edition of this work was published in the period dealt with here (Buenos Aires, 1946). Another very rich synthesis, however in various aspects inferior to that of Malaret, is Francisco Javier Santamaría's *Diccionario general de americanismos*, 3 vols. (Mexico City, 1942-43).⁹⁶ There is no synthesis comparable to these two in Brazil.

6.1.2. In Hispano-American dialectology a fundamental stage is represented by the *BDH* (cf. 2.1.1.) which, however, is not really a synthesis but rather a corpus of dialectological studies. For Brazil there is nothing comparable to this corpus (also because dialect studies are not very numerous there anyway); on the other hand there is available for Brazil an important historical-descriptive synthesis: Serafim Silva Neto's *Introdução ao estudo da língua portuguesa no Brasil*² (Rio de Janeiro, 1963), the like of which is lacking in Spanish America.⁹⁷

6.1.3. Concerning the problem of the standard language Amado Alonso's *El problema de la lengua en América* (Madrid, 1935) still preserves its entire value. Also

⁹⁶ The first syntheses on semantic aspects are those by the North American Charles E. Kany: *American-Spanish Semantics* and *American-Spanish Euphemisms* (both: Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960).

⁹⁷ The only general synthesis for American Spanish — on an elemental and popular level — is due to a German student: Max Leopold Wagner, *Lingua e dialetti dell'America spagnola* (Florence, 1949). About syntax and pronunciation we have two works due to North American students: Kany, *American-Spanish Syntax* (Chicago, 1945; 2nd ed., 1951), and Canfield's work referred to in fn. 25.

excellent is Ángel Rosenblat's initiation, *La lengua y la cultura de Hispanoamérica. Tendencias actuales* (Berlin, 1933), several times republished (last edition: Caracas, 1962).⁹⁸ In Brazil, a work similar to that of Alonso as far as the basic attitude is concerned is Sílvio Elia's *O problema da língua brasileira*² (Rio de Janeiro, 1961).⁹⁹

6.1.4. In the field of school grammar an important stage was reached by the renovating work of Amado Alonso and Pedro Henríquez Ureña, *Gramática castellana* (2 vols.; Buenos Aires, 1938), several times republished. There is nothing equal in Brazil, although there exist a number of school grammars written by linguists (Nascences, Rocha Lima, Silveira Bueno, Celso Cunha).

6.1.5. For the native languages a general synthesis is Antonio Tovar's *Catálogo de las lenguas de América del Sur* (Buenos Aires, 1961), an outcome of his activity in Tucumán, which contains short characterizations of these languages and their classification, as well as 168 pages of bibliography.¹⁰⁰

6.2.0. In the period with which we are concerned here, three disciplines are prevailing in IAm linguistics: dialectology, lexicology and stylistics (which in the opinion of most IAm linguists belongs to linguistics),¹⁰¹ all three applied to the national languages. For Brazil historical linguistics must be added, which even prevails there over the others (c.f. 6.4.2.).

6.2.1. Dialectology — although in an absolute sense it still is in an initial stage (e.g. concerning the determination of dialect borders) — is presently the most vital section of IAm linguistics from the point of view of the amount of work and of collected materials, and has perceptibly advanced in the recent years, at least in some countries (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Puerto Rico, Uruguay). Here I shall only point out in which sense progress has been made.

The contributions on principles and methods of dialectology are not numerous indeed. Besides the introductions by Silva Neto and Coseriu cited in 4.1.1.2. and the information contained in more general works, one should mention Rona's booklet,

⁹⁸ Cf. by the same author, *El castellano de España y el castellano de América. Unidad y diferenciación* (Caracas, 1962). The work of the Spaniard Américo Castro, *La peculiaridad lingüística rioplatense y su sentido histórico* (Buenos Aires, 1941; new ed. 1960) is impressionistic and very questionable; it has provoked many controversies. The same problem is dealt with in Rodolfo A. Borello, 'Actitud del argentino medio frente a la lengua' and Ángel J. Battistessa, 'El argentino y sus principales interrogantes frente a los problemas de la unidad de la lengua', both in *Presente y futuro de la lengua española. Actas de la Asamblea de Filología del I Congreso de Instituciones hispánicas* 1. 193-8, and 199-208, respectively (Madrid, 1964); and in Rosenblat's important historical study, 'Las generaciones argentinas del siglo XIX ante el problema de la lengua', *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*, 5th period, 5.539-84 (1960), also published separately (Buenos Aires, 1961).

⁹⁹ [Alexandre] Barbosa Lima Sobrinho adopts a point of view rather socio-cultural than linguistic in his *A língua portuguesa e a unidade do Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1958). An interesting discussion of the same subject is found in Antônio Houaiss' *Sugestões para uma política da língua* 74-129 (Rio de Janeiro, 1960).

¹⁰⁰ An initiation including also the North American languages is Dick E. Ibarra Grasso's *Lenguas indígenas americanas* (Buenos Aires, 1958). I have not yet seen Mattoso Câmara, *Introdução às línguas indígenas brasileiras*² (Rio de Janeiro, 1965).

¹⁰¹ Heles Contreras, 'Stylistics and Linguistics', in: Sol Saporta et alii, *Stylistics, Linguistics, and Literary Criticism* 23-31 (New York, 1961), represents a North American point of view.

Aspectos metodológicos pointed out above (cf. 5.1.2. and fn. 91), in which the necessity to distinguish in dialectology the different levels of language and to fix the dialect zones on an IAm scale¹⁰² beyond national borders is maintained. Ambrosio Rabanales' *Introducción al estudio del español de Chile. Determinación del concepto de chilenuismo* (Santiago, 1953) can also be named.¹⁰³ The descriptive studies are in turn numerous, and some of them contain methodological observations too.

Concerning the methods of investigation, a first immediate progress was made through research trips and inquiries, either direct or by correspondence, for which Tomás Navarro's *Cuestionario lingüístico hispanoamericano* (Buenos Aires, 1943; 2nd ed., 1945) was an important instrument. More decisive progress, going far beyond simple inquiries, was represented by the introduction of dialect geography. So far the only linguistic atlas for an American Spanish region is found, preceded by an ample study, in Tomás Navarro's *El español en Puerto Rico. Contribución a la geografía lingüística hispanoamericana* (Río Piedras, P.R., 1948). Since this work, however, dialect geography has advanced in Argentina (Vidal de Battini), in Uruguay (Rona), and above all in Colombia, where the ICC has become the foremost center for dialect geography in Spanish America, and where the preparation of the *ALEC* (cf. 2.1.5.) has fairly advanced.¹⁰⁴ Linguistic atlases are either in preparation or at least being planned for other IAm countries too.¹⁰⁵ About the onomasiological studies related to dialect geography, see 6.2.2. Besides these methodological improvements and partly independent of them, general studies, usually of a differential nature, on Spanish spoken in different Hispano-American countries¹⁰⁶ or smaller regions¹⁰⁷ have continued to be published.

¹⁰² Rona himself applied these principles in «Vulgarización» o adaptación diastrática de neologismos o cultismos', *Revista Nacional* 205.385-409 (also published separately: Montevideo, 1962), and in 'El uso del futuro en el voseo americano', *Fi* 7.121-44 (1961).

¹⁰³ Cf. the discussions by Rona, *BFM* 7 and by Juan M. Lope Blanch, *NRFH* 12.410-2.

¹⁰⁴ See: Tomás Buesa Oliver and Luis Flórez, *El Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC). Cuestionario preliminar* (Bogotá, 1954 [publ. 1956]) and *Cuestionario para el Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia. Segunda edición, en experimentación* (Bogotá, 1960; a third edition without the names of the authors was published in 1961); also several articles by Flórez: 'El español hablado en Colombia y su atlas lingüístico', *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 1.5-77 (with 50 maps); 'El Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC). Nota informativa', *BICC* 16. 77-125 (with 23 maps); 'Principios y métodos del Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC)', *BICC* 19.201-9.

¹⁰⁵ In Uruguay Adolfo Berro García has been preparing a linguistic atlas; in Chile the Instituto de Filología of Santiago has planned a similar work; another atlas has been planned for Costa Rica: cf. Arturo Agüero, 'El español de Costa Rica y su atlas lingüístico', *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 1.135-52. For Brazil a linguistic atlas has been planned by the Casa de Rui Barbosa (Rio de Janeiro).

¹⁰⁶ The outstanding among these studies are the following: Humberto Toscano Mateus, *El español en el Ecuador* (Madrid, 1953); Berta Elena Vidal de Battini, *El español en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1964; a first and shorter version was published in 1954); and, for his manner of posing problems, the pamphlet by Ángel Rosenblat, *Lengua y cultura de Venezuela* (Caracas, no date). *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 1. includes articles on the Spanish of Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, Puerto Rico, by Lope Blanch, Oroz, Toscano Mateus, Luis De Gásperi, Rubén del Rosario; and on Argentinean Spanish, by Luis Alfonso and Vidal de Battini.

