CURRENT TRENDS
IN LINGUISTICS
4

Ibero-American
and Caribbean Linguistics
GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

EUGENIO COSERIU

O. PRELIMINARIES

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

I. EXTERNAL CONDITIONS

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

1.1. The first condition to be named is the short tradition of IAm linguistics. The scientific tradition of Hispanic-American linguistics revolves around four great names: the genial Venezuelan grammarian Andrés Bello (d. 1865), whose philological activity developed chiefly in Chile; the remarkable Hispanic philologist Rutilio José Cuervo
curricula, which are frequently subject to reform in many countries. As far as I know, no university has the four professorships for General Linguistics, Romance Linguistics, Spanish and Hispano-American (or Portuguese and Brazilian) Linguistics and Amerindian Linguistics, which one would expect for an adequate linguistic curriculum in IAM, not to speak of Indo-European Linguistics or General Phonetics, the teaching of which is exceptional in IAM. Even in those countries where linguistics is most advanced the four professorships are not found. Thus the linguistic subjects commonly taught in Argentine universities are generally the courses on foreign and classical languages and literatures, and the teaching of Romance Philology and of the Spanish Language (the teaching of Romance Philology has been eliminated). The situation is similar in Chile (Santiago), where as a consequence of a recent reform Romance Linguistics is no longer taught. In Brazil there are chairs for Romance and Portuguese Philology, but no chairs for General Linguistics. The situation in Montevideo is probably the most favorable: the University there has chairs for General and Indo-European Linguistics and Romance Linguistics, besides a special chair for 'Ciencias del Lenguaje' devoted to the study of Spanish, and the curriculum of the Instituto de Profesores includes Introduction to Linguistics, History of the Spanish Language, Theory of Grammar (i.e. General and Spanish Grammar) and Philosophy of Language.

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

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

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

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

Some self-taught linguists have certainly proved to be excellent investigators and masters, particularly in Brazil, where the existence of good linguists partly preceded the creation of Faculties of Arts; but in this survey I am not concerned with individual cases and exceptions, but rather with a general IAM situation.
countries has noticeable progress been made, but there too scientific linguistics is concentrated in the capitals and only occasionally, as in Argentina and Brazil, in some other university towns. For the same reason, many of the initiators and promoters of linguistic studies in America, following Hassen and Lenz, were foreigners trained abroad (mainly Europeans). Among those who directed or created research centers and were particularly influential as to the development of linguistics in IAM, are the Spaniard Amado Alonso, in Buenos Aires, whose direct or indirect influence has been most conspicuous and partly continues to be effective today; the Spaniard Juan Corominas and the German Fritz Krüger, in Mendoza; the Italian trained Rumanian Eugenio Coseriu, in Montevideo. Others, whose temporary activity, independent of its intrinsic value, had a less directly noticeable influence were the Italian Terracini, the Dane Uldall, the Spaniard Tovar, all three in Tucumán; the Spaniard Zamora Vicente in Buenos Aires; the Rumanian Gizada (La Plata and Buenos Aires), the Spaniard Hernando Balborini (Tucumán and La Plata), the North American Swadesh (Mexico City), the Italian Ferrario (Montevideo)—although Terracini and Tovar have certainly been influential through their works published in Argentina; and Swadesh’s activity has unquestionably had repercussion among students of native languages.

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

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

1 Among other IAM linguists and philologists of foreign origin—excepting the Spanish and Portuguese—I mention the Italian Bussa in Argentina; the German Bunse (Porto Alegre, Brazil); Moldenhauer (Rosario, Argentina); and Schulte-Herbrüggen (Santiago de Chile); the Yugoslav Marcovich (Mérida, Venezuela); the Polish trained Russian Attuchow (Montevideo); and the Italian Moe Zillo, who was active for several years in Montevideo. From 1938 to 1945 the German Ulrich Lea, a Romance Philologist, was active in Venezuela. I do not know what repercussions the temporary activity of the North American Naaman McCown in Mexico had or that of the German Gerold Ungerhein in Colombia (Popayán).

2 Thus, e.g. in Germany, the Brazilian Dal’igna Rodrigues and the Peruvian Escobar; in Spain, the Ecuadorian Tucano Mateus and the Argentinian Guartarte; in the United States, the Peruvian Martha Hälsbrandt, the Argentinian Suárez and the Chilean Heise Contreras.

