PART ONE

General Principles

Chapter I

NATURE OF THE LINGUISTIC SIGN

1. Sign, Signified, Signifier

Some people regard language, when reduced to its elements, as a naming-process only—a list of words, each corresponding to the thing that it names. For example:

This conception is open to criticism at several points. It assumes that ready-made ideas exist before words (on this point, see below, p. 111); it does not tell us whether a name is vocal or psychological in nature (arbor, for instance, can be considered from either viewpoint); finally, it lets us assume that the linking of a name and a thing is a very simple operation—an assumption that is anything but true. But this rather naive approach can bring us near the truth by showing us that the linguistic unit is a double entity, one formed by the associating of two terms.

\[ \text{ARBOR} \]

\[ \text{EQUOS} \]

etc. etc.

We have seen in considering the speaking-circuit (p. 11) that both terms involved in the linguistic sign are psychological and are
united in the brain by an associative bond. This point must be emphasized.

The linguistic sign unites, not a thing and a name, but a concept and a sound-image.\(^1\) The latter is not the material sound, a purely physical thing, but the psychological imprint of the sound, the impression that it makes on our senses. The sound-image is sensory, and if I happen to call it "material," it is only in that sense, and by way of opposing it to the other term of the association, the concept, which is generally more abstract.

The psychological character of our sound-images becomes apparent when we observe our own speech. Without moving our lips or tongue, we can talk to ourselves or recite mentally a selection of verse. Because we regard the words of our language as sound-images, we must avoid speaking of the "phonemes" that make up the words. This term, which suggests vocal activity, is applicable to the spoken word only, to the realization of the inner image in discourse. We can avoid that misunderstanding by speaking of the *sounds* and *syllables* of a word provided we remember that the names refer to the sound-image.

The linguistic sign is then a two-sided psychological entity that can be represented by the drawing:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Concept} \\
\text{Sound-image} \\
\end{array}
\]

The two elements are intimately united, and each recalls the other. Whether we try to find the meaning of the Latin word *arbor* or the word that Latin uses to designate the concept "tree," it is

\(^1\) The term sound-image may seem to be too restricted inasmuch as beside the representation of the sounds of a word there is also that of its articulation, the muscular image of the phonational act. But for F. de Saussure language is essentially a depository, a thing received from without (see p. 13). The sound-image is par excellence the natural representation of the word as a fact of potential language, outside any actual use of it in speaking. The motor side is thus implied or, in any event, occupies only a subordinate role with respect to the sound-image. [Ed.]
clear that only the associations sanctioned by that language appear to us to conform to reality, and we disregard whatever others might be imagined.

Our definition of the linguistic sign poses an important question of terminology. I call the combination of a concept and a sound-image a sign, but in current usage the term generally designates only a sound-image, a word, for example (arbor, etc.). One tends to forget that arbor is called a sign only because it carries the concept "tree," with the result that the idea of the sensory part implies the idea of the whole.

Ambiguity would disappear if the three notions involved here were designated by three names, each suggesting and opposing the others. I propose to retain the word sign [signe] to designate the whole and to replace concept and sound-image respectively by signified [signifié] and signifier [signifiant]; the last two terms have the advantage of indicating the opposition that separates them from each other and from the whole of which they are parts. As regards sign, if I am satisfied with it, this is simply because I do not know of any word to replace it, the ordinary language suggesting no other.

The linguistic sign, as defined, has two primordial characteristics. In enunciating them I am also positing the basic principles of any study of this type.

2. Principle I: The Arbitrary Nature of the Sign

The bond between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary. Since I mean by sign the whole that results from the associating of the signifier with the signified, I can simply say: the linguistic sign is arbitrary.

The idea of "sister" is not linked by any inner relationship to the succession of sounds s-ö-r which serves as its signifier in French;
that it could be represented equally by just any other sequence is proved by differences among languages and by the very existence of different languages: the signified “ox” has as its signifier b-ö-f on one side of the border and o-k-s (Ochs) on the other.

No one disputes the principle of the arbitrary nature of the sign, but it is often easier to discover a truth than to assign to it its proper place. Principle I dominates all the linguistics of language; its consequences are numberless. It is true that not all of them are equally obvious at first glance; only after many detours does one discover them, and with them the primordial importance of the principle.

One remark in passing: when semiology becomes organized as a science, the question will arise whether or not it properly includes modes of expression based on completely natural signs, such as pantomime. Supposing that the new science welcomes them, its main concern will still be the whole group of systems grounded on the arbitrariness of the sign. In fact, every means of expression used in society is based, in principle, on collective behavior or—what amounts to the same thing—on convention. Polite formulas, for instance, though often imbued with a certain natural expressiveness (as in the case of a Chinese who greets his emperor by bowing down to the ground nine times), are nonetheless fixed by rule; it is this rule and not the intrinsic value of the gestures that obliges one to use them. Signs that are wholly arbitrary realize better than the others the ideal of the semiological process; that is why language, the most complex and universal of all systems of expression, is also the most characteristic; in this sense linguistics can become the master-pattern for all branches of semiology although language is only one particular semiological system.

The word *symbol* has been used to designate the linguistic sign, or more specifically, what is here called the signifier. Principle I in particular weighs against the use of this term. One characteristic of the symbol is that it is never wholly arbitrary; it is not empty, for there is the rudiment of a natural bond between the signifier and the signified. The symbol of justice, a pair of scales, could not be replaced by just any other symbol, such as a chariot.

The word *arbitrary* also calls for comment. The term should not
imply that the choice of the signifier is left entirely to the speaker (we shall see below that the individual does not have the power to change a sign in any way once it has become established in the linguistic community); I mean that it is unmotivated, i.e. arbitrary in that it actually has no natural connection with the signified.

In concluding let us consider two objections that might be raised to the establishment of Principle I:

1) *Onomatopoeia* might be used to prove that the choice of the signifier is not always arbitrary. But onomatopoeic formations are never organic elements of a linguistic system. Besides, their number is much smaller than is generally supposed. Words like French *fouet* 'whip' or *glas* 'knell' may strike certain ears with suggestive sonority, but to see that they have not always had this property we need only examine their Latin forms (*fouet* is derived from *fāgus* 'beech-tree,' *glas* from *classicum* 'sound of a trumpet'). The quality of their present sounds, or rather the quality that is attributed to them, is a fortuitous result of phonetic evolution.

As for authentic onomatopoeic words (e.g. *glug-glug, tick-tick*, etc.), not only are they limited in number, but also they are chosen somewhat arbitrarily, for they are only approximate and more or less conventional imitations of certain sounds (cf. English *bow-bow* and French *ouaoua*). In addition, once these words have been introduced into the language, they are to a certain extent subjected to the same evolution—phonetic, morphological, etc.—that other words undergo (cf. *pigeon*, ultimately from Vulgar Latin *pīpiō*, derived in turn from an onomatopoeic formation): obvious proof that they lose something of their original character in order to assume that of the linguistic sign in general, which is unmotivated.

2) *Interjections*, closely related to onomatopoeia, can be attacked on the same grounds and come no closer to refuting our thesis. One is tempted to see in them spontaneous expressions of reality dictated, so to speak, by natural forces. But for most interjections we can show that there is no fixed bond between their signified and their signifier. We need only compare two languages on this point to see how much such expressions differ from one language to the next (e.g. the English equivalent of French *aïe!* is *ouch!*). We know, moreover, that many interjections were once
words with specific meanings (cf. French *diable!* 'darn!' *mordieu!* 'golly!' from *mort Dieu* 'God’s death,' etc.).

Onomatopoeic formations and interjections are of secondary importance, and their symbolic origin is in part open to dispute.

3. **Principle II: The Linear Nature of the Signifier**

The signifier, being auditory, is unfolded solely in time from which it gets the following characteristics: (a) it represents a span, and (b) the span is measurable in a single dimension; it is a line.

While Principle II is obvious, apparently linguists have always neglected to state it, doubtless because they found it too simple; nevertheless, it is fundamental, and its consequences are incalculable. Its importance equals that of Principle I; the whole mechanism of language depends upon it (see p. 122 f.). In contrast to visual signifiers (nautical signals, etc.) which can offer simultaneous groupings in several dimensions, auditory signifiers have at their command only the dimension of time. Their elements are presented in succession; they form a chain. This feature becomes readily apparent when they are represented in writing and the spatial line of graphic marks is substituted for succession in time.

Sometimes the linear nature of the signifier is not obvious. When I accent a syllable, for instance, it seems that I am concentrating more than one significant element on the same point. But this is an illusion; the syllable and its accent constitute only one phonational act. There is no duality within the act but only different oppositions to what precedes and what follows (on this subject, see p. 131).

* Cf. English *goodness!* and *zounds!* (from *God’s wounds*). [Tr.]
Chapter II

IMMUTABILITY AND MUTABILITY OF THE SIGN

1. Immutability

The signifier, though to all appearances freely chosen with respect to the idea that it represents, is fixed, not free, with respect to the linguistic community that uses it. The masses have no voice in the matter, and the signifier chosen by language could be replaced by no other. This fact, which seems to embody a contradiction, might be called colloquially "the stacked deck." We say to language: "Choose!" but we add: "It must be this sign and no other." No individual, even if he willed it, could modify in any way at all the choice that has been made; and what is more, the community itself cannot control so much as a single word; it is bound to the existing language.

No longer can language be identified with a contract pure and simple, and it is precisely from this viewpoint that the linguistic sign is a particularly interesting object of study; for language furnishes the best proof that a law accepted by a community is a thing that is tolerated and not a rule to which all freely consent.

Let us first see why we cannot control the linguistic sign and then draw together the important consequences that issue from the phenomenon.

No matter what period we choose or how far back we go, language always appears as a heritage of the preceding period. We might conceive of an act by which, at a given moment, names were assigned to things and a contract was formed between concepts and sound-images; but such an act has never been recorded. The notion that things might have happened like that was prompted by our acute awareness of the arbitrary nature of the sign.

No society, in fact, knows or has ever known language other than as a product inherited from preceding generations, and one to be accepted as such. That is why the question of the origin of speech
is not so important as it is generally assumed to be. The question is not even worth asking; the only real object of linguistics is the normal, regular life of an existing idiom. A particular language—state is always the product of historical forces, and these forces explain why the sign is unchangeable, i.e. why it resists any arbitrary substitution.

Nothing is explained by saying that language is something inherited and leaving it at that. Can not existing and inherited laws be modified from one moment to the next?

To meet that objection, we must put language into its social setting and frame the question just as we would for any other social institution. How are other social institutions transmitted? This more general question includes the question of immutability. We must first determine the greater or lesser amounts of freedom that the other institutions enjoy; in each instance it will be seen that a different proportion exists between fixed tradition and the free action of society. The next step is to discover why in a given category, the forces of the first type carry more weight or less weight than those of the second. Finally, coming back to language, we must ask why the historical factor of transmission dominates it entirely and prohibits any sudden widespread change.

There are many possible answers to the question. For example, one might point to the fact that succeeding generations are not superimposed on one another like the drawers of a piece of furniture, but fuse and interpenetrate, each generation embracing individuals of all ages—with the result that modifications of language are not tied to the succession of generations. One might also recall the sum of the efforts required for learning the mother language and conclude that a general change would be impossible. Again, it might be added that reflection does not enter into the active use of an idiom—speakers are largely unconscious of the laws of language; and if they are unaware of them, how could they modify them? Even if they were aware of these laws, we may be sure that their awareness would seldom lead to criticism, for people are generally satisfied with the language they have received.

The foregoing considerations are important but not topical. The following are more basic and direct, and all the others depend on them.
1) The arbitrary nature of the sign. Above, we had to accept the theoretical possibility of change; further reflection suggests that the arbitrary nature of the sign is really what protects language from any attempt to modify it. Even if people were more conscious of language than they are, they would still not know how to discuss it. The reason is simply that any subject in order to be discussed must have a reasonable basis. It is possible, for instance, to discuss whether the monogamous form of marriage is more reasonable than the polygamous form and to advance arguments to support either side. One could also argue about a system of symbols, for the symbol has a rational relationship with the thing signified (see p. 68); but language is a system of arbitrary signs and lacks the necessary basis, the solid ground for discussion. There is no reason for preferring soeur to sister, Ochs to boeuf, etc.

2) The multiplicity of signs necessary to form any language. Another important deterrent to linguistic change is the great number of signs that must go into the making of any language. A system of writing comprising twenty to forty letters can in case of need be replaced by another system. The same would be true of language if it contained a limited number of elements; but linguistic signs are numberless.

3) The over-complexity of the system. A language constitutes a system. In this one respect (as we shall see later) language is not completely arbitrary but is ruled to some extent by logic; it is here also, however, that the inability of the masses to transform it becomes apparent. The system is a complex mechanism that can be grasped only through reflection; the very ones who use it daily are ignorant of it. We can conceive of a change only through the intervention of specialists, grammarians, logicians, etc.; but experience shows us that all such meddlings have failed.

4) Collective inertia toward innovation. Language—and this consideration surpasses all the others—is at every moment everybody's concern; spread throughout society and manipulated by it, language is something used daily by all. Here we are unable to set up any comparison between it and other institutions. The prescriptions of codes, religious rites, nautical signals, etc., involve only a certain number of individuals simultaneously and then only
during a limited period of time; in language, on the contrary, everyone participates at all times, and that is why it is constantly being influenced by all. This capital fact suffices to show the impossibility of revolution. Of all social institutions, language is least amenable to initiative. It blends with the life of society, and the latter, inert by nature, is a prime conservative force.

But to say that language is a product of social forces does not suffice to show clearly that it is unfree; remembering that it is always the heritage of the preceding period, we must add that these social forces are linked with time. Language is checked not only by the weight of the collectivity but also by time. These two are inseparable. At every moment solidarity with the past checks freedom of choice. We say man and dog. This does not prevent the existence in the total phenomenon of a bond between the two antithetical forces—arbitrary convention by virtue of which choice is free and time which causes choice to be fixed. Because the sign is arbitrary, it follows no law other than that of tradition, and because it is based on tradition, it is arbitrary.

2. Mutability

Time, which insures the continuity of language, yields another influence apparently contradictory to the first: the more or less rapid change of linguistic signs. In a certain sense, therefore, we can speak of both the immutability and the mutability of the sign.\(^2\)

In the last analysis, the two facts are interdependent: the sign is exposed to alteration because it perpetuates itself. What predominates in all change is the persistence of the old substance; disregard for the past is only relative. That is why the principle of change is based on the principle of continuity.