¹⁰⁷ Such as the remarkable study by Vidal de Battini, *El habla rural de San Luis*, I (= *BDH* 7; Buenos

Generally, IAm dialectology is mostly phonetical and lexical. Studies on grammatical dialectology were published by: Rosenblat, Lope Blanch, Flórez, José Joaquín Montes, Rona, Alfredo F. Padrón (Cuba) and some others.¹⁰⁸ There have also been some studies on stylistic aspects.¹⁰⁹

The most important general result of Hispano-American dialectology was a revision — or for the time being rather a rejection — of the dialect division traditionally accepted since Pedro Henríquez Ureña's article 'Observaciones sobre el español en América', *RFE* 7.357-90 (1921). Along with several European and North American students a number of IAm linguists have also contributed to this.¹¹⁰

6.2.2. The almost exclusively differentialistic IAm lexicology generally has not introduced new methods and there are hardly any theoretical and methodological contributions in this field.¹¹¹ In fact, it is almost always a particular form of dialectology, different from the latter only because it is limited to words and does not intend to establish dialect borders (but IAm dialectology usually does not establish them either). Therefore the properly new contributions in the field of lexicology are rather the onomasiological studies, partly related to dialect geography and partly to the Wörter und Sachen method. Such studies were published in Spanish America by Oroz, María E. Zappacosta, Oreste Plath and especially by Vidal de Battini, Flórez and Montes; in Brazil, by Heinrich Bunse and Florival Seraine.¹¹² A work which can be placed in between onomasiology, semantics, and stylistics is Lope Blanch's *Vocabulario mexi-*

Aires, 1949). In Brazil an important analogous study on a regional variety of Portuguese is: Antenor Nascentes, *O linguajar carioca* (Rio de Janeiro, 1953). About the phonic aspects of a local variety of American Spanish the most comprehensive contribution is Luis Flórez, *La pronunciación del español en Bogotá* (Bogotá, 1951).

¹⁰⁸ Among these studies the following particularly deserve to be mentioned: Rosenblat, 'Notas de morfología dialectal', *BDH* 2. 103-316 (Buenos Aires, 1946), and Lope Blanch, *Observaciones sobre la sintaxis del español hablado en México* (México, 1953).

¹⁰⁹ Thus: Ambrosio Rabanales, 'Uso tropológico, en el lenguaje chileno, de nombres del reino vegetal', *BFUCH* 5.137-243 and 'Recursos lingüísticos, en el español de Chile, de expresión de la afectividad', *BFUCH* 10.205-302; and Cecilia Enet, '1200 comparaciones populares argentinas', *ALL* 6.325-73. Elements of a study on the styles of language are contained in Ismael Silva-Fuenzalida, 'El uso de los morfemas 'formales' y 'familiares' en el español de Chile', *BFUCH* 8.439-55. Stylistic aspects are also treated by Frida Weber, 'Fórmulas de tratamiento en la lengua de Buenos Aires', *RFE* 3.105-139, and María Beatriz Fontanella, 'Algunas observaciones sobre el diminutivo en Bogotá', *BICC* 17. 556-73.

¹¹⁰ Concerning the present state of the problem, cf. José Pedro Rona, 'El problema de la división del español americano en zonas dialectales', *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 1.215-26, where also new criteria for a dialect classification are proposed.

¹¹¹ An exception is Fernando A. Martínez, 'Contribución a una teoría de la lexicografía española', *BICC* 3.61-116.

¹¹² Flórez even contributed to onomasiology with two books: *Habla y cultura popular en Antioquia. Materiales para un estudio* [the onomasiological part: 175-339] (Bogotá, 1957) and *Léxico de la casa popular urbana en Bolívar, Colombia* (Bogotá, 1962). The contributions by Zappacosta and Plath appeared in *ALL*; those by Vidal de Battini mostly in *Fi*; those by Montes in *BICC* (in which also other onomasiological studies were published). The contributions by Krüger in the same field belong rather to Romance linguistics.

cano relativo a la muerte (Mexico City, 1963). A methodologically interesting contribution, whose subject is a native language, is Anselmo Raguileo's 'Los nombres de parentesco en la familia mapuche', *BFUCh* 7.343-59.¹¹³

6.2.3. Many IAm linguists have dealt with stylistics, either with 'stylistics of the langue' (Bally stylistics) or with 'stylistics of speech', i.e. literary texts stylistics (Vossler-Spitzer stylistics). I shall here mention the main theoretical works in this field and some of the most important applications.

The leading promoter of stylistics in Hispano-America was Amado Alonso, who devoted a great part of his activity to it. Among his theoretical and methodological contributions the following must be remembered: 'Carta a Alfonso Reyes sobre la estilística', published in the newspaper *La Nación* of Buenos Aires (February, 9, 1941) and 'The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts', *MLN* 57.489-96 (1942).¹¹⁴ In Brazil Mattoso Câmara drew a theoretical sketch of stylistics together with a short stylistic characterization of the Portuguese language, *Contribuição para uma estilística da língua portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro, 1952; 2nd edition, 1953: *Contribuição à estilística portuguesa*). Coseriu wrote about several theoretical problems of stylistics; thus, about the position of stylistics in relation with other linguistic disciplines, in *Sistema, norma y habla*, particularly 63, and 'Determinación y entorno' (cf. 5.2.1.); about the different possible stylistics, in *Reseñas* 7-8 (Montevideo, 1953); about the conditions and modalities of metaphorical creation, in *La creación metafórica en el lenguaje* (Montevideo, 1956). An important and philosophically well-founded theoretical work on the relation between language and literature and on the work of verbal art is Félix Martínez Bonati's *La estructura de la obra literaria* (Santiago de Chile, 1960). An excellent introduction to stylistics (even the best initiation to prestructural stylistics of all I know) is Roberto Fernández Retamar's *Idea de la estilística* (Universidad Central de Las Villas [Santa Clara, Cuba], 1958).¹¹⁵ A criticism of Spitzer's stylistics was tried by Ângela Vaz Leão in *Sobre a estilística de Spitzer* (Belo Horizonte, 1960); a criticism of Devoto's stylistics is found in Coseriu's *Reseñas* cited above.

As to the application of stylistics, Amado Alonso's most important achievement is *Poesía y estilo de Pablo Neruda* (Buenos Aires, 1940; 2nd ed., 1951).¹¹⁶ Mattoso

¹¹³ The work of Rosenblat referred to in fn. 29 contains genuine historico-critical monographs on lexical problems, although written in a popular style. The lexicographical contributions on slang, which remain to be mentioned in this domain, are usually due to non-specialists. An important exception is Antenor Nascentes, *A gíria brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1953). To Nascentes we also owe a *Dicionário de sinónimos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957).

¹¹⁴ Both reprinted in: Amado Alonso, *Materia y forma en poesía* 95-106 and 107-32, respectively (Madrid, 1955).

¹¹⁵ Cf. also the more succinct and modest initiation by Luis Jaime Cisneros, *El estilo y sus límites* (Lima, 1958), and the informative pamphlet referred to in fn. 48.

¹¹⁶ Less accomplished (and less stylistic) is his work *Ensayo sobre la novela histórica. El modernismo en La Gloria de Don Ramiro* (Buenos Aires, 1942). Cf. also the other essays included in *Materia y forma en poesía*. Alonso's contributions to stylistics of the Spanish language belong to a period prior to that here considered.

Câmara applied his ideas on stylistics in some of his essays collected in *Ensaio Machadianos. Língua e estilo* (Rio de Janeiro, 1962).¹¹⁷

6.3.0. The IAm contributions to general linguistics, beyond those mentioned in 6.2., are not very numerous, if the purely informative contributions are left aside. Besides, almost all of them are concerned with particular disciplines or problems.

6.3.1. The main contributions to linguistic theory and the general foundations of linguistics are those by Coseriu cited and commented on in 5.1.2. (cf. also 7.2.). To these the book by Schulte-Herbrüggen cited in 4.2.3. can be added. On a seemingly particular problem, which, however, is connected with the basic function of language, Amado Alonso and Raimundo Lida, 'El concepto lingüístico de impresionismo', *El impresionismo en el lenguaje* (cf. 4.1.1.) 121-251, and Amado Alonso, 'Por qué el lenguaje en sí mismo no puede ser impresionista', *RFH* 2.379-86, should be remembered. A genuine theory of standard language is displayed in Alonso's *El problema de la lengua en América*. General ideas on language are found in several descriptive and historical studies by this same author; cf., e.g. his interpretation of the notion of 'interior form' in 'Sobre métodos: Construcciones con verbos de movimiento en español', *RFH* 1.105-38, and in 'Preferencias mentales en el habla del gaucho', *El problema de la lengua en América* 143-79.¹¹⁸ The complementarity between different views of language was affirmed by Coseriu, *La creación metafórica* 5-15.