3 The library of the Mendoza Institute, for instance, about which concrete information was published, possessed 700 volumes in 1941 and 1010 volumes in 1944. The Departamento de Montevideo of the lack of sufficiency of initial funds or because of the material difficulty in obtaining out of print books and journals, to which must be added the instability of the currency in several countries, it was generally impossible to build up organically designed libraries. These rather grew at random by means of donations, exchanges, and what could be found on the local market. An important exception is the library of the Instituto de Filología Hispánica de Buenos Aires, which was methodically enlarged at the time of Amado Alonso and later completed and partly kept up to date thanks to the untiring efforts of Guillermo Guartota, secretary of the Institute for several years, in its most critical period. But normally the libraries grew haphazardly, judging from those which I personally visited. This situation affects especially expensive works, such as linguistic atlases and collections of journals. In spite of the interest in dialect geography in IAM, there is not one public library, as far as I know, which possesses an Romance linguistic atlases. As for the journals, it is very common that in an Institute some collections are to be found, while others, equally important and relating to the same field, are lacking, simply because there are no exchange arrangements with them. It should also be mentioned that normally an IAM Institute can only rely upon its own bibliographical sources, which is another basic difference between IAM and many European countries or the United States concerning research possibilities. In most cases the specialized libraries are scattered about different countries, hundreds or thousands of miles apart from each other, and exchange arrangements either do not exist at all or are very limited.
1.5. The character of the basic information at the disposal of IAM linguists largely depends on the situation which has just been sketched, particularly in the case of general linguistics and linguistic theories. As for its quantity, this information is not scarce, but, in so far as it depends on local possibilities, it is unsystematic and fragmentary. If an IAM linguist quotes concepts of Brenchal or Jakobson, Frei or Hockett, this does not necessarily mean that he either adheres to one or another doctrine or that he has deliberately made a choice among several possibilities — it might simply result from a casual contact with some writing of the author quoted. Furthermore, the information as a whole is not homogeneous, i.e. it is not the same in the different research and teaching centers. The foreign teachers too contribute to this situation: they certainly open new horizons, but, at the same time, they determine the basic information of their pupils in accordance with their origin, their education, and their personal preferences, which can lead to unevennesses, especially if one linguistic theory is identified with linguistic theory as such, as is often the case. The heterogeneous character of the basic information is another feature which clearly distinguishes IAM linguistics from that of North America, at least from the descriptive linguistics which as a whole can be called 'Bloomfieldian'. Whereas two different North American descriptive linguists, independent of their specialization and their personal positions, possess to a certain extent the same basic information and therefore a common stock of concepts and terms, two IAM linguists trained in different centers may dispose of equally great (or even greater) but at the same time radically different bulks of information. This can certainly be the case also with two European linguists belonging to different schools or countries. In IAM, however, the difference often depends rather on the material conditions of information (e.g. whether or not the respective libraries contain certain books and journals), than on a coherent system of linguistic thought. So what elsewhere normally is a matter of orientation or of conception, can be a matter of information in IAM.

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

1.7. Another condition which is effective in the same sense is the limited knowledge of languages among the average IAM linguists. In most parts of IAM (particularly in South America) French still is the best known foreign language. Thus the works of French linguists (or those published in the French language) are more widely spread than works in German or English. This explains the utmost importance of translations for the works written in the latter languages. If Vossler has been more influential in IAM than any other German scholar (e.g. Paul is still widely unknown there), this is due to the fact that his works were translated. And if stylistics has spread far in IAM, this is not only due to the orientation of many IAM linguists not only to the writings of Amado Alonso, but also to translations and to the contributions of Vossler and Spitser to IAM periodicals. In the same way, Jespersen's Mankind, which was translated into Spanish, is much better known and quoted more often than his Language; and Sapir is now becoming a generally known name, thanks to his being translated into Spanish and Portuguese.

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

2. RESEARCH CENTERS

2.0. As has been indicated above (1.2.) most of the centers of linguistic work in IAM (and to some extent, all of them) are 'philological' centers. Linguistics prevailing in countries, where Bühler was influential to some extent, whereas the response to Stenzel was very limited among linguists. This is because they are just two among other theories of language in the German speaking countries, while they are the German theorists par excellence for most IAM linguists. The same also occurs in other fields of culture with translated authors.