Change in time takes many forms, on any one of which an important chapter in linguistics might be written. Without entering into detail, let us see what things need to be delineated.

First, let there be no mistake about the meaning that we attach to the word change. One might think that it deals especially with

\(^2\) It would be wrong to reproach F. de Saussure for being illogical or paradoxical in attributing two contradictory qualities to language. By opposing two striking terms, he wanted only to emphasize the fact that language changes in spite of the inability of speakers to change it. One can also say that it is intangible but not unchangeable. [Ed.]
IMMUTABILITY AND MUTABILITY OF THE SIGN

phonetic changes undergone by the signifier, or perhaps changes in meaning which affect the signified concept. That view would be inadequate. Regardless of what the forces of change are, whether in isolation or in combination, they always result in a shift in the relationship between the signified and the signifier.

Here are some examples. Latin necāre 'kill' became noyer 'drown' in French. Both the sound-image and the concept changed; but it is useless to separate the two parts of the phenomenon; it is sufficient to state with respect to the whole that the bond between the idea and the sign was loosened, and that there was a shift in their relationship. If instead of comparing Classical Latin necāre with French noyer, we contrast the former term with necare of Vulgar Latin of the fourth or fifth century meaning 'drown' the case is a little different; but here again, although there is no appreciable change in the signifier, there is a shift in the relationship between the idea and the sign.⁴

Old German dritteil 'one-third' became Drittel in Modern German. Here, although the concept remained the same, the relationship was changed in two ways: the signifier was changed not only in its material aspect but also in its grammatical form; the idea of Teil 'part' is no longer implied; Drittel is a simple word. In one way or another there is always a shift in the relationship.

In Anglo-Saxon the preliterary form fot 'foot' remained while its plural *fōti became fēt (Modern English feet). Regardless of the other changes that are implied, one thing is certain: there was a shift in their relationship; other correspondences between the phonetic substance and the idea emerged.

Language is radically powerless to defend itself against the forces which from one moment to the next are shifting the relationship between the signified and the signifier. This is one of the consequences of the arbitrary nature of the sign.

Unlike language, other human institutions—customs, laws, etc.—are all based in varying degrees on the natural relations of things; all have of necessity adapted the means employed to the ends pursued. Even fashion in dress is not entirely arbitrary; we can deviate only slightly from the conditions dictated by the human

⁴ From May to July of 1911, Saussure used interchangeably the old terminology (idea and sign) and the new (signified and signifier). [Tr.]
body. Language is limited by nothing in the choice of means, for apparently nothing would prevent the associating of any idea whatsoever with just any sequence of sounds.

To emphasize the fact that language is a genuine institution, Whitney quite justly insisted upon the arbitrary nature of signs; and by so doing, he placed linguistics on its true axis. But he did not follow through and see that the arbitrariness of language radically separates it from all other institutions. This is apparent from the way in which language evolves. Nothing could be more complex. As it is a product of both the social force and time, no one can change anything in it, and on the other hand, the arbitrariness of its signs theoretically entails the freedom of establishing just any relationship between phonetic substance and ideas. The result is that each of the two elements united in the sign maintains its own life to a degree unknown elsewhere, and that language changes, or rather evolves, under the influence of all the forces which can affect either sounds or meanings. The evolution is inevitable; there is no example of a single language that resists it. After a certain period of time, some obvious shifts can always be recorded.

Mutability is so inescapable that it even holds true for artificial languages. Whoever creates a language controls it only so long as it is not in circulation; from the moment when it fulfills its mission and becomes the property of everyone, control is lost. Take Esperanto as an example; if it succeeds, will it escape the inexorable law? Once launched, it is quite likely that Esperanto will enter upon a fully semiological life; it will be transmitted according to laws which have nothing in common with those of its logical creation, and there will be no turning backwards. A man proposing a fixed language that posterity would have to accept for what it is would be like a hen hatching a duck's egg: the language created by him would be borne along, willy-nilly, by the current that engulfs all languages.

Signs are governed by a principle of general semiology: continuity in time is coupled to change in time; this is confirmed by orthographic systems, the speech of deaf-mutes, etc.

But what supports the necessity for change? I might be reproached for not having been as explicit on this point as on the principle of immutability. This is because I failed to distinguish
between the different forces of change. We must consider their great variety in order to understand the extent to which they are necessary.

The causes of continuity are *a priori* within the scope of the observer, but the causes of change in time are not. It is better not to attempt giving an exact account at this point, but to restrict discussion to the shifting of relationships in general. Time changes all things; there is no reason why language should escape this universal law.

Let us review the main points of our discussion and relate them to the principles set up in the Introduction.

1) Avoiding sterile word definitions, within the total phenomenon represented by speech we first singled out two parts: language and speaking. Language is speech less speaking. It is the whole set of linguistic habits which allow an individual to understand and to be understood.

2) But this definition still leaves language outside its social context; it makes language something artificial since it includes only the individual part of reality; for the realization of language, a community of speakers [*masse parlante*] is necessary. Contrary to all appearances, language never exists apart from the social fact, for it is a semiological phenomenon. Its social nature is one of its inner characteristics. Its complete definition confronts us with two inseparable entities, as shown in this drawing:

![Diagram of Language and Community of Speakers](image)

But under the conditions described language is not living—it has only potential life; we have considered only the social, not the historical, fact.
3) The linguistic sign is arbitrary; language, as defined, would therefore seem to be a system which, because it depends solely on a rational principle, is free and can be organized at will. Its social nature, considered independently, does not definitely rule out this viewpoint. Doubtless it is not on a purely logical basis that group psychology operates; one must consider everything that deflects reason in actual contacts between individuals. But the thing which keeps language from being a simple convention that can be modified at the whim of interested parties is not its social nature; it is rather the action of time combined with the social force. If time is left out, the linguistic facts are incomplete and no conclusion is possible.

If we considered language in time, without the community of speakers—imagine an isolated individual living for several centuries—we probably would notice no change; time would not influence language. Conversely, if we considered the community of speakers without considering time, we would not see the effect of the social forces that influence language. To represent the actual facts, we must then add to our first drawing a sign to indicate passage of time:

[Diagram showing Time, Language, and Community of speakers with a sign for passage of time]

Language is no longer free, for time will allow the social forces at work on it to carry out their effects. This brings us back to the principle of continuity, which cancels freedom. But continuity necessarily implies change, varying degrees of shifts in the relationship between the signified and the signifier.
Chapter III

STATIC AND EVOLUTIONARY LINGUISTICS

1. Inner Duality of All Sciences Concerned with Values

Very few linguists suspect that the intervention of the factor of time creates difficulties peculiar to linguistics and opens to their science two completely divergent paths.

Most other sciences are unaffected by this radical duality; time produces no special effects in them. Astronomy has found that the stars undergo considerable changes but has not been obliged on this account to split itself into two disciplines. Geology is concerned with successions at almost every instant, but its study of strata does not thereby become a radically distinct discipline. Law has its descriptive science and its historical science; no one opposes one to the other. The political history of states is unfolded solely in time, but a historian depicting a particular period does not work apart from history. Conversely, the science of political institutions is essentially descriptive, but if the need arises it can easily deal with a historical question without disturbing its unity.

On the contrary, that duality is already forcing itself upon the economic sciences. Here, in contrast to the other sciences, political economy and economic history constitute two clearly separated disciplines within a single science; the works that have recently appeared on these subjects point up the distinction. Proceeding as they have, economists are—without being well aware of it—obeying an inner necessity. A similar necessity obliges us to divide linguistics into two parts, each with its own principle. Here as in political economy we are confronted with the notion of value; both sciences are concerned with a system for equating things of different orders—labor and wages in one and a signified and signifier in the other.

Certainly all sciences would profit by indicating more precisely the co-ordinates along which their subject matter is aligned. Every-
where distinctions should be made, according to the following illustration, between (1) *the axis of simultaneities* (AB), which stands for the relations of coexisting things and from which the intervention of time is excluded; and (2) *the axis of successions* (CD), on which only one thing can be considered at a time but upon which are located all the things on the first axis together with their changes.

![Diagram](image)

For a science concerned with values the distinction is a practical necessity and sometimes an absolute one. In these fields scholars cannot organize their research rigorously without considering both co-ordinates and making a distinction between the system of values per se and the same values as they relate to time.

This distinction has to be heeded by the linguist above all others, for language is a system of pure values which are determined by nothing except the momentary arrangement of its terms. A value—so long as it is somehow rooted in things and in their natural relations, as happens with economics (the value of a plot of ground, for instance, is related to its productivity)—can to some extent be traced in time if we remember that it depends at each moment upon a system of coexisting values. Its link with things gives it, perforce, a natural basis, and the judgments that we base on such values are therefore never completely arbitrary; their variability is limited. But we have just seen that natural data have no place in linguistics.
Again, the more complex and rigorously organized a system of values is, the more it is necessary, because of its very complexity, to study it according to both co-ordinates. No other system embodies this feature to the same extent as language. Nowhere else do we find such precise values at stake and such a great number and diversity of terms, all so rigidly interdependent. The multiplicity of signs, which we have already used to explain the continuity of language, makes it absolutely impossible to study simultaneously relations in time and relations within the system.

The reasons for distinguishing two sciences of language are clear. How should the sciences be designated? Available terms do not all bring out the distinction with equal sharpness. "Linguistic history" and "historical linguistics" are too vague. Since political history includes the description of different periods as well as the narration of events, the student might think that he is studying a language according to the axis of time when he describes its successive states, but this would require a separate study of the phenomena that make language pass from one state to another. Evolution and evolutionary linguistics are more precise, and I shall use these expressions often; in contrast, we can speak of the science of language-states [états de langue] or static linguistics.

But to indicate more clearly the opposition and crossing of two orders of phenomena that relate to the same object, I prefer to speak of synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Everything that relates to the static side of our science is synchronic; everything that has to do with evolution is diachronic. Similarly, synchrony and diachrony designate respectively a language-state and an evolutionary phase.

2. Inner Duality and the History of Linguistics

The first thing that strikes us when we study the facts of language is that their succession in time does not exist insofar as the speaker is concerned. He is confronted with a state. That is why the linguist who wishes to understand a state must discard all knowledge of everything that produced it and ignore diachrony. He can enter the mind of speakers only by completely suppressing the past. The intervention of history can only falsify his judgment. It would be absurd to attempt to sketch a panorama of the Alps
by viewing them simultaneously from several peaks of the Jura; a panorama must be made from a single vantage point. The same applies to language; the linguist can neither describe it nor draw up standards of usage except by concentrating on one state. When he follows the evolution of the language, he resembles the moving observer who goes from one peak of the Jura to another in order to record the shifts in perspective.

Ever since modern linguistics came into existence, it has been completely absorbed in diachrony. Comparative Indo-European philology uses the materials at hand to reconstruct hypothetically an older type of language; comparison is but a means of reconstructing the past. The method is the same in the narrower study of subgroups (Romance languages, Germanic languages, etc.); states intervene only irregularly and piecemeal. Such is the tendency introduced by Bopp. His conception of language is therefore hybrid and hesitating.

Against this, what was the procedure of those who studied language before the beginning of modern linguistics, i.e. the "grammarians" inspired by traditional methods? It is curious to note that here their viewpoint was absolutely above reproach. Their works clearly show that they tried to describe language-states. Their program was strictly synchronic. The Port Royal Grammar, for example, attempts to describe the state of French under Louis XIV and to determine its values. For this, the language of the Middle Ages is not needed; the horizontal axis is followed faithfully (see p. 80), without digression. The method was then correct, but this does not mean that its application was perfect. Traditional grammar neglects whole parts of language, such as word formation; it is normative and assumes the role of prescribing rules, not of recording facts; it lacks overall perspective; often it is unable even to separate the written from the spoken word, etc.

Classical grammar has been criticized as unscientific; still, its basis is less open to criticism and its data are better defined than is true of the linguistics started by Bopp. The latter, occupying ill-defined ground, has no clear-cut objective. It straddles two areas because it is unable to make a sharp distinction between states and successions.

Linguistics, having accorded too large a place to history, will
turn back to the static viewpoint of traditional grammar but in a new spirit and with other procedures, and the historical method will have contributed to this rejuvenation; the historical method will in turn give a better understanding of language-states. The old grammar saw only the synchronic fact; linguistics has revealed a new class of phenomena; but that is not enough; one must sense the opposition between the two classes of facts to draw out all its consequences.

3. Inner Duality Illustrated by Examples

The opposition between the two viewpoints, the synchronic and the diachronic, is absolute and allows no compromise. A few facts will show what the difference is and why it is irreducible.

Latin *crispus* ‘crisp’ provided French with the root *crép*—from which were formed the verbs *crépir* ‘rough-cast’ and *décrépir* ‘remove mortar.’ Against this, at a certain moment the word *décrepitus*, of unknown origin, was borrowed from Latin and became *décrépit* ‘decrepit.’ Certainly today the community of speakers sets up a relation between *un mur décérépi* ‘a wall from which mortar is falling’ and *un homme décérépit* ‘a decrepit man,’ although historically the two words have nothing in common; people often speak of the façade *décérépite* of a house. And this is static, for it concerns the relation between two coexisting forms of language. For its realization, the concurrence of certain evolutionary events was necessary. The pronunciation of *crisp*—had to become *crép*—, and at a particular moment a new word had to be borrowed from Latin. It is obvious that the diachronic facts are not related to the static facts which they produced. They belong to a different class.

Here is a more telling example. In Old High German the plural of *gast* ‘guest’ was first *gasti*, that of *hant* ‘hand’ was *hanti*, etc. Later the final −*i* produced an umlaut, i.e. it resulted in the changing of the *a* of the preceding syllable to *e*: *gasti* → *gesti*; *hanti* → *henti*. Then the final −*i* lost its timbre: *gesti* → *geste*, etc. The result is that today German has *Gast*: *Gäste*, *Hand*: *Hände*, and a whole group of words marked by the same difference between the singular and the plural. A very similar fact occurred in Anglo-Saxon: the earlier forms were *fōt*: *fōti*, *tōb*: *tōbi*, *gōs*: *gōsi*, etc. Through an
initial phonetic change, umlaut, *fōtī became *fēti; through a second, the fall of final -i, fēti became fēt; after that, fōt had as its plural fēt; tōb, tēb; gōs, gēs, etc. (Modern English foot: feet, tooth: teeth, goose: geese.)