6.3.2. The following have contributed to the theory of phonemics: Amado Alonso, 'La identidad del fonema' (containing a psychologicistic notion of the phoneme, much closer to Baudouin de Courtenay and Sapir than to the latter views of Trubetzkoy); Coseriu, *Sistema, norma y habla* (on the distinction between system and norm in the phonic plane of language); Coseriu and Vásquez, *Para la unificación de las ciencias fónicas* (cf. 5.1.2.); Coseriu, *Forma y sustancia* (on the problems of identification and delimitation of phonemes); Coseriu, *Sincronía, diacronía e historia* (on the scope and limits of diachronical phonemics); Luis Jorge Prieto, 'Remarques sur la nature des oppositions distinctives basées sur l'accentuation monotonique libre', *Revista de la Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades* 4, numbers 1-3 (Córdoba, Argentina, 1952), and 'Traits oppositionnels et traits contrastifs', *Word* 10.43-59 (on the distinction between opposition and contrast, also applicable outside of phonemics). Cf., furthermore, the work by Contreras and Saporta referred to in fn. 68 (a reinterpretation of phonic facts, particularly of facts of distribution, in transformational terms). A summary of

¹¹⁷ Among other studies, at least partially relating to stylistics, the following can be remembered: Enrique Anderson Imbert, *El arte de la prosa en Juan Montalvo* (Mexico, 1948); Ángel Rosenblat, 'La lengua de Cervantes', in the collective volume *Cervantes* 47-129 (Caracas, 1949); Ana María Barrenechea, 'Borges y el lenguaje', *RFH* 7.551-69, and *La expresión de la irrealidad en la obra de Jorge Luis Borges* (Mexico, 1957); Ulrich Leo, *Interpretaciones hispanoamericanas. Ensayos de teoría y práctica estilísticas. 1939-1958* (Santiago de Cuba, 1960); on a French text: Carlos M. Rey, *Una fábula de La Fontaine. Análisis métrico-estilístico* (Montevideo, 1956). Cf. moreover, the contributions on stylistics of the langue referred to in fn. 109.

¹¹⁸ Reprinted — the latter with many modifications and under the title of 'Americanismo en la forma interior del lenguaje' — in Amado Alonso, *Estudios lingüísticos. Temas españoles* 230-87 (Madrid, 1951) and *Estudios lingüísticos. Temas hispanoamericanos* 73-101 (Madrid, 1953), respectively.

the phonemic theory is found in Mattoso Câmara's *Para o estudo da fonêmica portuguesa* 7-52.¹¹⁹

6.3.3. There are many more contributions to the theory of grammar and to the discussion of grammatical notions. The main studies on the foundations of grammar are: Coseriu, *Logicismo y antilogicismo* and 'Determinación y entorno';¹²⁰ on basic grammatical notions, the two studies by Piccardo cited in 5.1.2.¹²¹ Important and modern are further Ana María Barrenechea's 'El pronombre y su inclusión en un sistema de categorías semánticas', *Fi* 8.241-72 and 'Las clases de palabras en español, como clases funcionales', *RomPh* 17.301-9. Concerning the distinction between coordination and subordination Eduardo J. Prieto's small pamphlet *Parataxis e hipotaxis* (Rosario, 1959) can be remembered; on the neutralization in grammar: Mattoso Câmara, 'Sur la neutralisation morphologique', *TIL* 2.76-77. About several other grammatical notions and problems: Coseriu, 'El plural en los nombres propios', *RBF* 1.1-15; 'Sobre el futuro romance', *RBF* 3.1-18; and *Sobre las llamadas 'construcciones con verbos de movimiento': un problema hispánico* (Montevideo, 1962). Among other contributions the following can be mentioned: Luis Cifuentes García, 'Acerca del aspecto', *BFUCh* 8.57-63; Gastón Carrillo Herrera, 'Las oraciones subordinadas', *BFUCh* 15.165-21; José Joaquín Montes, 'Sobre la división de la gramática en morfología y sintaxis', *BICC* 18.679-85. An attempt to adapt Tesnière's structural syntax to some aspects of Spanish is Jorge Páramo Pomareda, 'Elementos de sintaxis estructural', *BICC* 16.185-207. A number of grammatical distinctions drawn with modern criteria, although not further developed, are found in the program of Rabanales recorded in 6.3.5. Grammatical notions are moreover exposed and discussed in Mattoso Câmara's *Introdução* and also in Luis Jaime Cisneros, *Lengua y estilo*, I (Lima, 1959).¹²²

¹¹⁹ Among the applications — besides Mattoso Câmara's *Fonêmica*, the studies by Alonso, Vázquez, Silva-Fuenzalida and Guitarte pointed out in 4.2.2., and the pamphlet by Saporta and Contreras referred to in fn. 68 — there must be mentioned: Silva-Fuenzalida, 'La entonación en el español y su morfología', *BFUCh* 9.177-87, and Antônio Houaiss, *Tentativa de descrição do sistema vocálico do português culto na área dita carioca* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959). An interesting study, which raises new problems with regard to the phonemic distribution in Spanish is Ambrosio Rabanales, 'Las siglas: un problema de fonología española', *BFUCh* 15.327-42. In general, studies of experimental phonetics are lacking in IAM, although there are a number of laboratories for phonetics. The only general study which can be mentioned in this field is Mercedes V. Álvarez Puebla de Chaves, *Problemas de fonética experimental* (La Plata, 1948). Among the applications: Alonso Zamora Vicente, 'Rehileamiento porteño', *Fi* 1.5-22, and the study by the Portuguese Armando de Lacerda and the Brazilian Nelson Rossi, 'Particularidades fonéticas do comportamento elocucional do falar do Rio de Janeiro', *Revista do Laboratório de Fonética Experimental* 4.5-102 (Coimbra, 1958).

¹²⁰ These studies were also reprinted in *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general*, together with those pointed out in fn. 81 and with 'El plural en los nombres propios'.

¹²¹ Both reprinted, together with others, in Luis Juan Piccardo, *Estudios gramaticales* (Montevideo, 1962).

¹²² The following published important grammatical studies on the national languages — in Spanish America: Rosenblat, Rosales, Lidia Contreras, Lope Blanch, Cisneros, Mabel Manacorda de Rosetti; in Brazil: Nascentes, Mattoso Câmara, Maurer Jr., Carlos Henrique da Rocha Lima, Vaz Leão, Evanildo Bechara and others. In Brazil most of these grammatical studies are descriptive and historical at the same time; in Spanish America they are mainly descriptive and interpretative.

6.3.4. Semantics is represented in IAM by just a few contributions and generally continues to be understood as a discipline which studies the changes in the meaning of words. The best known work in this respect, Félix Restrepo's *Diseño de semántica general. El alma de las palabras*, which reached its 5th edition (Bogotá, 1958), does not belong to the period considered here. Francisco da Silveira Bueno, *Tratado de semântica geral aplicada à língua portuguesa do Brasil* (São Paulo, 1947; third edition, 1960: *Tratado de semântica brasileira*), is an adaptation and application to Portuguese of the classifications proposed by Albert Carnoy, *La science du mot. Traité de sémantique* (Louvain, 1927).¹²³ More recent trends in semantics have not yet entered IAM investigation, if one excepts the neo-Humboldtian trend — present in some of Amado Alonso's contributions (particularly in 'Preferencias mentales en el habla del gaucho', cited in 6.3.1.) and in the already mentioned book by Schulte-Herbrüggen — and the stimulus coming from anthropology, to which Raguileo's article cited in 6.2.2. is indebted. From IAM in turn came an important novelty in semantics, which at the same time is one of the most important IAM contributions to linguistic theory. That is the functional analysis of content — an analysis which, of course, embraces both grammar and the lexical level — undertaken by Luis Jorge Prieto in a number of contributions¹²⁴ published since 1954 and which culminated in his *Principes de noologie* (The Hague, 1964). In these *Principes* an attempt is made to establish minimal unities of simultaneous realization for content (noemes), analogous to the phonemes on the expression plane of language.¹²⁵

6.3.5. A number of IAM contributions of theoretical or methodological interest concern particular problems of general linguistics or applied linguistics.

Thus linguistic taboo is treated in Coseriu, *La creación metafórica* 23-7, and Mansur Guérios, *Tabus lingüísticos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1956). Women's language is dealt with in: Hernando Balmori, 'Habla mujeril', *Fi* 8.123-38. About the extra-linguistic expressive activities, Rabanales, 'La somatolalia', *BFUCh* 8.355-78; and Meo Zilio, 'Consideraciones generales sobre el lenguaje de los gestos', *BFUCh* 12.225-48, and 'El lenguaje de los gestos en el Uruguay', *BFUCh* 13.75-163,¹²⁶ should be mentioned, the latter being the first contribution in which a large number of gestures are interpreted in terms of functional oppositions and distinctive features.