It must be said that certain topics, such as the problems of the distinction between morphology and syntax or Hjelmslev's general grammar, have come to be known to the average Hispano-American linguist through Spanish books of a very low scientific quality, as are the two by Antonio Llorente Maldonado de Guerra, Los 'Principios de gramática general' de Hjelmslev y la lingüística (Granada, 1953) and Morfológia y sintaxe. El problema de la división de la gramática (Granada, 1955). Generally, the Spanish publications enjoy a great prestige in Spanish America; from this follows that certain Spanish works on 'modern' linguistics were widely accepted, which, however, would rather deserve to be forgotten: cf. Coseriu, Revista 2.11-13 (Montevideo, 1944).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.1. The IAA is a continuation of the former Instituto de Filología of the University of Buenos Aires. It was founded in 1923 — with the assistance of the Centro de Estudios Históricos of Madrid — under the honorary direction of Ramón Menéndez Pidal and with Américo Castro as acting director. This Institute was at first the only center of importance and later (until 1946) the most important of all the philological and linguistic research centers in Ibero-America. During the first years of its existence — a period in which it changed direction several times — this Institute already did excellent work and published a number of valuable contributions. But especially from 1927 to 1946, under the direction of Amado Alonso, it displayed an intensive and manifold activity, becoming one of the most important centers of the Hispanic world and even the foremost at the time when philological and linguistic activity decreased in Spain. Between the years 1930 and 1946 it published the deservedly famous Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana [BDH] (6 volumes and three supplements); in 1931 it initiated a Colección de estudios indígenistas; between 1932 and 1942 it published a Colección de estudios estilísticos (three volumes and one supplement); and between 1939 and 1946 the RFH (and two supplements of it, with a literary character), along with other works issued outside of these collections or outside of the University. About 1941, during the most splendid period of the Institute, Amado Alonso gathered around it a large number of collaborators: Pedro Henriquez Ureta (d. 1946), Eleuterio Tiscornia (d. 1945), Ángel Battistella, Ángel Rosenblat, Marcos Morínigo, Raimundo Lida, María Rosa Lida, Berta Elena Vidal de Battini, Ana María Barrenechea, and others, a number of whom had been his own pupils. In 1946, however, Amado Alonso was compelled to move to the United States. Many of his team dispersed and the Institute entered a critical phase of its existence, which it has not yet completely overcome. Associated at first with the Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas, as the Sección Románica of a new Instituto de Filología directed by Enrique François, it practically ceased to operate. The Sección Románica was changed to Instituto de Filología Románica in 1950, then in 1953 to Instituto de Filología Hispánica, which assumed its present form in 1962. In these successive forms the Institute had another period of rather intensive activity, although very short-lived (1949-51), under the direction of Alonso Zamora Vicente; then another period of inactivity or limited activity (from 1954 to 1958 it was completely unproductive). Since 1959 it has been in a process of recovering, but because of the difficulties it passed through, it does not today have a team of collaborators comparable to that of its former time. In Amado Alonso's days, the Instituto de Filología was a center open to various modern linguistic trends; under the direction of Zamora Vicente, it was a good center for Hispanic studies in the Spanish tradition; in its last form, under the guidance of Ana María Barrenechea, it seems to have turned its attentions toward structural grammar, although without abandoning other interests. Journal: Fl.

2.1.2. The DLLCl is a continuation of the former Instituto de Literaturas Clásicas. The DLLCl also underwent several transformations, before it reached its present state: Sección Clásica of the Instituto de Filología, Instituto de Filología Clásica (with a Section for Linguistics), Departamento de Filología Clásica y Lingüística. It was directed for many years in its various phases and up to its penultimate phase by the Latinist Enrique François (d. 1956). At present it is directed by Salvador Buco. Under the direction of François the DLLCl had a period of somewhat asiduous activity — although of a rather informative character — particularly between 1944 and 1949. During this period the DLLCl published, in addition to a number of Latin texts and works on literary history, a linguistic series including translations of Pseudo Varron, Iturriaga, Lejeune, and Marouzeau and Antonio Tovar's important book Estudios sobre las primitivas lenguas hispánicas (1949). From 1950 to 1955 the DLLCl displayed a more limited activity and later, until 1959, was altogether silent. This Institute was another supplement and a further volume were issued in 1948 and in 1951, respectively.