Previously, when speakers used gast: gasti, fōt: fōti, the simple addition of an i marked the plural; Gast: Gäste and fōt: fēt show a new mechanism for indicating the plural. The mechanism is not the same in both instances; in Old English there is only opposition between vowels; in German there is in addition the presence or absence of final -e; but here this difference is unimportant.

The relation between a singular and its plural, whatever the forms may be, can be expressed at each moment by a horizontal axis:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Period A} \\
\text{Period B}
\end{array} \]

Whatever facts have brought about passage from one form to another should be placed along a vertical axis, giving the overall picture:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Period A} \\
\text{Period B}
\end{array} \]

Our illustration suggests several pertinent remarks:

1) In no way do diachronic facts aim to signal a value by means of another sign; that gasti became gesti, geste (Gäste) has nothing to do with the plural of substantives; in tragit \( \rightarrow \) trägt, the same umlaut occurs in verbal inflection, and so forth. A diachronic fact is an independent event; the particular synchronic consequences that may stem from it are wholly unrelated to it.

2) Diachronic facts are not even directed toward changing the system. Speakers did not wish to pass from one system of relations to another; modification does not affect the arrangement but rather its elements.

Here we again find the principle enunciated previously: never is the system modified directly. In itself it is unchangeable; only certain elements are altered without regard for the solidarity that binds them to the whole. It is as if one of the planets that revolve
around the sun changed its dimensions and weight: this isolated event would entail general consequences and would throw the whole system out of equilibrium. The opposition of two terms is needed to express plurality: either fōt: fōti or fōt: fēl; both procedures are possible, but speakers passed from one to the other, so to speak, without having a hand in it. Neither was the whole replaced nor did one system engender another; one element in the first system was changed, and this change was enough to give rise to another system.

3) The foregoing observation points up the ever fortuitous nature of a state. In contrast to the false notion that we readily fashion for ourselves about it, language is not a mechanism created and arranged with a view to the concepts to be expressed. We see on the contrary that the state which resulted from the change was not destined to signal the meaning with which it was impregnated. In a fortuitous state (fōt: fēl), speakers took advantage of an existing difference and made it signal the distinction between singular and plural; fōt: fēl is no better for this purpose than fōt: *fōti. In each state the mind infiltrated a given substance and breathed life into it. This new perspective, inspired by historical linguistics, is unknown to traditional grammar, which could never acquire it by its own methods. Most philosophers of language are equally ignorant of it, and yet nothing is more important from the philosophical viewpoint.

4) Are facts of the diachronic series of the same class, at least, as facts of the synchronic series? By no means, for we have seen that changes are wholly unintentional while the synchronic fact is always significant. It always calls forth two simultaneous terms. Not Gäste alone but the opposition Gast: Gäste expresses the plural. The diachronic fact is just the opposite: only one term is involved, and for the new one to appear (Gäste), the old one (gasti) must first give way to it.

To try to unite such dissimilar facts in the same discipline would certainly be a fanciful undertaking. The diachronic perspective deals with phenomena that are unrelated to systems although they do condition them.

Here are some other examples to strengthen and complement the conclusions drawn from the first ones.
In French, the accent always falls on the last syllable unless this syllable contains a mute e (ə). This is a synchronic fact, a relation between the whole set of French words and accent. What is its source? A previous state. Latin had a different and more complicated system of accentuation: the accent was on the penultimate syllable when the latter was long; when short, the accent fell back on the antepenult (cf. amīcus, ánima). The Latin law suggests relations that are in no way analogous to the French law. Doubtless the accent is the same in the sense that it remained in the same position; in French words it always falls on the syllable that had it in Latin: amīcum → amī, ánimum → âme. But the two formulas are different for the two moments because the forms of the words changed. We know that everything after the accent either disappeared or was reduced to mute e. As a result of the alteration of the word, the position of the accent with respect to the whole was no longer the same; subsequently speakers, conscious of the new relation, instinctively put the accent on the last syllable, even in borrowed words introduced in their written forms (facile, consul, ticket, burgrave, etc.). Speakers obviously did not try to change systems, to apply a new formula, since in words like amīcum → amī the accent always remained on the same syllable; but a diachronic fact was interposed: speakers changed the position of the accent without having a hand in it. A law of accentuation, like everything that pertains to the linguistic system, is an arrangement of terms, a fortuitous and involuntary result of evolution.

Here is an even more striking example. In Old Slavic, slovo ‘word’ has in the instrumental singular slovem′b, in the nominative plural slova, in the genitive plural slov′b, etc.; in the declension each case has its own ending. But today the weak vowels b and ′b, Slavic representatives of Proto-Indo-European i and ů, have disappeared. Czech, for example, has slovo, slovem, slova, slov; likewise žena ‘woman’: accusative singular ženu, nominative plural ženy, genitive plural žen. Here the genitive (slov, žen) has zero inflection. We see then that a material sign is not necessary for the expression of an idea; language is satisfied with the opposition between something and nothing. Czech speakers recognize žen as a genitive plural simply because it is neither žena nor ženu nor any of the other forms. It seems strange at first glance that such a particular notion
as that of the genitive plural should have taken the zero sign, but this very fact proves that everything comes about through sheer accident. Language is a mechanism that continues to function in spite of the deteriorations to which it is subjected.

All this confirms the principles previously stated. To summarize:

Language is a system whose parts can and must all be considered in their synchronic solidarity.

Since changes never affect the system as a whole but rather one or another of its elements, they can be studied only outside the system. Each alteration doubtless has its countereffect on the system, but the initial fact affected only one point; there is no inner bond between the initial fact and the effect that it may subsequently produce on the whole system. The basic difference between successive terms and coexisting terms, between partial facts and facts that affect the system, precludes making both classes of fact the subject matter of a single science.

4. The Difference between the Two Classes Illustrated by Comparisons

To show both the autonomy and the interdependence of synchrony we can compare the first to the projection of an object on a plane surface. Any projection depends directly on the nature of the object projected, yet differs from it—the object itself is a thing apart. Otherwise there would not be a whole science of projections; considering the bodies themselves would suffice. In linguistics there is the same relationship between the historical facts and a language-state, which is like a projection of the facts at a particular moment. We do not learn about synchronic states by studying bodies, i.e. diachronic events, any more than we learn about geometric projections by studying, even carefully, the different types of bodies.

Similarly if the stem of a plant is cut transversely, a rather complicated design is formed by the cut surface; the design is simply one perspective of the longitudinal fibers, and we would be able to see them on making a second cut perpendicular to the first. Here again one perspective depends on the other; the longitudinal cut shows the fibers that constitute the plant, and the transversal cut shows their arrangement on a particular plane; but the second is distinct from the first because it brings out certain relations be-
tween the fibers—relations that we could never grasp by viewing the longitudinal plane.

But of all comparisons that might be imagined, the most fruitful is the one that might be drawn between the functioning of language and a game of chess. In both instances we are confronted with a system of values and their observable modifications. A game of chess is like an artificial realization of what language offers in a natural form.

Let us examine the matter more carefully.

First, a state of the set of chessmen corresponds closely to a state of language. The respective value of the pieces depends on their position on the chessboard just as each linguistic term derives its value from its opposition to all the other terms.

In the second place, the system is always momentary; it varies from one position to the next. It is also true that values depend above all else on an unchangeable convention, the set of rules that exists before a game begins and persists after each move. Rules that are agreed upon once and for all exist in language too; they are the constant principles of semiology.

Finally, to pass from one state of equilibrium to the next, or—according to our terminology—from one synchrony to the next, only one chesspiece has to be moved; there is no general rummage. Here we have the counterpart of the diachronic phenomenon with all its peculiarities. In fact:

(a) In each play only one chesspiece is moved; in the same way in language, changes affect only isolated elements.
(b) In spite of that, the move has a repercussion on the whole system; it is impossible for the player to foresee exactly the extent of the effect. Resulting changes of value will be, according to the circumstances, either nil, very serious, or of average importance. A certain move can revolutionize the whole game and even affect pieces that are not immediately involved. We have just seen that exactly the same holds for language.

(c) In chess, each move is absolutely distinct from the preceding and the subsequent equilibrium. The change effected belongs to neither state: only states matter.

In a game of chess any particular position has the unique characteristic of being freed from all antecedent positions; the route used in arriving there makes absolutely no difference; one who has followed the entire match has no advantage over the curious party who comes up at a critical moment to inspect the state of the game; to describe this arrangement, it is perfectly useless to recall what had just happened ten seconds previously. All this is equally applicable to language and sharpens the radical distinction between diachrony and synchrony. Speaking operates only on a language-state, and the changes that intervene between states have no place in either state.

At only one point is the comparison weak: the chessplayer intends to bring about a shift and thereby to exert an action on the system, whereas language premeditates nothing. The pieces of language are shifted—or rather modified—spontaneously and fortuitously. The umlaut of Hände for hanti and Gäste for gasti (see p. 83) produced a new system for forming the plural but also gave rise to verbal forms like trägt from tragit, etc. In order to make the game of chess seem at every point like the functioning of language, we would have to imagine an unconscious or unintelligent player. This sole difference, however, makes the comparison even more instructive by showing the absolute necessity of making a distinction between the two classes of phenomena in linguistics. For if diachronic facts cannot be reduced to the synchronic system which they condition when the change is intentional, all the more will they resist when they set a blind force against the organization of a system of signs.
5. The Two Linguistics Contrasted According to Their Methods and Principles

Everywhere the opposition between diachrony and synchrony stands out.

For instance—and to begin with the most apparent fact—they are not of equal importance. Here it is evident that the synchronic viewpoint predominates, for it is the true and only reality to the community of speakers (see p. 81). The same is true of the linguist: if he takes the diachronic perspective, he no longer observes language but rather a series of events that modify it. People often affirm that nothing is more important than understanding the genesis of a particular state; this is true in a certain sense: the forces that have shaped the state illuminate its true nature, and knowing them protects us against certain illusions (see pp. 84 ff.); but this only goes to prove clearly that diachronic linguistics is not an end in itself. What is said of journalism applies to diachrony: it leads everywhere if one departs from it.

The methods of diachrony and synchrony also differ, and in two ways.

(a) Synchrony has only one perspective, the speakers’, and its whole method consists of gathering evidence from speakers; to know to just what extent a thing is a reality, it is necessary and sufficient to determine to what extent it exists in the minds of speakers. Diachronic linguistics, on the contrary, must distinguish two perspectives. One of these, the prospective, follows the course of time; the other, the retrospective, goes back in time; the result is a duplication in methodology with which we shall deal in Part Five.

(b) A second difference results from delimiting the fields embraced by each of the two disciplines. Synchronic study has as its object, not everything that is simultaneous, but only the totality of facts corresponding to each language; separation will go as far as dialects and subdialects when necessary. The term synchronic is really not precise enough; it should be replaced by another—rather long to be sure—idiomsynchronous. Against this, diachronic linguistics not only does not need but even rejects such specialization; the terms that it studies do not necessarily belong to the same language (compare Proto-Indo-European *esti, Greek esti,
German *ist*, and French *est*). The succession of diachronic events and their multiplication in space are precisely what creates the diversity of idioms. To justify the associating of two forms, it is enough to show that they are connected by a historical bond, however indirect it may be.

The foregoing oppositions are neither the most striking nor the most profound. One consequence of the radical antimony between the evolutionary and the static fact is that all notions associated with one or the other are to the same extent mutually irreducible. Any notion will point up this truth. The synchronic and diachronic “phenomenon,” for example, have nothing in common (see p. 85). One is a relation between simultaneous elements, the other the substitution of one element for another in time, an event.

We shall also see (p. 107) that diachronic and synchronic identities are two very different things; historically the French negation *pas* is identical to the substantive *pas* ‘step,’ whereas the two forms are distinct in modern French. These observations would suffice to show the necessity of not confusing the two viewpoints, but nowhere is this necessity more apparent than in the distinction we are about to make.

6. *Synchronic and Diachronic Law*

It is a popular practice to speak of laws in linguistics. But are the facts of language actually governed by laws? If so, what are they like? Since language is a social institution, one might assume *a priori* that it is governed by prescriptions analogous to those that control communities. Now every social law has two basic characteristics: it is *imperative* and it is *general*; it comes in by force and it covers all cases—within certain limits of time and place, of course.

Do the laws of language fit this definition? The first step in answering the question—in line with what has just been said—is to separate once more the synchronic and diachronic areas. The two problems must not be confused; speaking of linguistic law in general is like trying to pin down a ghost.

Here are some examples, taken from Greek, in which the two classes are intentionally jumbled:
1. Proto-Indo-European voiced aspirates became voiceless: *dhūmos → thūmos ‘breath of life,’ *bherō → phērō ‘I bear,’ etc.
2. The accent never falls farther back than the antepenult.
3. All words end in a vowel or in s, n, or r, to the exclusion of all other consonants.
4. Prevocalic initial s became h (sign of aspiration): *septm (Latin septem) → heptá.
5. Final m changed to n: *jugom → zugón (cf. Latin jugum).  

Law 1 is diachronic: dh became th, etc. Law 2 expresses a relation between the word-unit and accent, a sort of contract between two coexisting terms; it is a synchronic law. The same is true of Law 3 since it concerns the word-unit and its ending. Laws 4, 5, and 6 are diachronic: s became h; –n replaced –m; –t, –k, etc. disappeared without leaving a trace.

We should also notice that Law 3 is the result of 5 and 6; two diachronic facts created a synchronic fact.

After we separate the two classes of laws, we see that Laws 2 and 3 are basically different from Laws 1, 4, 5, and 6.

The synchronic law is general but not imperative. Doubtless it is imposed on individuals by the weight of collective usage (see p. 73), but here I do not have in mind an obligation on the part of speakers. I mean that in language no force guarantees the maintenance of a regularity when established on some point. Being a simple expression of an existing arrangement, the synchronic law reports a state of affairs; it is like a law that states that trees in a certain orchard are arranged in the shape of a quincunx. And the arrangement that the law defines is precarious precisely because it is not imperative. Nothing is more regular than the synchronic law that governs Latin accentuation (a law comparable in every way to Law 2 above); but the accentual rule did not resist the

---

5 According to Meillet (Mem. de la Soc. de Ling., IX, pp. 365 ff.) and Gauthiot (La fin du mot indo-européen, pp. 158 ff.), final –m did not exist in Proto-Indo-European, which used only –n; if this theory is accepted, Law 5 can be stated in this way: Greek preserved every final –n; its demonstrative value is not diminished since the phonetic phenomenon that results in the preservation of a former state is the same in nature as the one that manifests a change (see p. 145). [Ed.]
forces of alteration and gave way to a new law, the one of French
(see above p. 86). In short, if one speaks of law in synchrony,
it is in the sense of an arrangement, a principle of regularity.