¹²³ Roberto Vilches Acuña, *Semántica española* (Buenos Aires, 1954; 2nd ed., 1959) and *Elementos de semántica* (Santiago de Chile, 1959) have a popular character.

¹²⁴ 'Signe articulé et signe proportionnel', *BSL* 50.134-43; 'Contributions à l'étude fonctionnelle du contenu', *TIL* 1.23-41; 'Figuras de la expresión y figuras del contenido', *Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet. Estructuralismo e historia* 1.243-9 (La Laguna, 1957); 'D'une asymétrie entre le plan de l'expression et le plan du contenu de la langue', *BSL* 53.86-95; 'Rapport paradigmatique et rapport syntagmatique sur le plan du contenu', *Omagiu lui Iorgu Iordan* 705-13 (Bucarest, 1958).

¹²⁵ The contributions to structural semantics by Coseriu initiated in Montevideo did not begin to be published until his transfer to Europe. The first of them is 'Pour une sémantique diachronique structurale', *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 2.1.139-86 (Strasbourg, 1964).

¹²⁶ Both were also published in one volume *El lenguaje de los gestos en el Río de La Plata* (Montevideo, 1961). Cf., moreover, by the same author 'Los sonidos avulsivos en el Río de La Plata' and 'Sonidos extralingüísticos en el habla rioplatense', *AION-L* 2.113-20 and 221-33.

The most important theoretical contribution to the problem of translation published in IAM is Benvenuto Terracini's 'El problema de la traducción' in *Conflictos de lenguas y de cultura* 43-103 (Buenos Aires, 1951). Furthermore, there should be remembered: Alfonso Reyes, 'De la traducción' in *La experiencia literaria* 116-28 (Buenos Aires, 1952); Paulo Rónai, *Escola de tradutores*² (Rio de Janeiro, 1956); Olaf Blixen, *La traducción literaria y sus problemas* (Montevideo, 1954).¹²⁷ On linguistic terminology, there is nothing to be mentioned in Spanish America; in Brazil in turn, several works appeared in this field: Nascentes, *Léxico de nomenclatura gramatical brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1946); Mattoso Câmara, *Dicionário de fatos gramaticais* (Rio de Janeiro, 1956; 2nd ed., São Paulo, 1964: *Dicionário de filologia e gramática referente à língua portuguesa*); Sílvia Elia et alii, *Dicionário gramatical*³ (Pôrto Alegre 1962; 1st ed., 1953). The most sensible essay on the teaching of grammar in secondary schools is Piccardo's *Gramática y enseñanza* (Montevideo, 1956),¹²⁸ partly based on ideas of Pagliaro and Fries.¹²⁹ A detailed program for the teaching of general and Spanish grammar in university courses was published by Rabanales: *Gramática española. Programas. Cuestionarios. Bibliografías*. (Santiago, 1959). A remarkable work concerned with the teaching of modern foreign languages was published in Brazil: R. Valmir C. Chagas, *Didática especial de línguas modernas* (São Paulo, 1957). Two important works on the teaching of Latin are also due to Brazilian linguists: Ernesto Faria, *O latim e a cultura contemporânea* (Rio de Janeiro, 1941), in the second considerably enlarged edition: *Introdução à didática do latim* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959); and Sílvia Elia, *O ensino do latim. Doutrina e métodos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957).

6.3.6. Problems of philosophy of language are treated in several of Coseriu's works, particularly in *Forma y sustancia*, in *Logicismo y antilogicismo*, in 'Determinación y entorno' and in *Sincronía, diacronía e historia*, and also in Martínez Bonati's book cited in 6.2.3. Philosophical problems are moreover discussed in the contributions on impressionism by Alonso and Lida pointed out in 6.3.1. More than by original works, philosophy of language is however represented in IAM by critical and informative contributions.¹³⁰ In this connection the activity of Raimundo Lida should be named first of all, although it belongs almost entirely to a period prior to that considered here.¹³¹ In the series *Cuadernos de filosofía del lenguaje* of the Departamento

¹²⁷ I do not know Ernesto Zierer, *Teoría y práctica de la traducción. Ensayo de lingüística aplicada* [= *Lenguaje y ciencias*, 10] (Trujillo, Peru, 1963).

¹²⁸ Reprinted in *Estudios gramaticales*, 87-109.

¹²⁹ Further, one can remember the important notice by Amado Alonso, 'Los nuevos programas de lengua y literatura', *RFH* 2. 55-57, and María Delia Paladini, *Fundamentos para la enseñanza de la lengua en la escuela secundaria* (Tucumán, 1947). I only heard indirectly about a booklet by Manacorda de Rosetti on structural grammar in high school teaching, published in Buenos Aires.

¹³⁰ I deliberately leave out some strange enterprises which have little to do with philosophy and nothing at all with linguistics.

¹³¹ His main contributions in this field are: 'Croce y Gentile, filósofos del lenguaje', *Cursos y Conferencias* 7.572-87 (Buenos Aires, 1935), and 'Bergson, filósofo del lenguaje', *Nosotros* 80.5-49 (Buenos Aires, 1933), the latter reprinted in his book *Letras hispánicas* 45-99 (Mexico, 1958). Later, too, Lida continued to deal occasionally with philosophy of language; cf. his indications in *Letras hispánicas* 10.

de Lingüística of Montevideo the following were published: Arnaldo Gomensoro, *John Dewey y la filosofía del lenguaje* (1956), and Mercedes Rein, *Ernst Cassirer* (1959).¹³² In Chile, Martínez Bonati published an important study: *La concepción del lenguaje en la filosofía de Husserl* (Santiago, 1960). Moreover there can be mentioned: Víctor Li Carrillo, *Platón, Hermógenes y el lenguaje* (Lima, 1959), and about Spanish speaking thinkers: Juan David García Bacca, 'Filosofía de la gramática y gramática universal según Andrés Bello', *RNC* 9:65.7-23 (1947), Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, *Unamuno, teórico del lenguaje* (Mexico, 1954); Ángel Rosenblat, *Ortega y Gasset: Lengua y estilo* (Caracas, 1958).

6.3.7. Comparatively many contributions are found in IAM, and particularly in Spanish America, on the history of linguistics. They refer to European linguistics (and sometimes to North American) as well as, and above all, to IAM linguistics.

To the history of linguistics belong Terracini's two books cited in footnote 31.¹³³ The former is a general outline, in which, according to the conviction of the author, recent linguistics is practically identified with Croce-Vossler idealism (to which only Saussureanism is opposed). The latter contains several keen essays interpreting Bopp, Ascoli, Meyer-Lübke and Meillet, Gilliéron, Schuchardt, Claudio Giacomino.¹³⁴ Very important are the studies by Gazdaru on various aspects of linguistics in the nineteenth century based on hitherto unpublished documents (from the Ascoli archive in Rome), which are issued together with these studies. The most important among them are the following: 'La controversia sobre las leyes fonéticas en el epistolario de los principales lingüistas del siglo XIX', *AFCl* 4.211-328; 'A propósito de Stammbaumtheorie y Wellentheorie', *AFCl* 5.99-116; 'Cartas inéditas de Adolfo Mussafia. La 'ley sintáctica Tobler-Mussafia' y otros problemas filológicos', *Fi* 4.8-48.¹³⁵

Concerning the history of Spanish linguistics some studies on Nebrija should be particularly mentioned.¹³⁶ As for IAM linguistics, the main studies are concerned with

¹³² In 1959 further pamphlets (on Aristotle, St. Augustine, Locke, Hegel, Humboldt and Richard Högnigswald) were in preparation.

¹³³ Both were reprinted in one volume in Italian *Guida allo studio della linguistica storica. I. Profilo storico-critico* (Rome, 1949).

¹³⁴ Two of these studies, those on Bopp and Schuchardt, were published for the first time in this book; the others had been published in European journals. Furthermore, Terracini published in Argentina: 'W.D. Whitney y la lingüística general', *RFH* 5.105-47. This study was also included in the Italian edition referred to in the preceding footnote.

¹³⁵ Other studies belonging to this series are: 'Cuatro cartas de Friedrich Diez a G. I. Ascoli', *Fi* 3.105-10; 'Epistolario inédito de 1878 sobre una nueva edición de la Gramática de Friedrich Diez', *Homenaje a Fritz Krüger* 2.659-83 (Mendoza, 1954); 'Un conflicto 'dialectológico' del siglo pasado. Contribución a la historia de la filología retorrománica', *Orbis* 11.61-74. Gazdaru further published 'Influjo de Benedetto Croce sobre la lingüística contemporánea' in *Benedetto Croce. Commemoración. Ensayos. Testimonios. Bibliografía* 118-45 (Buenos Aires, 1954), as well as several brief articles on the history of Rumanian linguistics, in his stenciled journal *Cuget romînesc* (Buenos Aires, 1951 ff.).