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

In 1955 it published: Giacomino Devoto, Los fundamentos de la historia lingüística, translated by Carlos Alberto Ronchi March, and Romualdo Ardiasone, Aspectos de la giving geografia argentina.
for many years a center for classical philology, also interested in historical and comparative (Indo-European) linguistics. In its new form, it seems to turn towards general and Amerindian linguistics and has shown interest for structuralism.\footnote{During recent years it published some informative pamphlets (cf. fn. 48) and began a series of Cuadernos de lingüística indígena (3 numbers in 1964).} Journal: AFCL.

2.1.3. The ILC was founded in 1940 and had a first period of activity until 1945, under the direction of the Hispanist Juan Corominas. After an interruption of several years, it again took up activity in 1949, under the direction of the well-known Romance philologist Fritz Krüger.\footnote{Concerning his activity in Germany and in Argentina see: Gerardo Molenbahuer, Fritz Krüger. \textit{Neue biographie et bibliographie} (Louvain, 1959). The University of Cuyo published two huge volumes of \textit{Un Homenaje a Fritz Krüger} (Mendoza, 1952 and 1954), with important foreign (mainly European) contributions.} In its first phase the ILC above all engaged in the study of (Hispanic) etymology. Under the direction of Krüger it turned towards linguistic-ethnographical Romance and Argentine studies. Journal: AIL.

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

2.1.5. The ICC, officially founded in 1942 (but actually organized only in 1944), has continually developed and enlarged, particularly in the last years. From 1944 to 1948 it was directed by Félix Restrepo (1887-1965; honorary president from 1948-1965); since 1948 it has been directed by José Rivas Sacconi, with Rafael Torres Quintero as associate director. It is now, in structure, the most powerful organ to be devoted to linguistics in 1Am. Although it does not exclusively dedicate itself to linguistic research, it has among its five departments two linguistic departments: a department of lexicography and another of dialectology (directed by Fernando Antonio Martínez and Luis Flórez, respectively), besides a department of classical philology (directed by Jorge Páramo Pomareda) and a large team of industrious collaborators. Among these, besides those already named, José Joaquín Montes deserves special mention.\footnote{From 1940 to 1949 the Spaniard Pedro Urbano González de la Calle was also active in Colombia and collaborated with the ICC since its foundation. Later he went to Mexico.} The Seminario ‘Andrés Bello’, a teaching section of the Institute, created in 1958, organizes postgraduate courses, partly with the collaboration of foreign teachers and lecturers, in which scholarship holders from different countries participate. Since the old group of Buenos Aires dispersed, the ICC has become the leading center of America for Spanish American studies, although it lacks the continental orientation of the Instituto de Filología (in fact, it has concentrated its attention almost exclusively on the

Spanish of Colombia) and has not reached in certain aspects the rigor and technical perfection of the work done in Argentina. Besides two bibliographical series, it is publishing: \textit{Publicaciones del ICC, Publicaciones del ICC. Series Menor, Filólogos colombianos, Clásicos colombianos}, (19, 9, 3, and 4 volumes, respectively, until 1964).\footnote{The linguistic contributions of Raimundo Lida — who was active in the Colegio between 1946 and 1953 and since 1953 has been a teacher at Harvard — mostly belong to his activity in Buenos Aires, prior to 1946.} The ICC has also taken care of a facsimile reprint of the published part of Cuervo’s \textit{Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana} (2 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1951-54) and is now publishing its continuation (under the direction of Fernando Antonio Martínez and with Corominas acting as an adviser). It is also preparing the \textit{Atlas Lingüístico-Enotmográfico de Colombia (ALEC)} (under the direction of Luis Flórez). The general orientation of the linguistic work done by the ICC is traditional, as is usual in the fields of lexicology and dialectology. However, through foreign participation in the Seminario ‘Andrés Bello’, the ICC has helped to spread structural ideas and methods. Some of its collaborators have also manifested some interest in structuralism. Journal: \textit{BICC}.