Diachrony, on the contrary, supposes a dynamic force through
which an effect is produced, a thing executed. But this imperative-
ness is not sufficient to warrant applying the concept of law to
evolutionary facts; we can speak of law only when a set of facts
obeys the same rule, and in spite of certain appearances to the
contrary, diachronic events are always accidental and particular.

The accidental and particular character of semantic facts is im-
mediately apparent. That French *poutre* 'mare' has acquired the
meaning 'piece of wood, rafter' is due to particular causes and does
not depend on other changes that might have occurred at the same
time. It is only one accident among all those registered in the
history of the language.

As for syntactical and morphological transformations, the issue
is not so clear from the outset. At a certain time almost all old
subject-case forms disappeared in French. Here a set of facts ap-
parently obeys the same law. But such is not the case, for all the
facts are but multiple manifestations of one and the same isolated
fact. The particular notion of subject was affected, and its dis-
appearance naturally caused a whole series of forms to vanish. For
one who sees only the external features of language, the unique
phenomenon is drowned in the multitude of its manifestations.
Basically, however, there is but one phenomenon, and this histori-
cal event is just as isolated in its own order as the semantic change
undergone by *poutre*. It takes on the appearance of a "law" only
because it is realized within a system. The rigid arrangement of the
system creates the illusion that the diachronic fact obeys the same
rules as the synchronic fact.

Finally, as regards phonetic changes, exactly the same is true.
Yet the popular practice is to speak of phonetic laws. Indeed, it is
said that at a given time and in a given area all words having
the same phonic features are affected by the same change; for
example, Law 1 on page 92 (*dhūmos → Greek *thūmos*) affects all
Greek words containing a voiced aspirate (cf. *nēbhos → nēphos,
*medhu → métu, *anghō → ánkhō, etc.); Law 4 (*septm → heptά)
applies to *serpō → hérpō, *sūs → hūs, and to all words that begin
with $s$. This regularity, which has at times been disputed, is apparently firmly established; obvious exceptions do not lessen the inevitability of such changes, for they can be explained either by more special phonetic laws (see the example of trikhes: thrikis, p. 97) or by the interference of facts of another class (analogy, etc.). Nothing seems to fit better the definition given above for the word law. And yet, regardless of the number of instances where a phonetic law holds, all facts embraced by it are but manifestations of a single particular fact.

The real issue is to find out whether phonetic changes affect words or only sounds, and there is no doubt about the answer: in *nephos, methu, ankhō*, etc. a certain phoneme—a voiced Proto-Indo-European aspirate—became voiceless, Proto-Greek initial $s$ became $h$, etc.; each fact is isolated, independent of the other events of the same class, independent also of the words in which the change took place. The phonic substance of all the words was of course modified, but this should not deceive us as to the real nature of the phenomenon.

What supports the statement that words themselves are not directly involved in phonetic transformations? The very simple observation that these transformations are basically alien to words and cannot touch their essence. The word-unit is not constituted solely by the totality of its phonemes but by characteristics other than its material quality. Suppose that one string of a piano is out of tune: a discordant note will be heard each time the one who is playing a melody strikes the corresponding key. But where is the discord? In the melody? Certainly not; the melody has not been affected; only the piano has been impaired. Exactly the same is true in phonetics. Our system of phonemes is the instrument we play in order to articulate the words of language; if one of its elements is modified, diverse consequences may ensue, but the modification itself is not concerned with the words which are, in a manner of speaking, the melodies of our repertory.

Of course the examples cited above are purely schematic: linguistics is right in trying currently to relate to the same initial principle the largest possible series of phonetic changes; for instance, Meillet explains all the transformations of Greek occlusives by progressive weakening of their articulation (see *Mem. de la Soc. de Ling.*, IX, pp. 163 ff.). Naturally the conclusions on the nature of phonetic changes are in the last analysis applicable to these general facts, wherever they exist. [Ed.]
Diachronic facts are then particular; a shift in a system is brought about by events which not only are outside the system (see p. 84), but are isolated and form no system among themselves.

To summarize: synchronic facts, no matter what they are, evidence a certain regularity but are in no way imperative; diachronic facts, on the contrary, force themselves upon language but are in no way general.

In a word—and this is the point I have been trying to make—neither of the two classes of facts is governed by laws in the sense defined above, and if one still wishes to speak of linguistic laws, the word will embrace completely different meanings, depending on whether it designates facts of one class or the other.

7. **Is There a Panchronic Viewpoint?**

Up to this point the term law has been used in the legal sense. But cannot the term also be used in language as in the physical and natural sciences, i.e. in the sense of relations that are everywhere and forever verifiable? In a word, can not language be studied from a panchronic viewpoint?

Doubtless. Since phonetic changes have always occurred and are still occurring, this general phenomenon is a permanent characteristic of speech; it is therefore one of the laws of speech. In linguistics as in chess (see pp. 88 ff.) there are rules that outlive all events. But they are general principles existing independently of concrete facts. When we speak of particular, tangible facts, there is no panchronic viewpoint. Each phonetic change, regardless of its actual spread, is limited to a definite time and territory; no change occurs at all times and in all places; change exists only diachronically. These general principles are precisely what serve as a criterion for determining what belongs to language and what does not. A concrete fact that lends itself to panchronic explanation cannot belong to language. Take the French word *chose* 'thing': from the diachronic viewpoint it stands in opposition to the Latin word from which it derives, *causa*; from the synchronic viewpoint it stands in opposition to every word that might be associated with it in Modern French. Only the sounds of the word considered independently (§ɔz) are susceptible of panchronic observation, but
they have no linguistic value. Even from the panchronic viewpoint §göz, considered in a chain like ün §göz admirable ‘an admirable thing,’ is not a unit but a shapeless mass; indeed, why §göz rather than qez or nëg? It is not a value, for it has no meaning. From the panchronic viewpoint the particular facts of language are never reached.

8. Consequences of the Confusing of Synchrony and Diachrony

Two instances will be cited:

(a) Synchronic truth seems to be the denial of diachronic truth, and one who has a superficial view of things imagines that a choice must be made; this is really unnecessary; one truth does not exclude the other. That French dépité ‘spite’ originally meant contempt does not prevent the word from having a completely different meaning now; etymology and synchronic value are distinct. Similarly, traditional grammar teaches that the present participle is variable and shows agreement in the same manner as an adjective in certain cases in Modern French (cf. une eau courante ‘running water’) but is invariable in others (cf. une personne courant dans la rue ‘a person running in the street’). But historical grammar shows that it is not a question of one and the same form: the first is the continuation of the variable Latin participle (currentum) while the second comes from the invariable ablative form of the gerund (currendō). Does synchronic truth contradict diachronic truth, and must one condemn traditional grammar in the name of historical grammar? No, for that would be seeing only half of the facts; one must not think that the historical fact alone matters and is sufficient to constitute language. Doubtless from the viewpoint of its origin the participle courant has two elements, but in the collective mind of the community of speakers, these are drawn together and fused into one. The synchronic truth is just as absolute and indisputable as the diachronic truth.

(b) Synchronic truth is so similar to diachronic truth that people confuse the two or think it superfluous to separate them. For example, they try to explain the meaning of French père ‘father’

[7 This generally accepted theory has been recently but, we believe, unsuccessfully attacked by M. E. Larch (Das invariable Particignum præsentis, Erlangen, 1913); there was then no reason for eliminating an example that would retain its didactic value. [Ed.]
by saying that Latin pater meant the same thing. Another example: Latin short a became i in noninitial open syllables; beside faciō we have consiciō, beside amicus, inimicus, etc. The law is often stated in this way: "The a of faciō becomes i in consiciō because it is no longer in the first syllable." That is not true: never did the a "become" i in consiciō. To re-establish the truth one must single out two periods and four terms. Speakers first said faciō—consiciō; then, consiciō having been changed to consiciō while faciō remained unchanged, they said faciō—consiciō:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{faciō} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{consiciō} \quad \quad \text{Period A} \\
\text{faciō} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{consiciō} \quad \quad \text{Period B}
\end{align*}
\]

If a "change" occurred, it is between consiciō and consiciō; but the rule, badly formulated, does not even mention consiciō! Then beside the diachronic change there is a second fact, absolutely distinct from the first and having to do with the purely synchronic opposition between faciō and consiciō. One is tempted to say that it is not a fact but a result. Nevertheless, it is a fact in its own class; indeed, all synchronic phenomena are like this. The true value of the opposition faciō: consiciō is not recognized for the very reason that the opposition is not very significant. But oppositions like Gast: Gaste and gebe: gibt, though also fortuitous results of phonetic evolution, are nonetheless basic grammatical phenomena of the synchronic class. The fact that both classes are in other respects closely linked, each conditioning the other, points to the conclusion that keeping them apart is not worthwhile; in fact, linguistics has confused them for decades without realizing that such a method is worthless.

The mistake shows up conspicuously in certain instances. To explain Greek phuktós, for example, it might seem sufficient to say that in Greek g or kh became k before voiceless consonants, and to cite by way of explanation such synchronic correspondences as phugein: phuktós, lékhsos: léktron, etc. But in a case like trikhès: thríksi there is a complication, the "passing" of l to th. The forms can be explained only historically, by relative chronology. The Proto-Greek theme *thrikh, followed by the ending -sti, became thríksi, a very old development identical to the one that produced
lēktron from the root lekh–. Later every aspirate followed by another aspirate in the same word was changed into an occlusive, and *thrikhes became trikhes; naturally thriksi escaped this law.

9. Conclusions
Linguistics here comes to its second bifurcation. We had first to choose between language and speaking (see pp. 17 ff.); here we are again at the intersection of two roads, one leading to diachrony and the other to synchrony.

Once in possession of this double principle of classification, we can add that everything diachronic in language is diachronic only by virtue of speaking. It is in speaking that the germ of all change is found. Each change is launched by a certain number of individuals before it is accepted for general use. Modern German uses ich war, wir waren, whereas until the sixteenth century the conjugation was ich was, wir waren (cf. English I was, we were). How did the substitution of war for was come about? Some speakers, influenced by waren, created war through analogy; this was a fact of speaking; the new form, repeated many times and accepted by the community, became a fact of language. But not all innovations of speaking have the same success, and so long as they remain individual, they may be ignored, for we are studying language; they do not enter into our field of observation until the community of speakers has adopted them.

An evolutionary fact is always preceded by a fact, or rather by a multitude of similar facts, in the sphere of speaking. This in no way invalidates but rather strengthens the distinction made above since in the history of any innovation there are always two distinct moments: (1) when it sprang up in individual usage; and (2) when it became a fact of language, outwardly identical but adopted by the community.

The following table indicates the rational form that linguistic study should take:

(Human) Speech

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \text{Language} \} \\
\{ & \text{Speaking} \} \\
\{ & \text{Synchrony} \} \\
\{ & \text{Diachrony} \}
\end{align*}
\]
One must recognize that the ideal, theoretical form of a science is not always the one imposed upon it by the exigencies of practice; in linguistics these exigencies are more imperious than anywhere else; they account to some extent for the confusion that now predominates in linguistic research. Even if the distinctions set up here were accepted once and for all, a precise orientation probably could not be imposed on investigations in the name of the stated ideal.

In the synchronic study of Old French, for instance, the linguist works with facts and principles that have nothing in common with those that he would find out by tracing the history of the same language from the thirteenth to the twentieth century; on the contrary, he works with facts and principles similar to those that would be revealed in the description of an existing Bantu language, Attic Greek of 400 B.C. or present-day French, for that matter. These diverse descriptions would be based on similar relations; if each idiom is a closed system, all idioms embody certain fixed principles that the linguist meets again and again in passing from one to another, for he is staying in the same class. Historical study is no different. Whether the linguist examines a definite period in the history of French (for example, from the thirteenth to the twentieth century) Javanese, or any other language whatsoever, everywhere he works with similar facts which he needs only compare in order to establish the general truths of the diachronic class. The ideal would be for each scholar to devote himself to one field of investigation or the other and deal with the largest possible number of facts in this class; but it is very difficult to command scientifically such different languages. Against this, each language in practice forms a unit of study, and we are induced by force of circumstances to consider it alternately from the historical and static viewpoints. Above all else, we must never forget that this unit is superficial in theory, whereas the diversity of idioms hides a profound unity. Whichever way we look in studying a language, we must put each fact in its own class and not confuse the two methods.

The two parts of linguistics respectively, as defined, will be the object of our study.

*Static and Evolutionary Linguistics* will be concerned with the logical and
psychological relations that bind together coexisting terms and form a system in the collective mind of speakers.

*Diachronic linguistics*, on the contrary, will study relations that bind together successive terms not perceived by the collective mind but substituted for each other without forming a system.
PART TWO
Synchronic Linguistics

Chapter I

GENERALITIES

The aim of general synchronic linguistics is to set up the fundamental principles of any idiosyncratic system, the constituents of any language-state. Many of the items already explained in Part One belong rather to synchrony; for instance, the general properties of the sign are an integral part of synchrony although they were used to prove the necessity of separating the two linguistics.

To synchrony belongs everything called "general grammar," for it is only through language-states that the different relations which are the province of grammar are established. In the following chapters we shall consider only the basic principles necessary for approaching the more special problems of static linguistics or explaining in detail a language-state.

The study of static linguistics is generally much more difficult than the study of historical linguistics. Evolutionary facts are more concrete and striking; their observable relations tie together successive terms that are easily grasped; it is easy, often even amusing, to follow a series of changes. But the linguistics that penetrates values and coexisting relations presents much greater difficulties.

In practice a language-state is not a point but rather a certain span of time during which the sum of the modifications that have supervened is minimal. The span may cover ten years, a generation, a century, or even more. It is possible for a language to change hardly at all over a long span and then to undergo radical transformations within a few years. Of two languages that exist side by side during a given period, one may evolve drastically and the other practically not at all; study would have to be diachronic in the former instance, synchronic in the latter. An absolute state is defined by the absence of changes, and since language changes
somewhat in spite of everything, studying a language-state means in practice disregarding changes of little importance, just as mathematicians disregard infinitesimal quantities in certain calculations, such as logarithms.