¹³⁶ Pedro U. González de la Calle, *Elio Antonio de Nebrija (Aelius Antonius Nebrissensis). Notas para un bosquejo histórico* (Bogotá, 1945); Piccardo, 'Dos momentos en la historia de la gramática española. Nebrija y Bello', *Revista de la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias* 4.87-112 (Montevideo, 1949), reprinted in his *Estudios gramaticales* 7-34. Of great importance is Amado Alonso's interpretative study 'Examen de las noticias de Nebrija sobre antigua pronunciación española', *NRFH* 3.1-82.

the four important linguists who constitute its older tradition: Bello, Cuervo, Hanssen and Lenz. The essential studies on Bello are: Amado Alonso, 'Introducción a los estudios gramaticales de Andrés Bello', and Ángel Rosenblat, 'Las ideas ortográficas de Bello', both in *Obras completas de Andrés Bello*, respectively, 4. *Gramática IX-LXXXVI* and 5. *Estudios gramaticales IX-CXXXVIII*.¹³⁷ The most ample contribution concerning Cuervo is: Fernando Antonio Martínez, 'Estudio preliminar', in Rufino José Cuervo, *Obras* 1. XI-CXLVI (Bogotá, 1954).¹³⁸ About Lenz there must be mentioned, in the first place, the study of the Chilean Alfonso M. Escudero, 'Rodolfo Lenz', *BICC* 18.445-84, which takes into account almost all earlier contributions.¹³⁹ On Hanssen: Eladio García, 'La obra científica de Federico Hanssen', and Julio Saavedra Molina, 'Bibliografía de Don Federico Hanssen' in Hanssen, *Estudios. Métrica-Gramática-Historia literaria* 1.9-26 and 3.245-55, respectively (Santiago, 1958). Much more than the title promises is offered in the important historico-critical study by Guillermo Guitarte, 'Cuervo, Henríquez Ureña y la polémica sobre el andalucismo de América', *VR* 17.363-416, reproduced and amplified in *BICC* 15.3-64.¹⁴⁰

6.4.0. With respect to historical linguistics concerning the national languages I shall proceed in the same manner as I did in the case of dialectology and lexicology, confining myself to aspects of a general or theoretical character and to those which seem to be symptomatic for a comparison between Spanish America and Brazil.

¹³⁷ The second of these studies is a genuine history of the ideas on Spanish orthography. Cf. also the study by Piccardo referred to in the preceding footnote; that of García Bacca cited in 6.3.6.; Ángel Rosenblat, *El pensamiento gramatical de Bello* (Caracas, 1961); and the study by the Spaniard Samuel Gili Gaya, 'Introducción a los estudios ortológicos y métricos de Bello', in *Obras completas de Andrés Bello*. 6. *Estudios filológicos* 1. XI-CIII (Caracas, 1954). Furthermore (among others): Claudio Rosales, 'Cien años de señorío de la gramática de Andrés Bello', *BFUCH* 4.247-59; Juan B. Selva, *Trascendencia de la Gramática de Bello y el estado actual de los estudios gramaticales* (Buenos Aires, 1950); Baltasar Isaza Calderón, *La doctrina gramatical de Bello* (Panama, 1960). In view of such abundant bibliography, it must be said that few linguists in the world have been so minutely studied and interpreted as Bello.

¹³⁸ Together with a bibliography of Cuervo by Rafael Torres Quintero also in F. A. Martínez and R. Torres Quintero, *Rufino José Cuervo. Estudio y bibliografía* (Bogotá, 1954). In addition: González de la Calle, 'Formación general lingüística del Maestro Rufino José Cuervo. Apuntes para un ensayo', *BICC* 1.212-41.

¹³⁹ Particularly important among these are two critical studies by Amado Alonso: 'Rodolfo Lenz y la dialectología hispanoamericana', *BDH* 6.269-78, and that referred to in fn. 92.

¹⁴⁰ Other historical contributions are: Piccardo, *Acotaciones al Diálogo de la lengua* [Valdés] (Montevideo, 1941); Silvio Elia, *O romantismo em face da filologia* (Pôrto Alegre, 1956), reprinted under the title of 'Origens românticas da filologia moderna' in the already mentioned *Ensaio de filologia* 11-37; Moldenhauer, 'Notas sobre el origen y la propagación de la palabra "linguistique" (>lingüística) y términos equivalentes', *AIL* 6.430-44; Lope Blanch, 'La Gramática española de Jerónimo de Texeda', *NRFH* 13.1-16; Emmanuel Pereira Filho, 'As "Regras de Orthographia" de Pero de Magalhães Gândavo', *RBF* 6.3-31; and the two editions: Mateo Alemán, *Ortografía castellana*, published by José Rojas Garcidueñas, with a preliminary study (pp. XIII-XXXIX) by Tomás Navarro, 'La Ortografía de Mateo Alemán' (Mexico, 1950), and Olmar Guterres da Silveira, *A Grammatica de Fernão d'Oliveira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1954). Contributions to the history of linguistics are also found in Silva Neto, *Ensaio de filologia portuguesa* (São Paulo, 1956), and *Lingua, cultura e civilização* (Rio de Janeiro, 1960). Cf. also the informative works pointed out in 4.1.1.2. and the studies referred to in 0.6.

6.4.1. The only theoretical study of a general nature on linguistic change and the foundations of linguistic history published in IAm is Coseriu, *Sincronía, diacronía e historia*. With single theoretical aspects of linguistic history are concerned: Amado Alonso's 'Substratum y superstratum', *RFH* 3.209-18; and Terracini's 'Cómo muere una lengua' and 'Lengua y cultura' in *Conflictos de lenguas y de cultura* 11-42 and 104-96, respectively. General problems relating to linguistic change are moreover treated in works of Alonso and Silva Neto, and in Mattoso Câmara's *Introdução*.

6.4.2. Historical linguistics as such is scarcely represented in Spanish America. The only continuous activity concerning the general history of the Spanish language is that of Amado Alonso (articles published in the *RFH*, *NRFH*, *BICC* and elsewhere). Coseriu and Guitarte have also dealt with problems of the history of Spanish. But since Hanssen¹⁴¹ no historical grammar or history of the language has so far been written in Spanish America, and studies on ancient Spanish are also lacking.¹⁴² The situation in Brazil is very different. There, besides a number of historical studies, a good historical grammar¹⁴³ and two histories of the Portuguese language appeared, which are the most extensive so far published in the Portuguese-Brazilian world;¹⁴⁴ several students (Augusto Magne, Silva Neto, Celso Cunha, Bem Veiga) published important critical editions of ancient Portuguese texts.

Somewhat more encouraging is the picture of the history of American Spanish, a field in which however Ángel Rosenblat has been the only great specialist since the death of Henríquez Ureña and Alonso.¹⁴⁵ During the last years two essentially important events were recorded in this field. On the one hand Rosenblat's fundamental work *La población indígena y el mestizaje en América* (2 volumes, Buenos Aires, 1954),¹⁴⁶ about the history of the hispanization of America and the external relations between Spanish and the native languages, was published. On the other hand, concerning the problem of the historical basis of American Spanish, the anti-Andalusian

¹⁴¹ His *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana* was published in Halle in 1913 and was reprinted in Buenos Aires in 1945.

¹⁴² Coseriu, *La Hispania romana y el latín hispánico. Breve introducción al estudio histórico del español* (Montevideo, 1953) is a concise summary of problems and facts designed for beginners. As far as ancient text editions are concerned, I can only name Rodolfo A. Borello, *Jaryas andalusies* (Bahía Blanca, Argentina, 1959).

¹⁴³ Ismael de Lima Coutinho, *Pontos de gramática histórica*⁴ (Rio de Janeiro, 1958 [since then a 5th edition was published, which I have not seen]). This work is the best, by the way, but it is not the only one of its kind in Brazil.

¹⁴⁴ Silveira Bueno, *A formação histórica da língua portuguesa*² (Rio de Janeiro, 1958); Silva Neto, *História da língua portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro, 1952-7).

¹⁴⁵ Along with him one can only mention Guillermo Guitarte, the best historian among the younger linguists (many of whom simply ignore historical linguistics).