2.1.6. The principal interests of the CdM — an institute for post-University studies, founded in 1943 — are more of a literary and historico-cultural nature. Among its collaborators in the field of linguistics Juan M. Lope Blanch (also at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) deserves special mention.\footnote{The same can be said about the series \textit{Publicaciones de la NREH}, also edited by the Colegio, into which linguistics enters only partially, in the form of syntheses. Some linguistic works that were in turn published by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México in the series \textit{Publicaciones del Centro de Estudios Literarios}.} In the comprehensive and philologically important series of its publications only occasionally does a work appear related to linguistics.\footnote{50 In this series there appeared in the domain of linguistics works of exceptional interest, as the published and unpublished writings of Cuervo: very useful handbooks, as Robert’s \textit{Manual de Filología hispánica} (1957); valuable studies, as Delos Lincoln Canfield’s \textit{La pronunciación del español en América} (1962) and the dialectological works of Flórez; useful popularizing books (also by Flórez); but unfortunately also a few works which are close to amateur linguistics, as Homero Serio’s \textit{Bibliografía de la lingüística española} (1964) — very rich to be sure, but unsystematic, careless and arbitrary in the selection and arrangement of the material and full of naive affirmations and of serious inaccuracies — as well as some works far beneath the level of scientific acceptability, as Celia Hernández de Mendoza’s \textit{Introducción a la Estilística} (1962).} The linguistic interests of the CdM are more readily expressed in its journal: NRFH.

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

2.1.8. The DLM, founded in 1951, was directed by the present writer from its beginning until March, 1965. Following my transfer to Germany, it remained in charge of my former pupil José Pedro Rona, who, after some attempts in the Indo-European field, has been specializing in Hispanic-American dialectology. The DLM — in addition to those materials designed for its own use — is publishing two series of *Publicaciones*, one printed and one mimeographed, and a series of *Cuadernos de Filología del Lenguaje* (17, 14, and 2 items, respectively, until 1964). The DLM has also published 2 volumes of the series *Filología y Lingüística* of the Facultad de Humanidades. From 1952 to 1962 the DLM was the most active linguistic center in IAM and the most modern in its orientation, being at the same time the only IAM center for research in general linguistics. Concerning its aims and collaborators see 5.1.2. No journal.

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

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

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

Thus, in ARGENTINA, the activity of the well-known structuralist Luis Jorge Prieto (Córdoba); of Gerardo [Gerhard] Moldenhauer and Germán Fernández Guizzetti (Rosario); and of Clemente Hernando Balmary (La Plata) (cf. 1.2.) should be mentioned. In BUENOS AIRES the successive presence of several linguists (cf. 1.2.) has not led to the establishment of a permanent research center; nevertheless, Terracini published two important works there and initiated a collection of students’ pamphlets, of which two items were issued. In Buenos Aires, where he established himself after World War II, the Romance philologist Gazdaru has displayed a significant activity while collaborating intermittently with the two Institute of the University.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

90 From 1953 to 1961 the Peruvian structuralist Martha Hildebrandt was a collaborator of the Instituto (cf. 2.1.7. and fn. 8) and was moreover dealing with native languages in the Comisión In- digenista Nacional. One can further mention the young Hungarian Esteban Emilio Mosonyi, who has also devoted himself to the study of native languages applying structural methods.
is also concentrated in Rio. Ismael de Lima Coutinho (d. 1965), Gladstone Chaves de Melo, Antônio Houaiss too, and perhaps some others, can be included in this group. Matoso Câmara (born 1904), the oldest of this generation, has also been the most modern in his orientation, since he introduced structuralism in Brazil (and indirectly even in Portugal). In turn Silva Neto, an indefatigable promoter of all kinds of linguistic studies, who was recognized as a master by the linguists of his own generation and also by older ones, has been the main representative of historical linguistics in his country and is so far the most outstanding figure in Brazilian linguistics in more than one sense. The main subjects of research for this and the preceding generation have been Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese (history, phonetics, grammar, lexicology, dialectology, stylistics, critical text editions). Other topics, however, were not ignored; thus, general linguistics (Matoso Câmara), Romance linguistics (Silva Neto), Latin studies (Faria), history of linguistics (Silva Neto, Silvio Elia) and Amerindian linguistics (Matoso Câmara).

In other Brazilian centers too there has been a notable or at least promising development in linguistics. For São Paulo, we can mention the activity of Francisco da Silveira Bueno, a student of Portuguese, and particularly that of the Latinist and Romance philologist Theodoro Henrique Maurer Jr. Elsewhere, the following names, among others, have to be remembered: Rosário Ferrão, Manzur Guerios (Curiúba), Heinrich Busse and Albino de Beviga (Porto Alegre), Florival Serafim and B. Valmir C. Chagas (Fortaleza), Ágatha Vaz Leão (Belo Horizonte). A promising new center was until recently that of Brasilia, including Aryon Dal' Igna Rodrigues (Native languages), Adriano Da Gama Kury (Portuguese) and Nelson Rossi (Romance languages); this center dispersed however in 1965. Some linguistic activity has also been recorded in Recife, Salvador and Florianópolis.