Political history makes a distinction between *era*, a point in time, and *period*, which embraces a certain duration. Still, the historian speaks of the Antoninian Era, the Era of the Crusades, etc. when he considers a set of characteristics which remained constant during those times. One might also say that static linguistics deals with eras. But *state* is preferable. The beginning and the end of an era are generally characterized by some rather brusque revolution that tends to modify the existing state of affairs. The word state avoids giving the impression that anything similar occurs in language. Besides, precisely because it is borrowed from history, the term era makes one think less of language itself than of the circumstances that surround it and condition it; in short, it suggests rather the idea of what we called external linguistics (see p. 20).

Besides, delimitation in time is not the only difficulty that we encounter in defining a language-state: space presents the same problem. In short, a concept of a language-state can be only approximate. In static linguistics, as in most sciences, no course of reasoning is possible without the usual simplification of data.

Chapter II

THE CONCRETE ENTITIES OF LANGUAGE

1. Definition: Entity and Unit
   The signs that make up language are not abstractions but real objects (see p. 15); signs and their relations are what linguistics studies; they are the *concrete entities* of our science.

   Let us first recall two principles that dominate the whole issue:

   1) The linguistic entity exists only through the associating of the signifier with the signified (see p. 66 ff.). Whenever only one ele-
ment is retained, the entity vanishes; instead of a concrete object we are faced with a mere abstraction. We constantly risk grasping only a part of the entity and thinking that we are embracing it in its totality; this would happen, for example, if we divided the spoken chain into syllables, for the syllable has no value except in phonology. A succession of sounds is linguistic only if it supports an idea. Considered independently, it is material for a physiological study, and nothing more than that.

The same is true of the signed as soon as it is separated from its signifier. Considered independently, concepts like “house,” “white,” “see,” etc. belong to psychology. They become linguistic entities only when associated with sound-images; in language, a concept is a quality of its phonic substance just as a particular slice of sound is a quality of the concept.

The two-sided linguistic unit has often been compared with the human person, made up of the body and the soul. The comparison is hardly satisfactory. A better choice would be a chemical compound like water, a combination of hydrogen and oxygen; taken separately, neither element has any of the properties of water.

2) The linguistic entity is not accurately defined until it is delimited, i.e. separated from everything that surrounds it on the phonic chain. These delimited entities or units stand in opposition to each other in the mechanism of language.

One is at first tempted to liken linguistic signs to visual signs, which can exist in space without becoming confused, and to assume that separation of the significant elements can be accomplished in the same way, without recourse to any mental process. The word “form,” which is often used to indicate them (cf. the expression “verbal form,” “noun form”) gives support to the mistake. But we know that the main characteristic of the sound-chain is that it is linear (see p. 70). Considered by itself, it is only a line, a continuous ribbon along which the ear perceives no self-sufficient and clear-cut division; to divide the chain, we must call in meanings. When we hear an unfamiliar language, we are at a loss to say how the succession of sounds should be analyzed, for analysis is impossible if only the phonic side of the linguistic phenomenon is considered. But when we know the meaning and function that must
be attributed to each part of the chain, we see the parts detach themselves from each other and the shapeless ribbon break into segments. Yet there is nothing material in the analysis.

To summarize: language does not offer itself as a set of pre-delimited signs that need only be studied according to their meaning and arrangement; it is a confused mass, and only attentiveness and familiarization will reveal its particular elements. The unit has no special phonic character, and the only definition that we can give it is this: it is a slice of sound which to the exclusion of everything that precedes and follows it in the spoken chain is the signifier of a certain concept.

2. Method of Delimitation

One who knows a language singles out its units by a very simple method—in theory, at any rate. His method consists of using speaking as the source material of language and picturing it as two parallel chains, one of concepts (A) and the other of sound-images (B).

In an accurate delimitation, the division along the chain of sound-images (a, b, c) will correspond to the division along the chain of concepts (a', b', c'):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
A & a & b & c \\
\hline
B & a' & b' & c'
\end{array}
\]

Take French siżlapra. Can we cut the chain after l and make siżl a unit? No, we need only consider the concepts to see that the division is wrong. Neither is the syllabic division siż-la-pra to be taken for granted as having linguistic value. The only possible divisions are these: (1) si-ż-la-pra (si je la prends 'if I take it') and (2) si-ż-l-aprä (si je l'apprends 'if I learn it'), and they are determined by the meaning that is attached to the words.1

To verify the result of the procedure and be assured that we are really dealing with a unit, we must be able in comparing a series of

1 Cf. the sounds [jurməm] in English: "your mine" or "you're mine." [Tr.]
sentences in which the same unit occurs to separate the unit from the rest of the context and find in each instance that meaning justifies the delimitation. Take the two French phrases la force du vent (‘the force of the wind’) and abus de force (‘exhausted’; literally: ‘at the end of one’s force’). In each phrase the same concept coincides with the same phonic slice, force; thus it is certain a linguistic unit. But in il me force to parler (‘he forces me to talk’) force has an entirely different meaning: it is therefore another unit.

3. Practical Difficulties of Delimitation

The method outlined above is very simple in theory, but is it easy to apply? We are tempted to think so if we start from the notion that the units to be isolated are words. For what is a sentence except a combination of words? And what can be grasped more readily than words? Going back to the example given above, we may say that the analysis of the spoken chain sižlaprâ resulted in the delimiting of four units, and that the units are words: si-je-l-apprends. But we are immediately put on the defensive on noting that there has been much disagreement about the nature of the word, and a little reflection shows that the usual meaning of the term is incompatible with the notion of concrete unit.

To be convinced, we need only think of French cheval ‘horse’ and its plural from chevaux. People readily say that they are two forms of the same word; but considered as wholes, they are certainly two distinct things with respect to both meaning and sound. In mwa (mois, as in le mois de Septembre ‘the month of September’) and mwaz (mois, in un mois après ‘a month later’) there are also two forms of the same word, and there is no question of a concrete unit. The meaning is the same, but the slices of sound are different. As soon as we try to liken concrete units to words, we face a dilemma: we must either ignore the relation—which is nonetheless evident—that binds cheval and chevaux, the two sounds of mwa and mwaz, etc. and say that they are different words, or instead of concrete units be satisfied with the abstraction that links the different forms of the same word. The concrete unit must be sought, not in the word, but elsewhere. Besides, many words are
complex units, and we can easily single out their subunits (suffixes, prefixes, radicals). Derivatives like pain-ful and delight-ful can be divided into distinct parts, each having an obvious meaning and function. Conversely, some units are larger than words: compounds (French porte-plume 'penholder'), locutions (s'il vous plaît 'please'), inflected forms (il a été 'he has been'), etc. But these units resist delimitation as strongly as do words proper, making it extremely difficult to disentangle the interplay of units that are found in a sound-chain and to specify the concrete elements on which a language functions.

Doubtless speakers are unaware of the practical difficulties of delimiting units. Anything that is of even the slightest significance seems like a concrete element to them and they never fail to single it out in discourse. But it is one thing to feel the quick, delicate interplay of units and quite another to account for them through methodical analysis.

A rather widely held theory makes sentences the concrete units of language: we speak only in sentences and subsequently single out the words. But to what extent does the sentence belong to language (see p. 124)? If it belongs to speaking, the sentence cannot pass for the linguistic unit. But let us suppose that this difficulty is set aside. If we picture to ourselves in their totality the sentences that could be uttered, their most striking characteristic is that in no way do they resemble each other. We are at first tempted to liken the immense diversity of sentences to the equal diversity of the individuals that make up a zoological species. But this is an illusion: the characteristics that animals of the same species have in common are much more significant than the differences that separate them. In sentences, on the contrary, diversity is dominant, and when we look for the link that bridges their diversity, again we find, without having looked for it, the word with its grammatical characteristics and thus fall back into the same difficulties as before.

4. Conclusion

In most sciences the question of units never even arises: the units are delimited from the outset. In zoology, the animal immediately presents itself. Astronomy works with units that are separated in
space, the stars. The chemist can study the nature and composition of potassium bichromate without doubting for an instant that this is a well-defined object.

When a science has no concrete units that are immediately recognizable, it is because they are not necessary. In history, for example, is the unit the individual, the era, or the nation? We do not know. But what does it matter? We can study history without knowing the answer.

But just as the game of chess is entirely in the combination of the different chesspieces, language is characterized as a system based entirely on the opposition of its concrete units. We can neither dispense with becoming acquainted with them nor take a single step without coming back to them; and still, delimiting them is such a delicate problem that we may wonder at first whether they really exist.

Language then has the strange, striking characteristic of not having entities that are perceptible at the outset and yet of not permitting us to doubt that they exist and that their functioning constitutes it. Doubtless we have here a trait that distinguishes language from all other semiological institutions.

Chapter III

IDENTITIES, REALITIES, VALUES

The statement just made brings us squarely up against a problem that is all the more important because any basic notion in static linguistics depends directly on our conception of the unit and even blends with it. This is what I should like successively to demonstrate with respect to the notions of synchronic identity, reality, and value.

A. What is a synchronic identity? Here it is not a question of the identity that links the French negation pas ‘not’ to Latin passum, a diachronic identity that will be dealt with elsewhere (see p. 181), but rather of the equally interesting identity by virtue of which we
state that two sentences like je ne sais pas 'I don't know' and ne dites pas cela 'don't say that' contain the same element. An idle question, one might say; there is identity because the same slice of sound carries the same meaning in the two sentences. But that explanation is unsatisfactory, for if the correspondence of slices of sound and concepts is proof of identity (see above, p. 105, la force du vent: a bout de force), the reverse is not true. There can be identity without this correspondence. When Gentlemen! is repeated several times during a lecture, the listener has the feeling that the same expression is being used each time, and yet variations in utterance and intonation make for appreciable phonic differences in diverse contexts—differences just as appreciable as those that elsewhere separate different words (cf. French pomme 'apple' and paume 'palm,' goutte 'drop' and je goute 'I taste,' fuir 'flee,' and fourir 'stuff,' etc.); besides, the feeling of identity persists even though there is no absolute identity between one Gentlemen! and the next from a semantic viewpoint either. In the same vein, a word can express quite different ideas without compromising its identity (cf. French adopter une mode 'adopt a fashion' and adopter un enfant 'adopt a child,' la fleur du pommier 'the flower of the apple tree' and la fleur de la noblesse 'the flower of nobility,' etc.).

The linguistic mechanism is geared to differences and identities, the former being only the counterpart of the latter. Everywhere then, the problem of identities appears; moreover, it blends partially with the problem of entities and units and is only a complication—illuminating at some points—of the larger problem. This characteristic stands out if we draw some comparisons with facts taken from outside speech. For instance, we speak of the identity of two "8:25 p.m. Geneva-to-Paris" trains that leave at twenty-four hour intervals. We feel that it is the same train each day, yet everything—the locomotive, coaches, personnel—is probably different. Or if a street is demolished, then rebuilt, we say that it is the same street even though in a material sense, perhaps nothing of the old one remains. Why can a street be completely rebuilt and still be the same? Because it does not constitute a purely material entity; it is based on certain conditions that are distinct from the materials

that fit the conditions, e.g. its location with respect to other streets. Similarly, what makes the express is its hour of departure, its route, and in general every circumstance that sets it apart from other trains. Whenever the same conditions are fulfilled, the same entities are obtained. Still, the entities are not abstract since we cannot conceive of a street or train outside its material realization.

Let us contrast the preceding examples with the completely different case of a suit which has been stolen from me and which I find in the window of a second-hand store. Here we have a material entity that consists solely of the inert substance—the cloth, its lining, its trimmings, etc. Another suit would not be mine regardless of its similarity to it. But linguistic identity is not that of the garment; it is that of the train and the street. Each time I say the word Gentlemen! I renew its substance; each utterance is a new phonic act and a new psychological act. The bond between the two uses of the same word depends neither on material identity nor on sameness in meaning but on elements which must be sought after and which will point up the true nature of linguistic units.

B. What is a synchronic reality? To what concrete or abstract elements of language can the name be applied?

Take as an example the distinction between the parts of speech. What supports the classing of words as substantives, adjectives, etc.? Is it done in the name of a purely logical, extra-linguistic principle that is applied to grammar from without like the degrees of longitude and latitude on the globe? Or does it correspond to something that has its place in the system of language and is conditioned by it? In a word, is it a synchronic reality? The second supposition seems probable, but the first could also be defended. In the French sentence ces gants sont bon marché ‘these gloves are cheap,’ is bon marché an adjective? It is apparently an adjective from a logical viewpoint but not from the viewpoint of grammar, for bon marché fails to behave as an adjective (it is invariable, it never precedes its noun, etc.); in addition, it is composed of two words. Now the distinction between parts of speech is exactly what should serve to classify the words of language. How can a group of words be attributed to one of the “parts”? But to say that bon ‘good’ is an adjective and marché ‘market’ a substantive explains nothing. We are then dealing with a defective or incomplete clas-
sification; the division of words into substantives, verbs, adjectives, etc. is not an undeniable linguistic reality.¹

Linguistics accordingly works continuously with concepts forged by grammarians without knowing whether or not the concepts actually correspond to the constituents of the system of language. But how can we find out? And if they are phantoms, what realities can we place in opposition to them?

To be rid of illusions we must first be convinced that the concrete entities of language are not directly accessible. If we try to grasp them, we come into contact with the true facts. Starting from there, we can set up all the classifications that linguistics needs for arranging all the facts at its disposal. On the other hand, to base the classifications on anything except concrete entities—to say, for example, that the parts of speech are the constituents of language simply because they correspond to categories of logic—is to forget that there are no linguistic facts apart from the phonic substance cut into significant elements.

C. Finally, not every idea touched upon in this chapter differs basically from what we have elsewhere called values. A new comparison with the set of chessmen will bring out this point (see pp. 88 ff.). Take a knight, for instance. By itself is it an element in the game? Certainly not, for by its material make-up—outside its square and the other conditions of the game—it means nothing to the player; it becomes a real, concrete element only when endowed with value and wedded to it. Suppose that the piece happens to be destroyed or lost during a game. Can it be replaced by an equivalent piece? Certainly. Not only another knight but even a figure shorn of any resemblance to a knight can be declared identical provided the same value is attributed to it. We see then that in semiological systems like language, where elements hold each other in equilibrium in accordance with fixed rules, the notion of identity blends with that of value and vice versa.