¹⁴⁶ Cf., by the same author 'La hispanización de América. El castellano y las lenguas indígenas desde 1492', *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 2.189-216 (Madrid, 1964). Among other contributions to this topic there are: Marcos A. Morínigo, 'Difusión del español en el Noroeste argentino', in his *Programa de filología hispánica* 71-100 (Buenos Aires, 1959), and the book by Ardissonne referred to in fn. 21. A general history of the Romanization of America, however not comparable to Rosenblat's work, was published in Brazil: Joaquim Ribeiro, *História da romanização da América* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959).

thesis, which had been universally admitted since the contributions of Henríquez Ureña¹⁴⁷ on this problem and the acceptance of his results by Amado Alonso, was thrown into the discussion and basically rejected. Guillermo Guitarte, with his article cited in 6.3.7., decisively contributed to this revision, along with some Spanish and North American students.¹⁴⁸

6.4.3. Scarcely cultivated in Spanish America are also certain disciplines of a historical character as etymology and historical toponymy, although there are abundant extemporaneous etymologists among the pre-scientific and non-scientific linguists, and although there exist studies on descriptive toponymy and collections of such place names as are immediately etymologizable (at least in a generic sense). The principal etymological investigations are due to Corominas (articles published in the *AIL*, *RFH* and elsewhere). Others who also dealt with etymology are: Amado Alonso, Henríquez Ureña, Krüger, Rosenblat, Hernando Balmori, Gazdaru, Coseriu, Rona, Cisneros and a few others. An exemplary etymological investigation is Rosenblat's 'Origen e historia del *che* argentino', *Fi* 8.325-401.¹⁴⁹ The works on historical toponymy worth mentioning first of all, also belong to Rosenblat: *Argentina. Historia de un nombre* (Buenos Aires, 1949), 2nd edition: *El nombre de la Argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1964), and *El nombre de Venezuela* (Caracas, 1956).¹⁵⁰ In Brazil Nascentes, Augusto Magne, Silva Neto and A. G. Cunha have contributed to etymology.

6.4.4. A number of contributions concerning interlinguistic contacts are found in Spanish America as well as in Brazil. Many Hispano-American linguists have been concerned with the contacts with native languages (among them: Morínigo, Oroz, Rosenblat).¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, the general problem of the influence of these languages on American Spanish has remained in the same stage in which Amado Alonso left it (in the study cited in fn. 92) and which needs to be revised. Meo Zilio above all devoted himself to the Hispano-Italian contacts (local influences in both directions).¹⁵² The first contributions on Hispano-Portuguese contacts from a dialectological point of view are due to Rona.¹⁵³ The main contribution on the cultural influence of

¹⁴⁷ In particular *Sobre el problema del andalucismo dialectal de América* (Buenos Aires, 1932).

¹⁴⁸ Partial doubts concerning anti-Andalusianism were also expressed by Coseriu, *Amado Alonso* 11 (Montevideo, 1953).

¹⁴⁹ About some theoretical and methodological aspects of etymology, cf. Coseriu, '¿Arabismos o romanismos?', *NRFH* 15.4-22 (particularly 17-18).

¹⁵⁰ An interesting methodological problem was raised by Rona, 'Uruguay. (The Problem of Etymology of Place Names of Guaraní Origin)', *Names* 8.1-5.

¹⁵¹ Especially the Paraguayan Morínigo paid much attention to these contacts, primarily to the influence of Spanish on Guaraní. His most important work, *Hispanismos en el guaraní* (Buenos Aires, 1931) elaborated under the direction of Amado Alonso, is prior to the period considered here. Among his ulterior contributions there are: 'Influencia del español en la estructura lingüística del guaraní', *Fi* 5.237-47 and 'La penetración de los indigenismos americanos en el español', *Presente y futuro de la lengua española* 2. 217-26.

¹⁵² In numerous articles published above all in *LN* since 1955 and in 'Italianismos generales en el español rioplatense', *BICC* 20.68-119.

¹⁵³ *La frontera lingüística entre el portugués y el español en el Norte de Uruguay* (Pôrto Alegre, 1963), and, among the preprinted contributions of the DLM, *El dialecto 'fronterizo' del Norte de Uruguay* and *El 'caingusino': un dialecto mixto hispano-portugués* (both 1959).

English is Ricardo J. Alfaro's *Diccionario de anglicismos* (Panama, 1950; new ed., Madrid, 1964).¹⁵⁴

6.5.0. Little attention has been given to languages other than national languages in IAm, in Spanish America even less than in Brazil.

6.5.1. Romance linguistics has been cultivated in Spanish America almost exclusively by linguists of foreign origin: Terracini, Coseriu and especially Krüger and Gazdaru. In Brazil, in turn, an interesting activity has been displayed in this field by several Brazilian linguists, and four important works on Vulgar Latin were published,¹⁵⁵ besides some other works of a general character,¹⁵⁶ to which Spanish America has either little or nothing to oppose.¹⁵⁷ Researches on single Romance languages other than national are altogether lacking, however, in Spanish America as well as in Brazil.¹⁵⁸ Not even investigations on Portuguese are found in Spanish America,¹⁵⁹ whereas there were some contributions concerning Spanish in Brazil (Nascentes, Hércio Martins [d. 1966]).

6.5.2. Even less is found outside of the Romance field. Concerning the English language I do not know contributions worth mentioning other than those by Bertens Charnley, published in European or North American journals. Nothing has come to my knowledge concerning other modern non-Romance languages: if such contributions do exist, they did not spread and were not influential in IAm linguistics as a whole. As far as the classical languages are concerned, I only know some contributions of a rather philological character and some grammars designed for use in teaching. Among these, Rodolfo Oroz' *Gramática latina* (Santiago, 1932; 3rd ed., 1953; Portuguese translation, Rio de Janeiro, 1938) deserves to be mentioned. In Brazil two works of a good scientific level are recorded in this field: Ernest Faria's *Fonética histórica do latim*

¹⁵⁴ Lidia Contreras, 'Los anglicismos en el lenguaje deportivo chileno', *BFUCh* 7.177-341, can furthermore be remembered.

¹⁵⁵ Silva Neto, *Fontes do latim vulgar. O Appendix Probi* (Rio de Janeiro, 1938; 3rd ed., 1956) and *História do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957); Maurer Jr., *Gramática do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959) and *O Problema do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1962).

¹⁵⁶ Such as Maurer Jr., *A unidade da România ocidental* (São Paulo, 1951), interesting for its main thesis, although modest and questionable in its realization. There can also be mentioned an introduction to Romance linguistics: Nascentes, *Elementos de filologia romanica* (Rio de Janeiro, 1954).

¹⁵⁷ Coseriu, *El llamado 'latín vulgar' y las primeras diferenciaciones romances. Breve introducción a la lingüística románica* (Montevideo, 1954) is an initiation for students based on well known facts, whose originality is limited to the manner in which several problems are posed (among these, the problem of Vulgar Latin itself). More than modest is Cisneros' *Appendix Probi* (Lima, 1952). An effort of a certain interest is Heles Contreras' 'Una clasificación morfo-sintáctica de las lenguas románicas', *RomPh* 16.261-8. I do not know A. Luco's handbook *Lingüística románica* (Santiago de Chile, 1955).

¹⁵⁸ About Catalan one must remember *Miscel·lània Fabra. Recull de treballs de lingüística catalana i romànica dedicats a Pompeu Fabra* (Buenos Aires, 1943), in which Amado Alonso published his important study 'Partición de las lenguas románicas de Occidente' (pp. 81-101), and Corominas a contribution on toponymy, 'Noms de lloc catalans d'origen germànic' (pp. 108-132). Corominas also dedicated a few other contributions to Catalan. Gazdaru dedicated several contributions to the Rumanian language.

¹⁵⁹ Coseriu, 'Fiz y tenho feito. Contribución al estudio del sistema de tiempos y aspectos del verbo portugués', a contribution submitted to the fourth Colóquio Internacional de Estudos Luso-Brasileiros (Salvador, Brazil, 1959), has not yet been published.

(Rio de Janeiro, 1955) and *Gramática superior da lingua latina* (Rio de Janeiro, 1958). Strangely enough, a language which found a certain number of cultivators in IAm, although almost exclusively from a philological point of view, has been Sanskrit, with which Fernando Tola, González de la Calle, Miroslav Marcovich (Venezuela), Bucca, Altuchow, Jorge Bertolaso Stella (Brazil) have dealt. As far as I know the only linguistic work in this field is Nicolás Altuchow's *Gramática sánscrita elemental* (Montevideo, 1962).¹⁶⁰ In the field of Indo-European linguistics I do not know anything worth mentioning beyond Tovar's work cited in 2.1.2. and P. Bosch-Gimpera's important work on prehistory, *El problema indoeuropeo* (Mexico, 1960).¹⁶¹ Outside of the Indo-European domain there are practically no scientific contributions to be mentioned, if one excludes the studies on native languages.¹⁶²

6.6. Summarizing: in Spanish America linguistics is mostly concentrated on Spanish, particularly on American Spanish and even more on present American Spanish. In Brazil, Portuguese is the main subject of linguistics, but historical interests are prevailing at the scientific level: from this follows the 'unitarian' attitude in contrast to the 'differentialistic' attitude of Spanish America, and the greater attention devoted to Romance and Latin linguistics.