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

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

28 In this connection there must be mentioned above all the Biblioteca Brasileira de Filologia of the Livraria Acadêmica, the publications of the Livros de Portugal Press as well as the meritorious, although very variable Coleção 'Rex' of the Organização Símones (all in Rio de Janeiro).
Aires, 1939-46, continued as Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica [NRFH], Mexico City, 1947ff. (16 vols. until 1962), is the most important among IAM philological journals and the principal Hispanic organ in America, owing to its wealth and variety of content as well as to its scientific and technical level. Founded by Amado Alonso in its two forms, it was directed by him until his death (1952), then by Alfonso Reyes (d. 1959) and since 1962 by Antonio Alatorre and Ángel Rosenblat.97 Since its foundation it included important foreign contribution which has considerably increased in the NRFH. The NRFH was mainly an organ of the Buenos Aires Instituto de Filología and of Hispanists or Romance philologists, either Argentine or resident in Argentina. The NRFH has become an organ of continental Hispanic studies (including North America). Under the direction of Amado Alonso it kept, in its two forms, a certain balance between linguistics and philology. In the following period the interest for literature prevailed. Only during recent years does it seem to have regained a balance between philology and linguistics, particularly in the book review section, thanks to Lope Blanch. The articles it publishes deals mainly with Spanish (European and American), but general linguistics, Romance linguistics, and philosophy of language are also represented, above all in the book reviews. It has always been an organ open to the various trends of modern linguistics, including structuralism to a certain extent (but cf. 4.2.1.). Most useful is its Bibliografía elaborated in systematic connection with that of the Revista Hispánica Moderna. Particularly important are the volumes in honor of Amado Alonso (7, 1953) and of Alfonso Reyes (15, 1961).

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

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

---

The only exclusively or almost exclusively linguistic journal, Investigaciones Lingüísticas (5 vols., Mexico City, 1933-38), belongs to a period prior to that considered here. From a journal Folia Linguistica Americana (originally volumes contributions to no. 1 (announced for 1952) were distributed, but the journal itself, as far as I know, was not issued.

97 The NRFH was edited by the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires and the Instituto de las Españas (Hispanic Institute) of the Columbia University, New York; the NRFH, by the CDM (1947-57) and later by the CDM and the University of Texas, Austin, Texas (1958-63); since 1962 it is edited by the Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios of the CDM and the IFAB. In the period, when the direction was interrupted, the appearance of the NRFH was secured by its secretaries (at first, Raimundo Lida; later, Antonio Alatorre).
amount of philological and linguistic articles, considered on the whole, although philology is prevalent in certain volumes. European and North American collaboration is abundant, but IAM and, in particular, Colombian contribution has gradually increased. The topics of its local contributions are Colombian dialectology and lexicology (practically lacking in historical linguistics). Other linguistic topics are found almost exclusively in the book reviews. The latter have recently become numerous and varied owing above all to Joaquín Montes. The general outlook of the journal is traditional, sometimes open to structuralism through the foreign collaboration and a few reviews. Special mention should be given to volume 5 (1949, issued 1950), Homenaje a Félix Restrepo.

3.1.5. Filologia (FI), Buenos Aires, 1949ff. (with an interruption between 1954 and 1938), directed successively by Alonso Zamora Vicente (1-3, 1949-51), Arturo Berenguer (4, 1952-53), Marcos Morínigo (5-6, 1959-60), and finally by Ana María Barrenechea (1961ff.), 8 volumes until 1962, reflects the ups and downs of the Instituto de Filologia of Buenos Aires after what happened in 1946 (cf. 2.1.1.). Under the direction of Zamora Vicente this journal had a good period and presented a clearcut physiognomy. The following period was rather one of decay and disorientation. Since the last volumes the FI has been recovering to some extent and is at the same time gaining a definite character. Its contributions are mostly Hispano-American and Argentine (a good number of the collaborators remain those trained in the school of Amado Alonso and who belonged to the RFH group). Its content was more linguistic than philological during the first years; later, the reverse. In the latest volumes it seems to aim at a balance between linguistics and historico-literary erudition. The linguistic articles mostly deal with European and American (Argentine) Spanish, and to some extent with Romance linguistics (Gazdaru). Linguistic book reviews are numerous in the first three volumes, much less however in the following. The general outlook of FI is traditional, approaching structuralism in the recent years. Volume 8 (1962), Homenaje a Marta Rosa Lida de Maltiel, deserves particular mention.