In a word, that is why the notion of value envelopes the notions of unit, concrete entity, and reality. But if there is no fundamental

¹ Form, function, and meaning combine to make the classing of the parts of speech even more difficult in English than in French. Cf. ten-foot: ten feet in a ten-foot pole: the pole is ten feet long. [Tr.]
difference between these diverse notions, it follows that the problem can be stated successively in several ways. Whether we try to define the unit, reality, concrete entity, or value, we always come back to the central question that dominates all of static linguistics.

It would be interesting from a practical viewpoint to begin with units, to determine what they are and to account for their diversity by classifying them. It would be necessary to search for the reason for dividing language into words—for in spite of the difficulty of defining it, the word is a unit that strikes the mind, something central in the mechanism of language—but that is a subject which by itself would fill a volume. Next we would have to classify the subunits, then the larger units, etc. By determining in this way the elements that it manipulates, synchronic linguistics would completely fulfill its task, for it would relate all synchronic phenomena to their fundamental principle. It cannot be said that this basic problem has ever been faced squarely or that its scope and difficulty have been understood; in the matter of language, people have always been satisfied with ill-defined units.

Still, in spite of their capital importance, it is better to approach the problem of units through the study of value, for in my opinion value is of prime importance.

Chapter IV

LINGUISTIC VALUE

1. Language as Organized Thought Coupled with Sound

To prove that language is only a system of pure values, it is enough to consider the two elements involved in its functioning: ideas and sounds.

Psychologically our thought—apart from its expression in words—is only a shapeless and indistinct mass. Philosophers and linguists have always agreed in recognizing that without the help of signs we would be unable to make a clear-cut, consistent distinction
between two ideas. Without language, thought is a vague, uncharted nebula. There are no pre-existing ideas, and nothing is distinct before the appearance of language.

Against the floating realm of thought, would sounds by themselves yield predelimited entities? No more so than ideas. Phonic substance is neither more fixed nor more rigid than thought; it is not a mold into which thought must of necessity fit but a plastic substance divided in turn into distinct parts to furnish the signifiers needed by thought. The linguistic fact can therefore be pictured in its totality—i.e. language—as a series of contiguous subdivisions marked off on both the indefinite plane of jumbled ideas (A) and the equally vague plane of sounds (B). The following diagram gives a rough idea of it:

![Diagram of A and B planes]

The characteristic role of language with respect to thought is not to create a material phonic means for expressing ideas but to serve as a link between thought and sound, under conditions that of necessity bring about the reciprocal delimitations of units. Thought, chaotic by nature, has to become ordered in the process of its decomposition. Neither are thoughts given material form nor are sounds transformed into mental entities; the somewhat mysterious fact is rather that “thought-sound” implies division, and that language works out its units while taking shape between two shapeless masses. Visualize the air in contact with a sheet of water; if the atmospheric pressure changes, the surface of the water will be broken up into a series of divisions, waves; the waves resemble the union or coupling of thought with phonic substance.

Language might be called the domain of articulations, using the
word as it was defined earlier (see p. 10). Each linguistic term is a member, an *articulus* in which an idea is fixed in a sound and a sound becomes the sign of an idea.

Language can also be compared with a sheet of paper: thought is the front and the sound the back; one cannot cut the front without cutting the back at the same time; likewise in language, one can neither divide sound from thought nor thought from sound; the division could be accomplished only abstractedly, and the result would be either pure psychology or pure phonology.

Linguistics then works in the borderland where the elements of sound and thought combine; *their combination produces a form, not a substance.*

These views give a better understanding of what was said before (see pp. 67 ff.) about the arbitrariness of signs. Not only are the two domains that are linked by the linguistic fact shapeless and confused, but the choice of a given slice of sound to name a given idea is completely arbitrary. If this were not true, the notion of value would be compromised, for it would include an externally imposed element. But actually values remain entirely relative, and that is why the bond between the sound and the idea is radically arbitrary.

The arbitrary nature of the sign explains in turn why the social fact alone can create a linguistic system. The community is necessary if values that owe their existence solely to usage and general acceptance are to be set up; by himself the individual is incapable of fixing a single value.

In addition, the idea of value, as defined, shows that to consider a term as simply the union of a certain sound with a certain concept is grossly misleading. To define it in this way would isolate the term from its system; it would mean assuming that one can start from the terms and construct the system by adding them together when, on the contrary, it is from the interdependent whole that one must start and through analysis obtain its elements.

To develop this thesis, we shall study value successively from the viewpoint of the signified or concept (Section 2), the signifier (Section 3), and the complete sign (Section 4).

Being unable to seize the concrete entities or units of language directly, we shall work with words. While the word does not con-
form exactly to the definition of the linguistic unit (see p. 105), it at least bears a rough resemblance to the unit and has the advantage of being concrete; consequently, we shall use words as specimens equivalent to real terms in a synchronic system, and the principles that we evolve with respect to words will be valid for entities in general.

2. Linguistic Value from a Conceptual Viewpoint

When we speak of the value of a word, we generally think first of its property of standing for an idea, and this is in fact one side of linguistic value. But if this is true, how does value differ from signification? Might the two words be synonyms? I think not, although it is easy to confuse them, since the confusion results not so much from their similarity as from the subtlety of the distinction that they mark.

From a conceptual viewpoint, value is doubtless one element in signification, and it is difficult to see how signification can be dependent upon value and still be distinct from it. But we must clear up the issue or risk reducing language to a simple naming-process (see p. 65).

Let us first take signification as it is generally understood and as it was pictured on page 67. As the arrows in the drawing show, it is only the counterpart of the sound-image. Everything that occurs concerns only the sound-image and the concept when we look upon the word as independent and self-contained.

But here is the paradox: on the one hand the concept seems to be the counterpart of the sound-image, and on the other hand the sign itself is in turn the counterpart of the other signs of language.

Language is a system of interdependent terms in which the value of each term results solely from the simultaneous presence of the others, as in the diagram:
How, then, can value be confused with signification, i.e. the counterpart of the sound-image? It seems impossible to liken the relations represented here by horizontal arrows to those represented above (p. 114) by vertical arrows. Putting it another way—and again taking up the example of the sheet of paper that is cut in two (see p. 113)—it is clear that the observable relation between the different pieces A, B, C, D, etc. is distinct from the relation between the front and back of the same piece as in A/A', B/B', etc.

To resolve the issue, let us observe from the outset that even outside language all values are apparently governed by the same paradoxical principle. They are always composed:

(1) of a dissimilar thing that can be exchanged for the thing of which the value is to be determined; and

(2) of similar things that can be compared with the thing of which the value is to be determined.

Both factors are necessary for the existence of a value. To determine what a five-franc piece is worth one must therefore know:

(1) that it can be exchanged for a fixed quantity of a different thing, e.g. bread; and (2) that it can be compared with a similar value of the same system, e.g. a one-franc piece, or with coins of another system (a dollar, etc.). In the same way a word can be exchanged for something dissimilar, an idea; besides, it can be compared with something of the same nature, another word. Its value is therefore not fixed so long as one simply states that it can be “exchanged” for a given concept, i.e. that it has this or that signification: one must also compare it with similar values, with other words that stand in opposition to it. Its content is really fixed only by the concurrence of everything that exists outside it. Being part of a system, it is endowed not only with a signification but also and especially with a value, and this is something quite different.

A few examples will show clearly that this is true. Modern French mouton can have the same signification as English sheep but not the same value, and this for several reasons, particularly because in speaking of a piece of meat ready to be served on the
table, English uses *mutton* and not *sheep*. The difference in value between *sheep* and *mutton* is due to the fact that *sheep* has beside it a second term while the French word does not.

Within the same language, all words used to express related ideas limit each other reciprocally; synonyms like French *redouter* ‘dread,’ *craindre* ‘fear,’ and *avoir peur* ‘be afraid’ have value only through their opposition: if *redouter* did not exist, all its content would go to its competitors. Conversely, some words are enriched through contact with others: e.g. the new element introduced in *décépi* (un vieillard *décépi*, see p. 83) results from the co-existence of *décépi* (un mur *décépi*). The value of just any term is accordingly determined by its environment; it is impossible to fix even the value of the word signifying “sun” without first considering its surroundings: in some languages it is not possible to say “sit in the sun.”

Everything said about words applies to any term of language, e.g. to grammatical entities. The value of a French plural does not coincide with that of a Sanskrit plural even though their signification is usually identical; Sanskrit has three numbers instead of two (*my eyes, my ears, my arms, my legs, etc. are dual*); it would be wrong to attribute the same value to the plural in Sanskrit and in French; its value clearly depends on what is outside and around it.

If words stood for pre-existing concepts, they would all have exact equivalents in meaning from one language to the next; but this is not true. French uses *louer* (*une maison*) ‘let (a house)’ indifferently to mean both “pay for” and “receive payment for,” whereas German uses two words, *mieten* and *vermieten*; there is obviously no exact correspondence of values. The German verbs *schätzen* and *urteilen* share a number of significations, but that correspondence does not hold at several points.

Inflection offers some particularly striking examples. Distinctions of time, which are so familiar to us, are unknown in certain languages. Hebrew does not recognize even the fundamental

---

4 The use of the comparative form for two and the superlative for more than two in English (e.g. *may the better boxer win: the best boxer in the world*) is probably a remnant of the old distinction between the dual and the plural number. [Tr.]
distinctions between the past, present, and future. Proto-Germanic has no special form for the future; to say that the future is expressed by the present is wrong, for the value of the present is not the same in Germanic as in languages that have a future along with the present. The Slavic languages regularly single out two aspects of the verb: the perfective represents action as a point, complete in its totality; the imperfective represents it as taking place, and on the line of time. The categories are difficult for a Frenchman to understand, for they are unknown in French; if they were predetermined, this would not be true. Instead of pre-existing ideas then, we find in all the foregoing examples values emanating from the system. When they are said to correspond to concepts, it is understood that the concepts are purely differential and defined not by their positive content but negatively by their relations with the other terms of the system. Their most precise characteristic is in being what the others are not.

Now the real interpretation of the diagram of the signal becomes apparent. Thus

![Diagram](image)

means that in French the concept “to judge” is linked to the sound-image _juger_; in short, it symbolizes signification. But it is quite clear that initially the concept is nothing, that is only a value determined by its relations with other similar values, and that without them the signification would not exist. If I state simply that a word signifies something when I have in mind the associating of a sound-image with a concept, I am making a statement that may suggest what actually happens, but by no means am I expressing the linguistic fact in its essence and fullness.

3. *Linguistic Value from a Material Viewpoint*

The conceptual side of value is made up solely of relations and differences with respect to the other terms of language, and the
same can be said of its material side. The important thing in the word is not the sound alone but the phonic differences that make it possible to distinguish this word from all others, for differences carry signification.

This may seem surprising, but how indeed could the reverse be possible? Since one vocal image is no better suited than the next for what it is commissioned to express, it is evident, even a priori, that a segment of language can never in the final analysis be based on anything except its noncoincidence with the rest. Arbitrary and differential are two correlative qualities.

The alteration of linguistic signs clearly illustrates this. It is precisely because the terms a and b as such are radically incapable of reaching the level of consciousness—one is always conscious of only the a/b difference—that each term is free to change according to laws that are unrelated to its signifying function. No positive sign characterizes the genitive plural in Czech žen (see p. 86); still the two forms žena: žen function as well as the earlier forms žena: ženb; žen has value only because it is different.

Here is another example that shows even more clearly the systematic role of phonic differences: in Greek, ἐφην is an imperfect and ἐστὴν an aorist although both words are formed in the same way; the first belongs to the system of the present indicative of φημὶ ‘I say,’ whereas there is no present *στῇμι; now it is precisely the relation φημὶ: ἐφην that corresponds to the relation between the present and the imperfect (cf. δείκνυμι: ἐδείκνυν, etc.). Signs function, then, not through their intrinsic value but through their relative position.

In addition, it is impossible for sound alone, a material element, to belong to language. It is only a secondary thing, substance to be put to use. All our conventional values have the characteristic of not being confused with the tangible element which supports them. For instance, it is not the metal in a piece of money that fixes its value. A coin nominally worth five francs may contain less than half its worth of silver. Its value will vary according to the amount stamped upon it and according to its use inside or outside a political boundary. This is even more true of the linguistic signifier, which is not phonic but incorporeal—constituted not by its ma-
terial substance but by the differences that separate its sound-image from all others.

The foregoing principle is so basic that it applies to all the material elements of language, including phonemes. Every language forms its words on the basis of a system of sonorous elements, each element being a clearly delimited unit and one of a fixed number of units. Phonemes are characterized not, as one might think, by their own positive quality but simply by the fact that they are distinct. Phonemes are above all else opposing, relative, and negative entities.

Proof of this is the latitude that speakers have between points of convergence in the pronunciation of distinct sounds. In French, for instance, general use of a dorsal r does not prevent many speakers from using a tongue-tip trill; language is not in the least disturbed by it; language requires only that the sound be different and not, as one might imagine, that it have an invariable quality. I can even pronounce the French r like German ch in Bach, doch, etc., but in German I could not use r instead of ch, for German gives recognition to both elements and must keep them apart. Similarly, in Russian there is no latitude for t in the direction of t' (palatalized t), for the result would be the confusing of two sounds differentiated by the language (cf. govorit' 'speak' and goverit 'he speaks'), but more freedom may be taken with respect to th (aspirated t) since this sound does not figure in the Russian system of phonemes.

Since an identical state of affairs is observable in writing, another system of signs, we shall use writing to draw some comparisons that will clarify the whole issue. In fact:

1) The signs used in writing are arbitrary; there is no connection, for example, between the letter t and the sound that it designates.

2) The value of letters is purely negative and differential. The same person can write t, for instance, in different ways:
The only requirement is that the sign for \( t \) not be confused in his
script with the signs used for \( l \), \( d \), etc.

3) Values in writing function only through reciprocal opposition
within a fixed system that consists of a set number of letters. This
third characteristic, though not identical to the second, is closely
related to it, for both depend on the first. Since the graphic sign is
arbitrary, its form matters little or rather matters only within the
limitations imposed by the system.

4) The means by which the sign is produced is completely un-
important, for it does not affect the system (this also follows from
characteristic 1). Whether I make the letters in white or black,
raised or engraved, with pen or chisel—all this is of no importance
with respect to their signification.