6.7. A few words remain to be said about the technical level of IAm publications, as far as the authors are concerned (exactness of quotations, correctness and completeness of bibliographical data, systematic arrangement of material, etc.), as well as to editorial aspects (print, mistakes, etc.). An elevated technical level was achieved in Buenos Aires in former times, where the *RFH* constituted an example in this connection. Technically excellent are the publications of the CdM in Mexico. A high technical level is also presented, with a few exceptions, by the printed publications of the DLM, as well as by the recent publications of Santiago and Bogotá, where considerable progress has been made in the last years. Elsewhere the technical level is lower. Leaving aside those countries where scientific linguistics virtually does not exist, the publications show a low technical level in Peru and in many instances also in Brazil, although some Brazilian printings have perceptibly improved during recent years in this respect.

7. REPERCUSSIONS

7.0. Generally speaking, the repercussions of IAm linguistics in the scientific world do not correspond to its value: on the one hand, they are less than this value; on the

¹⁶⁰ Of linguistic interest is also his excellent annotated translation *El Tarkasamgraha de Annambhatta. Texto sánscrito con introducción, traducción y notas* (Montevideo, 1959).

¹⁶¹ The contributions of O. F. A. Menghin 'Veneto-Illyrica I' and 'Veneto-Illyrica II', *AFCI* 4.151-81 and 5.61-69, and some others are also concerned with prehistory and archeology.

¹⁶² The Africanistic activity displayed by Benigno Ferrario in Montevideo has had no repercussions; see his 'La protohistoria a la luz de la glotología (Área etiópico-egipcio-bérbera)', *Revista del Instituto de Antropología de la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán* 2.3.37-63 (1941). In Brazil, too, a number of Africanistic contributions have been recorded, whose value I do not know. I have not seen Ernesto Zierer's booklet *Introducción a la lengua japonesa hablada* (Trujillo, Peru, 1964).

other hand, they are varying and haphazard, and show no sound selection criteria, so that unrepresentative works often are better known than representative ones. This is to some extent due to language difficulties (deficient knowledge of Spanish and Portuguese in international spheres). But primarily it is due to a wide lack of acquaintance with IAm culture, which is considered more as an object for research than as a possible contribution to research, and which usually arouses interest only among specialists of IAm studies. Thus IAm linguistics too is almost exclusively known among Ibero-Americanists, and even among these mostly as Ibero-Americanistics (not e.g. as a contribution to general linguistics), and particularly for the material it gathered. This ignorance in the linguistic as well as in other cultural fields, by the way, begins with the IAm countries themselves. Indeed, there exists a profound mutual ignorance between the Hispano-American countries. Therefore the unity of language, traditions, and conditions implies an ANALOGOUS but not a UNITARIAN development of linguistics as well as of other forms of culture in these countries. Culturally Lima, Quito, or Bogotá are much further apart from Buenos Aires or Santiago de Chile than are Paris, Rome, or New York.¹⁶³ There is an even more marked lack of acquaintance, although unilateral, between Spanish and Portuguese America. Further on IAm linguistics is, of course, widely ignored by European linguistics and even more so by North American linguistics.

7.1. The scarce acceptance of IAm linguistics in Spanish America is due to its mainly local and localistic character, as well as to a great critical insecurity and to a certain timidity in evaluating directly what originates in other IAm countries, which constitutes a kind of inferiority complex of this linguistics, i.e. all that comes from Europe or the United States must be good in itself, but what comes from other IAm countries is probably bad. This explains why certain IAm works reach other IAm countries only by way of Europe. Actually only the works of Amado Alonso and his group had repercussions practically all over Spanish America. A work such as Fernández Retamar's *Idea de la estilística* has remained widely unknown (otherwise it cannot be explained why other inferior introductions to stylistics were published), and the same can be said of Martínez Bonati's *La estructura de la obra literaria*. The important works of Piccardo too are still ignored by most Hispano-American grammarians.¹⁶⁴ Concerning the knowledge of Brazilian linguistics the situation is even worse. The vast activity of Silva Neto and such excellent works as Mattoso Câmara's *Introdução* (which could have been adopted as a handbook all over Latin America) and his *Fonêmica*, or such useful works as Valnir Chagas' *Didática*, Sílvio Elia's

¹⁶³ Thus, in Argentina or in Uruguay it is much easier to obtain books published in Europe or in the United States than books from other Hispano-American countries (except for Mexico). In fact, only from two centers (Buenos Aires and Mexico) the diffusion of publications in Spanish America is constant and goes on under more or less acceptable conditions.

¹⁶⁴ Most of the publications of Montevideo are not listed in Seris' *Bibliografía*; there even are lacking a good number of those registered in the bibliographical repertories or reviewed (and even published) in journals, which the compiler of the bibliography apparently consulted.

Orientações and the works of Faria on Latin, have had either no or few repercussions in Spanish America.¹⁶⁵ The old Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires tried to overcome this mutual ignorance and distrust and was at the time of Amado Alonso a center interested in the development of linguistics in the Hispano-American countries and in Brazil. But since 1946 the situation has become worse instead of becoming better.¹⁶⁶

Very different is the attitude of the Brazilian linguists, who generally follow with enough attention what is being published in Spanish America,¹⁶⁷ and review and use Hispano-American works.¹⁶⁸

7.2. In Spain it was above all Amado Alonso who met with wide acceptance as he is considered there — not without reason — as a representative of Spanish linguistics. But beyond Alonso the repercussions of IAm linguistics are not so far-reaching as one might suppose, and, what is worse, scientific and pre-scientific linguistics are sometimes badly confused, owing to a strange lack of insight.¹⁶⁹ IAm activity concerning linguistic theory, grammatical theory, and general linguistics after Alonso is known to the more advanced Spanish linguists, but is still ignored by most of the others.¹⁷⁰ Elsewhere in Europe only Amado Alonso, Coseriu and Luis Jorge Prieto are relatively known names, and even Alonso is mainly known to students of Romance and Hispanic languages. Nevertheless, judging from reviews and quotations, European

¹⁶⁵ The *Introdução* by Mattoso Câmara has not yet been reviewed, from what I know, by any of the great Hispano-American journals.

¹⁶⁶ Thus, e.g. the first and very sporadic reviews of publications of the DLM — which are found reviewed in European journals since 1952 — appeared in the *BICC* in 1957 and not until 1958 in the *BFUCh* and in the *NRFH*, and no reviews of these publications have hitherto appeared in Buenos Aires. In the 8 volumes of the *RFH* one can find 11 reviews of Portuguese works (almost all of them Brazilian), 6 of them on linguistics; in turn, the 16 volumes of the *NRFH* only contain 5 reviews of works in Portuguese and only one of them on linguistics (by the way, a work by the German linguist Piel). In the *BFUCh* there are only four reviews of Brazilian linguistic works; in *Fi* none at all. Reviews of Portuguese and Brazilian publications are relatively numerous only in the *AIL* (from volume 4 on), but they almost exclusively concern contributions about ethnography or ethnographical linguistics.

¹⁶⁷ With exceptions, of course. Thus F. Gomes de Matos, *Lg* 40.631 (1964) believes that IAm linguistics has awakened from its lethargy only in the last three years, which evidently is far from being true.

¹⁶⁸ The Hispano-American bibliography mentioned in fn. 60 does not include any Portuguese titles; in turn, a similar — and more limited — Brazilian bibliography lists 26 Spanish titles, 14 of them Hispano-American. The *RBF*, too, regularly publishes reviews of Spanish and Hispano-American works. In this same connection, I can point out that the DLM has had much closer and earlier relations with Rio de Janeiro than, e.g. with Buenos Aires.

¹⁶⁹ Works of very low scientific value, which do not enjoy any prestige in the Hispano-American countries themselves, are quoted and praised in Spanish publications. And more than one amateur linguist received excellence attestations from famous Spanish scholars. Cf. Coseriu, *Reseñas* 13 (Montevideo, 1953).