3.1.6. The Revista Brasileira de Filologia (RBF), Rio de Janeiro, 1955ff, founded by Serafin Silva Neto and directed by him until volume 4 (1958), since volume 6 by a committee (Nascimento, Lima Coutinho, Matosso Câmara, Silvio Elia), 6 volumes until 1961, is the leading philological-linguistic journal of Brazil. It appeared regularly under the direction of Silva Neto and less regularly after his death. In some volumes there is an abundance of foreign contribution; generally however, Brazilian contributors (linguists belonging to the Rio, Pórtio Alegre, and, to a smaller extent, to the São Paulo groups) prevail. Its content is to a much greater extent linguistic than philological. The topics of the RBF are European and Brazilian Portuguese, but it also publishes articles and book reviews concerning general and Romance linguistics. Together with the RFH-NRFH it is the IAM journal which devotes most interest to historical linguistics. Its book reviews are numerous and generally extensive. Although its orientation is fundamentally traditional (historical), it is the IAM journal which grants most space to structuralism, in its articles as well as in its review section.
United States) or to the original IAM contribution to linguistic theory and methodology, this survey would have no reason to be written or it would have been a very limited one. As to its trends, the outlook of IAM linguistics is determined by what it received, not by what it could offer. For this very reason the problem of orientations for IAM coincides to a high degree with the problem of information and will be considered here from this point of view.

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

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

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

Except for this enterprise, there has not been a regular or rational translation program in IAM. Yet University and above all commercial presses published several important works, such as: Psychologia del lenguaje [Psychologie du langage = Journal de psychologie, 30. 1933; an incomplete translation] (Buenos Aires, 1952); Jespersen, Humanidad, nación, individuo desde el punto de vista lingüístico (Maskind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View) (Buenos Aires, 1947); Sapir, El lenguaje [Language] (Mexico City, 1954); Bertil Malmberg, La fonética [La Phonétique] (Buenos Aires, 1964). In Brazil Matosso Cámara excellently translated Sapir, A linguagem. Introdução ao estudo da fala [Language] (Rio de Janeiro, 1956) and Lingüística como ciência (a selection of 9 articles; Rio de Janeiro, 1961). Works of

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

49 Numbers 112-113 of this journal (1955) constituted an Homenaje a Andrés Belli.

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

41 The translation of de Saussure reached its 4th impression in 1961.
general linguistics (Vulgar Latin) is given in Silva Neto’s *História do latim vulgar* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957).

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

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

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


45 In this field even a Russian work was translated: D. P. Gorskij, Ed., *Pensamiento y Lenguaje* (Myślenie i język) (Montevideo, 1958), which certainly is not the most adequate to represent the thinking of the best Soviet theorists of language.

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

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

48 Thus, Max Müller and Dauzat are listed in some IAm bibliographies next to Saussure and Bloomfield, and Dauzat even figures as a philosopher of language (!).
The first results are partly tangible: such names as Vendryes, de Saussure, Vossler, Spitzer, Bally, Büllner are well known to IAM linguists and are usually included in the lists of readings in those universities where linguistics is taught, alongside with the leading Spanish linguists (and Portuguese linguists in Brazil). These are followed by names such as: Humboldt, Melleit, Sapir, Trubetzkoy, Wartburg, and some others.

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

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

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

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

67 NAL is ignored in Terracina’s ¿Qué es la lingüística? (where Sapir, Totality is incidentally quoted). Thiriet, for example, in his book on NAL around 1923, refers to the work of the IAM linguists (in which, however, some North American works are quoted).

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

Thus, e.g. an identification of Wilhelm von Humboldt with Alexander von Humboldt, as can be found in Harry Hoijer, Ed., Language in Culture 53 and 286, is simply inconceivable among the well-informed IAM linguists. Equally—indeed, independent of the practical justification—it may have in the United States — the well-informed IAM linguist is vexed by the fact that the North American handbooks so often ignore the great European linguists whom he knows and admires, e.g. that neither Gilliéron nor Bartoli are quoted in connection with dialect geography, as is the case in Hockett, A Course in Modern Linguistics 484 (where, instead of Bartoli’s well-known norm of the lateral series, only an unpublished formulation by Isidore Dyen is quoted about this same norm) or that the name of de Saussure simply does not appear in this same body.