4. The Sign Considered in Its Totality

Everything that has been said up to this point boils down to
this: in language there are only differences. Even more important:
a difference generally implies positive terms between which the
difference is set up; but in language there are only differences
without positive terms. Whether we take the signified or the signifier,
language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the lin-
guistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that
have issued from the system. The idea or phonic substance that a
sign contains is of less importance than the other signs that sur-
round it. Proof of this is that the value of a term may be modified
without either its meaning or its sound being affected, solely be-
cause a neighboring term has been modified (see p. 115).

But the statement that everything in language is negative is
true only if the signified and the signifier are considered separately;
when we consider the sign in its totality, we have something that
is positive in its own class. A linguistic system is a series of differ-
ces of sound combined with a series of differences of ideas; but
the pairing of a certain number of acoustical signs with as many
cuts made from the mass of thought engenders a system of values;
and this system serves as the effective link between the phonic and
psychological elements within each sign. Although both the sig-
nified and the signifier are purely differential and negative when
considered separately, their combination is a positive fact; it is
even the sole type of facts that language has, for maintaining the parallelism between the two classes of differences is the distinctive function of the linguistic institution.

Certain diachronic facts are typical in this respect. Take the countless instances where alteration of the signifier occasions a conceptual change and where it is obvious that the sum of the ideas distinguished corresponds in principle to the sum of the distinctive signs. When two words are confused through phonetic alteration (e.g. French décrépit from décrepitus and décrépi from crispus), the ideas that they express will also tend to become confused if only they have something in common. Or a word may have different forms (cf. chaise ‘chair’ and chaire ‘desk’). Any nascent difference will tend invariably to become significant but without always succeeding or being successful on the first trial. Conversely, any conceptual difference perceived by the mind seeks to find expression through a distinct signifier, and two ideas that are no longer distinct in the mind tend to merge into the same signifier.

When we compare signs—positive terms—with each other, we can no longer speak of difference; the expression would not be fitting, for it applies only to the comparing of two sound-images, e.g. father and mother, or two ideas, e.g. the idea “father” and the idea “mother”; two signs, each having a signified and signifier, are not different but only distinct. Between them there is only opposition. The entire mechanism of language, with which we shall be concerned later, is based on oppositions of this kind and on the phonic and conceptual differences that they imply.

What is true of value is true also of the unit (see pp. 110 ff.). A unit is a segment of the spoken chain that corresponds to a certain concept; both are by nature purely differential.

Applied to units, the principle of differentiation can be stated in this way: the characteristics of the unit blend with the unit itself. In language, as in any semiological system, whatever distinguishes one sign from the others constitutes it. Difference makes character just as it makes value and the unit.

Another rather paradoxical consequence of the same principle is this: in the last analysis what is commonly referred to as a “grammatical fact” fits the definition of the unit, for it always expresses an opposition of terms; it differs only in that the opposition is
particularly significant (e.g. the formation of German plurals of the type \textit{Nacht: Nächte}). Each term present in the grammatical fact (the singular without umlaut or final \textit{e} in opposition to the plural with umlaut and \textit{e}) consists of the interplay of a number of oppositions within the system. When isolated, neither \textit{Nacht} nor \textit{Nächte} is anything: thus everything is opposition. Putting it another way, the \textit{Nacht: Nächte} relation can be expressed by an algebraic formula \(a/b\) in which \(a\) and \(b\) are not simple terms but result from a set of relations. Language, in a manner of speaking, is a type of algebra consisting solely of complex terms. Some of its oppositions are more significant than others; but units and grammatical facts are only different names for designating diverse aspects of the same general fact: the functioning of linguistic oppositions. This statement is so true that we might very well approach the problem of units by starting from grammatical facts. Taking an opposition like \textit{Nacht: Nächte}, we might ask what are the units involved in it. Are they only the two words, the whole series of similar words, \(a\) and \(\ddot{a}\), or all singulars and plurals, etc.?

Units and grammatical facts would not be confused if linguistic signs were made up of something besides differences. But language being what it is, we shall find nothing simple in it regardless of our approach; everywhere and always there is the same complex equilibrium of terms that mutually condition each other. Putting it another way, language is a form and not a substance (see p. 113). This truth could not be overstressed, for all the mistakes in our terminology, all our incorrect ways of naming things that pertain to language, stem from the involuntary supposition that the linguistic phenomenon must have substance.

\textit{Chapter V}

\textbf{SYNTAGMATIC AND ASSOCIATIVE RELATIONS}

1. \textit{Definitions}

In a language-state everything is based on relations. How do they function?
Relations and differences between linguistic terms fall into two distinct groups, each of which generates a certain class of values. The opposition between the two classes gives a better understanding of the nature of each class. They correspond to two forms of our mental activity, both indispensable to the life of language.

In discourse, on the one hand, words acquire relations based on the linear nature of language because they are chained together. This rules out the possibility of pronouncing two elements simultaneously (see p. 70). The elements are arranged in sequence on the chain of speaking. Combinations supported by linearity are syntagms. The syntagm is always composed of two or more consecutive units (e.g. French re-lire 're-read,' contre tous 'against everyone,' la vie humaine 'human life,' Dieu est bon 'God is good,' s'il fait beau temps, nous sortirons 'if the weather is nice, we'll go out,' etc.). In the syntagm a term acquires its value only because it stands in opposition to everything that precedes or follows it, or to both.

Outside discourse, on the other hand, words acquire relations of a different kind. Those that have something in common are associated in the memory, resulting in groups marked by diverse relations. For instance, the French word enseignement 'teaching' will unconsciously call to mind a host of other words (enseigner 'teach,' renseigner 'acquaint,' etc.; or armement 'armament,' changement 'amendment,' etc.; or éducation 'education,' apprentissage 'apprenticeship,' etc.). All those words are related in some way.

We see that the co-ordinations formed outside discourse differ strikingly from those formed inside discourse. Those formed outside discourse are not supported by linearity. Their seat is in the brain; they are a part of the inner storehouse that makes up the language of each speaker. They are associative relations.

The syntagmatic relation is in praesentia. It is based on two or more terms that occur in an effective series. Against this, the associative relation unites terms in absentia in a potential mnemonic series.

From the associative and syntagmatic viewpoint a linguistic
unit is like a fixed part of a building, e.g. a column. On the one hand, the column has a certain relation to the architrave that it supports; the arrangement of the two units in space suggests the syntagmatic relation. On the other hand, if the column is Doric, it suggests a mental comparison of this style with others (Ionic, Corinthian, etc.) although none of these elements is present in space: the relation is associative.

Each of the two classes of co-ordination calls for some specific remarks.

2. Syntagmatic Relations

The examples on page 123 have already indicated that the notion of syntagm applies not only to words but to groups of words, to complex units of all lengths and types (compounds, derivatives, phrases, whole sentences).

It is not enough to consider the relation that ties together the different parts of syntags (e.g. French contre ‘against’ and tous ‘everyone’ in contre tous, contre and maître ‘master’ in contremaitre ‘foreman’), one must also bear in mind the relation that links the whole to its parts (e.g. contre tous in opposition on the one hand to contre and on the other tous, or contremaitre in opposition to contre and maître).

An objection might be raised at this point. The sentence is the ideal type of syntagm. But it belongs to speaking, not to language (see p. 14). Does it not follow that the syntagm belongs to speaking? I do not think so. Speaking is characterized by freedom of combinations; one must therefore ask whether or not all syntags are equally free.

It is obvious from the first that many expressions belong to language. These are the pat phrases in which any change is prohibited by usage, even if we can single out their meaningful elements (cf. à quoi bon? ‘what’s the use?’ allons donc! ‘nonsense!’). The same is true, though to a lesser degree, of expressions like prendre la mouche ‘take offense easily,’ forcer la main à quelqu’un ‘force someone’s hand,’ rompre une lance ‘break a lance,’ or even avoir mal (à la

---

6 Cf. English head and waiter in headwaiter. [Tr.]
7 Literally ‘take the fly.’ Cf. English take the bull by the horns. [Tr.]
8 Cf. English bury the hatchet. [Tr.]
tête, etc.) ‘have (a headache, etc.),’ à force de (soins, etc.) ‘by dint of (care, etc.),’ que vous en semble? ‘how do you feel about it?’ pas n’est besoin de . . . ‘there’s no need for . . . ,’ etc., which are characterized by peculiarities of signification or syntax. These idiomatic twists cannot be improvised; they are furnished by tradition. There are also words which, while lending themselves perfectly to analysis, are characterized by some morphological anomaly that is kept solely by dint of usage (cf. difficulté ‘difficulty’ beside facilité ‘facility,’ etc., and mourrai ‘[I] shall die’ beside dormirai ‘[I] shall sleep’).\(^9\)

There are further proofs. To language rather than to speaking belong the syntagmatic types that are built upon regular forms. Indeed, since there is nothing abstract in language, the types exist only if language has registered a sufficient number of specimens. When a word like indécorable arises in speaking (see pp. 167 ff.), its appearance supposes a fixed type, and this type is in turn possible only through remembrance of a sufficient number of similar words belonging to language (impardonable ‘unpardonable,’ intolérable ‘intolerable,’ infatigable ‘indefatigable,’ etc.). Exactly the same is true of sentences and groups of words built upon regular patterns. Combinations like la terre tourne ‘the world turns,’ que vous dit-il? ‘what does he say to you?’ etc. correspond to general types that are in turn supported in the language by concrete remembrances.

But we must realize that in the syntagm there is no clear-cut boundary between the language fact, which is a sign of collective usage, and the fact that belongs to speaking and depends on individual freedom. In a great number of instances it is hard to class a combination of units because both forces have combined in producing it, and they have combined in indeterminable proportions.

3. **Associative Relations**

Mental association creates other groups besides those based on the comparing of terms that have something in common; through its grasp of the nature of the relations that bind the terms together, the mind creates as many associative series as there are diverse relations. For instance, in enseignement ‘teaching,’ enseigner ‘teach,’

\(^9\) The anomaly of the double \(r\) in the future forms of certain verbs in French may be compared to irregular plurals like oxen in English. [Tr.]
enseignons 'we teach,' etc., one element, the radical, is common to every term; the same word may occur in a different series formed around another common element, the suffix (cf. enseignement, arment, changement, etc.); or the association may spring from the analogy of the concepts signified (enseignement, instruction, apprentissage, éducation, etc.); or again, simply from the similarity of the sound-images (e.g. enseignement and justement 'precisely').

Thus there is at times a double similarity of meaning and form, at times similarity only of form or of meaning. A word can always evoke everything that can be associated with it in one way or another.

Whereas a syntagm immediately suggests an order of succession and a fixed number of elements, terms in an associative family occur neither in fixed numbers nor in a definite order. If we associate painful, delightful, frightful, etc. we are unable to predict the number of words that the memory will suggest or the order in which they will appear. A particular word is like the center of a constellation; it is the point of convergence of an indefinite number of co-ordinated terms (see the illustration on page 127).

But of the two characteristics of the associative series—indeterminate order and indefinite number—only the first can always be verified; the second may fail to meet the test. This happens in the case of inflectional paradigms, which are typical of associative groupings. Latin dominus, domînî, dominô, etc. is obviously an associative group formed around a common element, the noun theme domin-, but the series

---

10 The last case is rare and can be classed as abnormal, for the mind naturally
is not indefinite as in the case of enseignement, changement, etc.; the number of cases is definite. Against this, the words have no fixed order of succession, and it is by a purely arbitrary act that the grammarian groups them in one way rather than in another; in the mind of speakers the nominative case is by no means the first one in the declension, and the order in which terms are called depends on circumstances.

Chapter VI

THE MECHANISM OF LANGUAGE

1. Syntagmatic Solidarities

The set of phonic and conceptual differences that constitutes language results from two types of comparisons; the relations are sometimes associative, sometimes syntagmatic. The groupings in both classes are for the most part fixed by language; this set of common relations constitutes language and governs its functioning.

What is most striking in the organization of language are syntagmatic solidarities; almost all units of language depend on what surrounds them in the spoken chain or on their successive parts.

This is shown by word formation. A unit like painful decomposes
into two subunits (*pain-ful*), but these subunits are not two independent parts that are simply lumped together (*pain + ful*). The unit is a product, a combination of two interdependent elements that acquire value only through their reciprocal action in a higher unit (*pain × ful*). The suffix is nonexistent when considered independently; what gives it a place in the language is a series of common terms like *delight-ful*, *fright-ful*, etc. Nor is the radical independent. It exists only through combining with a suffix. In *gos-ling*, the element *gos-* is nothing without its suffix. The whole has value only through its parts, and the parts have value by virtue of their place in the whole. That is why the syntagmatic relation of the part to the whole is just as important as the relation of the parts to each other.

This general principle holds true for every type of syntagm enumerated above (pp. 124 ff.), for larger units are always composed of more restricted units linked by their reciprocal solidarity. To be sure, language has independent units that have syntagmatic relations with neither their parts nor other units. Sentence equivalents like *yes*, *no*, *thanks*, etc. are good examples. But this exceptional fact does not compromise the general principle. As a rule we do not communicate through isolated signs but rather through groups of signs, through organized masses that are themselves signs. In language everything boils down to differences but also to groupings. The mechanism of language, which consists of the interplay of successive terms, resembles the operation of a machine in which the parts have a reciprocating function even though they are arranged in a single dimension.

2. Simultaneous Functioning of the Two Types of Groupings

Between the syntagmatic groupings, as defined, there is a bond of interdependence; they mutually condition each other. In fact, spatial co-ordinations help to create associative co-ordinations, which are in turn necessary for analysis of the parts of the syntagm.

Take the French compound *dé-faire* 'un-do.' 12 We can picture it as a horizontal ribbon that corresponds to the spoken chain:

12 Cf. English *misplace*. To the French series correspond English *mistake*, *misspell*, *misrepresent*, etc. and *place*, *replace*, *displace*, etc. [Tr.]
But simultaneously and on another axis there exists in the subconscious one or more associative series comprising units that have an element in common with the syntagm:

In the same way, if Latin *quadruplex* is a syntagm, this is because it too is supported by a double associative series:

To the extent that the other forms float around *défaire* or *quadruplex*, these words can be decomposed into subunits. This is just another way of saying that they are syntagms. *Défaire* could not be analyzed, for instance, if the other forms containing *dé-* or *faire* disappeared from the language. It would be but a simple unit, and its two parts could not be placed in opposition.