¹⁷⁰ Thus Fernando Lázaro Carreter, *Diccionario de términos filológicos*³ (Madrid, 1962), which even includes terms proposed by some obscure European linguists and never employed by anybody, does not include any of the terms proposed and regularly employed by IAm linguists and generally ignores (deliberately?) all the theoretical IAm contributions. In this respect the attitude of Portuguese linguists towards Brazilian linguistics is very different: the best Brazilian linguists are well known in Portugal and their works figure regularly in the lists of lectures recommended to students of linguistics.

linguistics seems to pay more attention to the development of IAm linguistics than does North American linguistics. In fact, in the United States IAm linguistics is almost exclusively known and made use of by Hispanists and Ibero-Americanists (although in this case probably more than in Europe). Thus the publications of the DLM, which have had ample repercussions in Western¹⁷¹ as well as in Eastern Europe,¹⁷² are practically ignored in the United States and have not been reviewed so far either in *Lg*, *Word*, or *IJAL*. Except for some occasional reviews by Romance philologists and a few sporadic indications, the North American reader has available only the completely distorted, malevolent, and curiously anachronistic presentation by Robert A. Hall, Jr.: *Idealism in Romance Linguistics* 85-8 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1963). Strangely enough, the theory developed in Montevideo has remained unknown even to the promoters of generative grammar, although they assert a number of principles which have been maintained in Montevideo since 1952, e.g. a) the conception of languages as 'rule-governed creativity';¹⁷³ b) the dynamic interpretation of language as a technique to express and understand also what is new and what was never said before; c) the criticism of antimentalism and the stressing of the importance of the speakers' intuition, which is considered as the very subject and foundation of linguistic theory; d) the necessity for re-interpreting and re-evaluating traditional grammar in so far as it corresponds to the actual functioning of language; e) the necessity for describing languages as systems for linguistic creation.¹⁷⁴ In the transformationalists' writings one can sometimes find textual coincidences with former writings of Montevideo, coincidences which are evidently due to an analogous point of view. It is regrettable that the transformationalists should have ignored this, since generative grammar would have found in the Montevideo writings a clear distinction of levels of grammaticality, the determination of the actual nature of the speaker's intuition, and its relation to scientific analysis as well as its theoretical basis,¹⁷⁵ and, more generally, those philosophical foundations which it lacks and is still searching, not always in adequate places. In addition, the theory developed in Montevideo has gone much further than transformational grammar, which explicitly limits itself to

¹⁷¹ Cf., e.g. the reviews by Martinet, *BSL* 52.19-23 and 263 (1956); by Pisani, *AGI* 61.58-68 (1956) and *Paideia* 17.82-92 (1962); and by René Gsell, *RLR* 23.165-6 (1959); and N. C. W. Spence, 'Towards a New Synthesis in Linguistics: the Work of Eugenio Coseriu', *ArchL* 12.1-34 (1960).

¹⁷² Coseriu, *Sincronía, diacronía e historia* was translated into Russian in V. A. Zvegincev, Ed., *Novoe v lingvistike* 3.123-343 (Moscow, 1963).

¹⁷³ Cf. *Sincronía, diacronía e historia* 53, fn. 47.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. the latest formulation of such exigency in *Sincronía* 155: 'In fact, for the speakers themselves the present-day language is not only a collection of forms which have already been realized and can be used as models (*norm*), but also a technique to go beyond what has been realized, a system of possibilities (*system*). The description, therefore, has to account for the possibilities of all that which is a productive pattern, a schema which is applicable to the realization of that which does not yet exist as a norm. This is true not only in morphology but also in syntax, lexicon (derivation and composition of words) and even in the phonological system where the possibilities of realization are not identical for each functional unit'.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. *Sincronía* 32-3.

synchrony,¹⁷⁶ as it has shown that linguistic technique not only works synchronically, but also diachronically, i.e. that 'linguistic change' is the historical realization of this system of possibilities, which each language is.¹⁷⁷

8. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

8.0. The survey just outlined may seem to be pessimistic. Indeed, apart from a few exceptions, there is not really an IAM linguistics which might be characterized by a specific conceptual and methodological content, as there is a North American, or even an English or Italian linguistics. What really exists rather is a SITUATION of linguistics in IAM; consequently the characterization I tried to give had to refer to this situation, to the typical attitudes of IAM linguistics and to its style, rather than to its contribution to the internal progress of linguistics. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the achievements of IAM linguistics are remarkable, if one considers the conditions mentioned in 1., besides others which I could not enumerate, and I believe that there are good perspectives for future development, not only for an external progress — extension and application of linguistics existing today — but also for internal progress, i.e. for overcoming linguistics imported from Europe and the United States.

8.1. As to the external progress, a great development can be expected first of all in Brazil. It is true that Brazil has not yet had organized centers for progressive linguistic work such as those of Buenos Aires and Montevideo. But these latter were shortlived efforts and under the present circumstances it cannot be said how far the weakened IAA will be able to renew and continue the tradition of Amado Alonso in all its dimensions, nor does it seem probable that the DLM can uphold and continue the universalistic orientation it had between 1951 and 1962. Moreover, the achievements in scientific linguistics so far made in Brazil, in proportion surpass the achievements of Spanish America. One must further add that, whereas there does not exist one uniform Hispano-American linguistics, in Brazil there already exists an uninterrupted Brazilian linguistic tradition, which is beginning to acquire its own definite features. And what is more, in Brazil the universities are much more interested in linguistics, and the remarkable circulation of certain linguistic works¹⁷⁸ allows the hope that a young generation with a good and homogeneous preparation will soon exist there.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Noam Chomsky, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 22 (The Hague, 1964).

¹⁷⁷ The coincidences in views and intentions do not imply, however, that I agree with transformational technique. On the contrary I consider this technique as inadequate and as a further form of an arbitrary partialization of the concrete linguistic experience. 'Inadequate', as in the case of other abstract and dogmatized models, of course, means 'only partially adequate'.

¹⁷⁸ It was seen that Mattoso Câmara's *Introdução* already had four editions and Lima Coutinho's *Gramática histórica* five, and that even books implying a stricter especialization had several editions; thus, Silva Neto, *Fontes do latim vulgar* had three, and Faria's *Fonética histórica do latim* had two editions.

In Spanish America a future development can be expected above all in Argentina, where several linguistic centers are already existing and where a new generation of well-prepared linguists with a modern outlook is rising: Ana María Barrenechea, L. J. Prieto, Guitarte (presently at the Boston College), Suárez, Fernández Guizzetti. A future development can also be expected in Chile (Santiago and Concepción), and, of course, in Colombia, especially provided that the ICC can overcome localism in its research (as it is doing now in teaching), that its publications are subjected to a more rigorous selection, and if it can keep up the orientation towards broader information as is observed e.g. in the case of Montes.

8.2. It is more difficult to predict how far IAM will be able to contribute to the theoretical and methodological progress of linguistics. IAM linguistics presently is, as was seen, in a receptive phase, and there are no indications that this phase will be overcome in the near future and on a sufficiently large scale. But precisely in receptivity lies the possibility for a qualitative progress of linguistics as of other fields of culture. What seems to be — and even is — at a certain time eclecticism, is also, in a broader historical perspective, ideological openness and anti-dogmatism, non-limitation to a single tradition. One only needs to have a look at the bibliographical background of some of the books published in IAM. While most North American linguistic books and also many Western European books are primarily based on local and national traditions, while neglecting all other traditions and what happens elsewhere, in IAM the information tends towards a balance between the local, the European and the North American traditions. A writing or bibliography in which such names as Humboldt, de Saussure, Bloomfield, Trubetzkoy, Jakobson, Harris, Terracini, Pagliaro, Frei, Martinet appear together, is exceptional elsewhere, whereas it is not so in some IAM centers. Such contributions as Rulon S. Wells' 'De Saussure's System of Linguistics', *Word* 3.1-31 (1947) or Einar Haugen's 'Directions in Modern Linguistics', *Lg* 27.211-22 (1951) are classical in North American linguistics, not only because of their unquestionable intrinsic value, but also because they were exceptional in their environment and at the time when they appeared. In IAM, however, a good knowledge of de Saussure and the co-existence of European and North American linguistics are by no means exceptional among the better informed linguists. If aspects of pre-scientific linguistics, which persevere in many countries of IAM, including on the academic level, are eliminated, and if IAM linguistics matures, acquires self-confidence, and thus passes from a receptive to a critical and creative phase, this linguistics, which is today indefinite, will be able to attain an impartial and anti-dogmatic synthesis of all traditions combined in it and to contribute to the advance and unity of international linguistics in a way which cannot now be foreseen. In this sense I can conclude this survey with convinced optimism.

8.3. But general progress will of course depend on various circumstances, such as: the intensification of contacts and interchanges between the IAM centers of activity, the intensification of interchanges with European and North American centers, the creation of a greater number of regular linguistic courses, the creation of linguistic

institutes and specialized libraries with sufficient endowment, the training of young linguists in foreign countries, and the translation of a number of classical linguistic works, be it in the theoretical or didactic field (as e.g. Humboldt, Paul, Bloomfield, Trubetzkoy, Hjelmslev, Pagliaro, Harris, Gleason).¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹ A recent Peruvian translation of Bloomfield's *Language* (*Lenguaje* [sic], Lima 1964) should be disregarded altogether: it is full of errors of every sort and kind and, in its present form, cannot reasonably be recommended to anybody.