Now the functioning of the dual system in discourse is clear.
Our memory holds in reserve all the more or less complex types of syntagms, regardless of their class or length, and we bring in the associative groups to fix our choice when the time for using them arrives. When a Frenchman says marchons! '(let's) walk!' he thinks unconsciously of diverse groups of associations that converge on the syntagm marchons! The syntagm figures in the series marche! '(thou) walk!' marchez! '(you) walk!' and the opposition between marchons! and the other forms determines his choice; in addition, marchons! calls up the series montons! '(let's) go up!' mangeons '(let's) eat!' etc. and is selected from the series by the same process. In each series the speaker knows what he must vary in order to produce the differentiation that fits the desired unit. If he changes the idea to be expressed, he will need other oppositions to bring out another value; for instance, he may say marchez! or perhaps montons!

It is not enough to say, looking at the matter positively, that the speaker chooses marchons! because it signifies what he wishes to express. In reality the idea evokes not a form but a whole latent system that makes possible the oppositions necessary for the formation of the sign. By itself the sign would have no signification. If there were no forms like marche! marchez! against marchons!, certain oppositions would disappear, and the value of marchons! would be changed ipso facto.

This principle applies to even the most complex types of syntagms and sentences. To frame the question que vous dit-il? 'what does he say to you?' the speaker varies one element of a latent syntactical pattern, e.g. que te dit-il? 'what does he say to thee?' que nous dit-il? 'what does he say to us?' etc., until his choice is fixed on the pronoun vous. In this process, which consists of eliminating mentally everything that does not help to bring out the desired differentiation at the desired point, associative groupings and syntagmatic patterns both play a role.

Conversely, the process of fixation and choice governs the smallest units and even phonological elements wherever they are endowed with a value. I am thinking not only of cases like French petit 'small' (feminine form, written petite) in opposition to petit (masculine form, written petit) or Latin dominā against dominō, where the difference happens to be based on a simple phoneme, but
also of the more subtle and characteristic fact that a phoneme by itself plays a role in the system of a language-state. For example, if \( m, p, t, \) etc. can never occur at the end of a word in Greek, this means that their presence or absence in a definite position counts in the structure of the word and in the structure of the sentence. In every such case the isolated sound, like every other unit, is chosen after a dual mental opposition. In the imaginary grouping \( anma, \) for instance, the sound \( m \) stands in syntagmatic opposition to its environing sounds and in associative opposition to all other sounds that may come to mind:

\[
anma
\]

\[
v
\]

\[
d
\]

3. Absolute and Relative Arbitrariness

The mechanism of language can be presented from another especially important angle.

The fundamental principle of the arbitrariness of the sign does not prevent our singling out in each language what is radically arbitrary, i.e. unmotivated, and what is only relatively arbitrary. Some signs are absolutely arbitrary; in others we note, not its complete absence, but the presence of degrees of arbitrariness: the sign may be relatively motivated.

For instance, both \( vingt \) 'twenty' and \( dix-neuf \) 'nineteen' are unmotivated in French, but not in the same degree, for \( dix-neuf \) suggests its own terms and other terms associated with it (e.g. \( dix \) 'ten,' \( neuf \) 'nine,' \( vingt-neuf \) 'twenty-nine,' \( dix-huit \) 'eighteen,' \( soixante-dix \) 'seventy,' etc.). Taken separately, \( dix \) and \( neuf \) are in the same class as \( vingt, \) but \( dix-neuf \) is an example of relative motivation. The same is true of \( poirier \) 'pear-tree,' which recalls the simple word \( poire \) 'pear' and, through its suffix, \( cerisier \) 'cherry-tree,' \( pommier \) 'apple-tree,' etc.\(^{13}\) For \( frêne \) 'ash,' \( chêne \) 'oak,' etc. there is nothing comparable. Again, compare \( berger \) 'shepherd,' which is completely unmotivated, and \( vacher \) 'cowherd,' which is relatively motivated.\(^{14}\) In the same way, the pairs \( geôle \) 'jail' and

\(^{13}\) Cf. English \( flaxen, \) which suggests \( flax, \) \( silken, \) \( woolen, \) etc. [Tr.]

\(^{14}\) Cf. English \( clerk, \) unmotivated, against \( farmer, \) relatively motivated. [Tr.]
cachot ‘dungeon,’ hache ‘ax’ and couperet ‘chopper,’ concierge ‘porter’ and portier ‘doorman,’ jadis ‘of old’ and autrefois ‘formerly,’ souvent ‘often’ and frequemment ‘frequently,’ aveugle ‘blind’ and boiteux ‘limping,’ sourd ‘deaf’ and bossu ‘hunchbacked,’ second ‘second’ and deuxième ‘second (of a series),’ German Laub and French feuillage ‘foliage,’ and French métier ‘handicraft’ and German Handwerk.\(^{15}\) The English plural ships suggests through its formation the whole series flags, birds, books, etc., while men and sheep suggest nothing. In Greek dósō ‘I shall give’ the notion of futurity is expressed by a sign that calls up the association láso, stesō, tūpsō, etc.; eîmi ‘I shall go,’ on the other hand, is completely isolated.

This is not the place to search for the forces that condition motivation in each instance; but motivation varies, being always proportional to the ease of syntagmatic analysis and the obviousness of the meaning of the subunits present. Indeed, while some formative elements like –ier in poir-ier against ceris-ier, pomm-ier, etc. are obvious, others are vague or meaningless. For instance, does the suffix –ot really correspond to a meaningful element in French cachot ‘dungeon’? On comparing words like coutelas ‘cutlas,’ fatras ‘pile,’ platras ‘rubbish,’ canevas ‘canvas,’ etc., one has no more than the vague feeling that –as is a formative element characteristic of substantives. At any rate, even in the most favorable cases motivation is never absolute. Not only are the elements of a motivated sign themselves unmotivated (cf. dix and neuf in dix-neuf), but the value of the whole term is never equal to the sum of the value of the parts. Teach + er is not equal to teach ¥ er (see p. 128).

Motivation is explained by the principles stated in Section 2. The notion of relative motivation implies: (1) analysis of a given term, hence a syntagmatic relation; and (2) the summoning of one or more other terms, hence an associative relation. It is the mechanism through which any term whatever lends itself to the expression of an idea, and is no more than that. Up to this point units have appeared as values, i.e. as elements of a system, and we

\(^{15}\)For examples not similar in English and French, compare completely unmotivated jail, slave, then and relatively motivated reformatory, servant, heretofore. [Tr.]
have given special consideration to their opposition; now we recognize the solidarities that bind them; they are associative and syntagmatic, and they are what limits arbitrariness. Dix-neuf is supported associatively by dix-huit, soixante-dix, etc. and syntagmatically by its elements dix and neuf (see p. 128). This dual relation gives it a part of its value.

Everything that relates to language as a system must, I am convinced, be approached from this viewpoint, which has scarcely received the attention of linguists: the limiting of arbitrariness. This is the best possible basis for approaching the study of language as a system. In fact, the whole system of language is based on the irrational principle of the arbitrariness of the sign, which would lead to the worst sort of complication if applied without restriction. But the mind contrives to introduce a principle of order and regularity into certain parts of the mass of signs, and this is the role of relative motivation. If the mechanism of language were entirely rational, it could be studied independently. Since the mechanism of language is but a partial correction of a system that is by nature chaotic, however, we adopt the viewpoint imposed by the very nature of language and study it as it limits arbitrariness.

There is no language in which nothing is motivated, and our definition makes it impossible to conceive of a language in which everything is motivated. Between the two extremes—a minimum of organization and a minimum of arbitrariness—we find all possible varieties. Diverse languages always include elements of both types—radically arbitrary and relatively motivated—but in proportions that vary greatly, and this is an important characteristic that may help in classifying them.

In a certain sense—one which must not be pushed too far but which brings out a particular form that the opposition may take—we might say that languages in which there is least motivation are more lexicological, and those in which it is greatest are more grammatical. Not because "lexical" and "arbitrary" on the one hand and "grammar" and "relative motivation" on the other, are always synonymous, but because they have a common principle. The two extremes are like two poles between which the whole system moves, two opposing currents which share the movement of language: the tendency to use the lexicological instrument (the unmotivated
sign) and the preference given to the grammatical instrument (structural rules).

We would see, for example, that motivation plays a much larger role in German than in English. But the ultra-lexicological type is Chinese while Proto-Indo-European and Sanskrit are specimens of the ultra-grammatical type. Within a given language, all evolutionary movement may be characterized by continual passage from motivation to arbitrariness and from arbitrariness to motivation; this see-saw motion often results in a perceptible change in the proportions of the two classes of signs. Thus with respect to Latin, French is characterized, among other things, by a huge increase in arbitrariness. Latin inimicus recalls in- and amicus and is motivated by them; against this, ennemi ‘enemy’ is motivated by nothing—it has reverted to absolute arbitrariness, which is really the prime characteristic of the linguistic sign. We would notice this shift in hundreds of instances: cf. constäre (stäre): coûter ‘cost,’ fabrica (faber): forge ‘forge,’ magister (magis): maître ‘master,’ berbicarius (berbix): berger ‘shepherd,’ etc. French owes its characteristic appearance to this fact.

Chapter VII

GRAMMAR AND ITS SUBDIVISIONS

1. Definitions: Traditional Divisions

Static linguistics or the description of a language-state is grammar in the very precise, and moreover usual, sense that the word has in the expressions “grammar of the Stock Exchange,” etc., where it is a question of a complex and systematic object governing the interplay of coexisting values.

Grammar studies language as a system of means of expression. Grammatical means synchronic and significant, and since no system straddles several periods, there is no such thing as “historical grammar”; the discipline so labeled is really only diachronic linguistics.
My definition disagrees with the narrower one usually given. *Morphology* and *syntax* together are what is generally called grammar while lexicology, or the science of words, is excluded.

But first, do these divisions fit the facts? Do they agree with the principles that have just been posited?

Morphology deals with different classes of words (verbs, nouns, adjectives, pronouns, etc.) and with different inflectional forms (conjugation, declension, etc.). To separate this study from syntax, it is alleged that syntax has as its object the functions attached to linguistic units while morphology considers only their form. For instance, morphology says simply that the genitive of Greek *phúlax* 'guardian' is *phúlakos*, and syntax explains the use of the two forms.

But the distinction is illusory. The series of forms of the substantive *phúlax* becomes an inflectional paradigm only through comparison of the functions attached to the different forms; reciprocally, the functions are morphological only if each function corresponds to a definite phonic sign. A declension is neither a list of forms nor a series of logical abstractions but a combination of the two (see pp. 102 ff.). Forms and functions are interdependent and it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate them. Linguistically, morphology has no real, autonomous object. It cannot form a discipline distinct from syntax.

Second, it is not logical to exclude lexicology from grammar. As they are registered in the dictionary, words do not seem at first glance to lend themselves to grammatical study, which is generally restricted to the relations between units. But we notice at once that innumerable relations may be expressed as efficiently by words as by grammar. For instance, Latin *fīō* and *faciō* stand in opposition to each other in the same way as *dōcor* and *dicō*, two grammatical forms of the same word. The distinction between the perfective and imperfective is expressed grammatically in Russian *sprosčit'": *sprášivat' "ask" and lexicologically in *skazat'": *govort' "say." Prepositions are usually assigned to grammar, but the prepositional locution *en considération de" in consideration of" is basically lexicological since the word *considération* retains its own meaning in the French phrase. If we compare Greek *peithō*: *pethōmai* with French *je persuade* 'I persuade': *j’obéis* 'I obey,' we see that the
opposition is expressed grammatically in the first instance and lexicologically in the second. A large number of relations that are expressed in certain languages by cases or prepositions are rendered in others by compounds, more like words proper (French royaume des cieux ‘kingdom of heaven’ and German Himmelreich), or by derivatives (French moulin à vent ‘windmill’ and Polish wiatr-ak) or finally, by simple words (French bois de chauffage ‘firewood’ and Russian дровá, French bois de construction ‘timber’ and Russian лес). The interchange of simple words and phrases within the same language also occurs very frequently (cf. French considérer ‘consider’ and prendre en considération ‘take into consideration,’ se venger de ‘avenge’ and tirer vengeance de ‘take revenge on’).

Functionally, therefore, the lexical and the syntactical may blend. There is basically no distinction between any word that is not a simple, irreducible unit and a phrase, which is a syntactical fact. The arrangement of the subunits of the word obeys the same fundamental principles as the arrangement of groups of words in phrases.

In short, although the traditional divisions of grammar may be useful in practice, they do not correspond to natural distinctions. To build a grammar, we must look for a different and a higher principle.

2. Rational Divisions
Morphology, syntax, and lexicology interpenetrate because every synchronic fact is identical. No line of demarcation can be drawn in advance. Only the distinction established above between syntagmatic and associative relations can provide a classification that is not imposed from the outside. No other base will serve for the grammatical system.

We should first gather together all that makes up a language-state and fit this into a theory of syntagms and a theory of associations. Immediately certain parts of traditional grammar would seem to fall effortlessly into one category or the other. Inflection is evidently a typical kind of association of forms in the mind of speakers; and syntax (i.e. the theory of word groupings, according to the most common definition) goes back to the theory of syntagms, for the groupings always suppose at least two units dis-
tributed in space. Not every syntagmatic fact is classed as syntactical, but every syntactical fact belongs to the syntagmatic class.

To prove the necessity of the dual approach, almost any point of grammar will do. The notion of word, for instance, poses two distinct problems, depending on whether the word is studied from the associative or the syntagmatic viewpoint. In French, the adjective grand ‘big’ offers a duality of form from the syntagmatic viewpoint (grā garçon written grand garçon ‘big boy’ and grāt āfā, written grand enfant ‘big baby’) and another duality from the associative viewpoint (masculine grā, written grand, and feminine grād, written grande).

Each fact should in this way be fitted into its syntagmatic or associative class, and the whole subject matter of grammar should be arranged along its two natural co-ordinates; no other division will show what must be changed in the usual framework of synchronic linguistics. I cannot undertake that task here, for my aim is limited to stating only the most general principles.

Chapter VIII

ROLE OF ABSTRACT ENTITIES IN GRAMMAR

One important subject, not yet touched upon, points up this very necessity of examining every grammatical question from the two viewpoints specified in Chapter VII: abstract entities in grammar. Let us consider them first associatively.

To associate two forms is not only to feel that they have something in common but also to single out the nature of the relations that govern associations. For instance, speakers are aware that the relation between enseigner and enseignement or juger and jugement is not the same as the relation between enseignement and jugement ‘judgment’ (see p. 125). This is how the system of associations is tied to the system of grammar. We can say that the sum of the conscious and methodical classifications made by the grammarian