4.1.5. The varying familiarity with the latter fields implies perceivable differences as to information levels in the various IAM centers, in spite of what can be considered as more or less uniform. Relatively high levels of information are recorded above all in Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, Buenos Aires and Santiago, still judging from the...
publications. An optimum of information, including all those fields referred to as less known in 4.1.4. and such disciplines as history of linguistics and philosophy of language, was achieved in Montevideo between 1952 and 1962. In connection with the diffusion of information, I spoke of 'influences' exerted on IAm linguistics. But this calls for an explanation. It is certainly possible in some cases to speak properly of influences, implying the critical incorporation of borrowed elements to new or at least organic and definable conceptions. In this sense one can trace direct influence of Vossler and Husseri in Amado Alonso, of Jakobson and Sapir in Mattoso Câmara, of Martinet and glossematics in Luis Jorge Prieto, of Italian linguistics, a number of language philosophers and several forms of European structuralism in the theoretical works of Montevideo. In most cases, however, one cannot speak of influences in this sense, but rather of a total or partial adherence to a certain doctrine or even of an occasional application or use of views and methods for particular or circumscribed aims. In the following I shall not, however, insist on this distinction, which, strictly speaking, can only be made for each particular linguist and sometimes only for single works. I shall rather refer to those views, methods, and techniques of modern linguistics which were either accepted or applied and used in IAm, without implying in each case a total adherence on the part of the cited linguists. Indeed, the most general feature of IAm linguistics in this connection is its eclecticism: the simultaneous presence of different views and methods in the activity of the same linguists and sometimes in the same work.

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

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

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

43 In part, and especially since 1957, the DLM has been active in different ways also as a center for the diffusion of linguistic information to several other IAm centers.
44 Cf. his booklet El idealismo en la lingüística y su derivación metodológica (Lima, 1931).
45 Concerning the stylistic application of idealism, see 6.2.3.
linguistics). This situation has somewhat changed during the last years, although not much. The following have since then directed their attention towards structuralism: Ana María Bernabé, Mabel Manacorda de Rosetti, Fernández Guizetti and Jorge Súarez in Argentina; Rabanes and Heles Contreras in Chile; and a certain interest for structuralism also appeared in Colombia (Patrísio Rossetti, Montes). European structuralism (including Jakobson) generally met with broader acceptance and sometimes also penetrated into non-structuralist works, especially in the form of phonemics. North American methods were applied by: Silva-Fuenzalida, Marsha Hillenbrandt, Fernández Guizetti, Jorge Súarez and Heles Contreras. But North American structuralism was by no means assimilated and incorporated into IAm linguistics, so that the contributions of these latter linguists are for the time being rather foreign bodies in it: they are pieces of North American linguistics casually produced in IAm.

4.2.2. Certain trends as well as certain methods and techniques of very recent linguistics have not been recorded so far in IAm or they are found only sporadically. Thus there has not been any adherence to glottochronies (although pastasemical concepts were used here and there) nor to Guillaumeism, which is strange, when one considers its recent diffusion in France. The only representative of Weisgerber's Neo-Humboldtism — and thus also of what is called in the U.S.A. the 'Suph-Whorf hypothesis' — is Schulte-Herbrüggen, with his book El lenguaje y la visión del mundo (Santiago de Chile, 1963).87 Heles Contreras is the only one who has been dealing with generative grammar.88 No activity is recorded in the field of mathematical linguistics or machine translation.89 Swadesh's glottochronology has not been widely received and this is not always a matter of chance, nor does it have all the qualities of an example,90 and with sympathy, although not without reservations, in another.91 But beyond this it was either explicitly opposed as lacking rational foundation,92 or considered with welcome scepticism93 or, as in most cases, simply ignored.

5. TYPICAL ATTITUDES AND NEW EXPERIENCES

5.0. IAm linguistics as a whole can be characterized by two basic attitudes which constitute, so to speak, its typical style: the attitude it assumes concerning linguistic theories and methodology and the attitude it reveals in the delimitation of its objective field of activity.94 These attitudes have been implicitly or explicitly opposed, particularly by the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires and the Departamento de Linguística of Montevideo, which Súarez and Heles Contreras consider as representatives of a different style.

5.1.0. As far as the former attitude is concerned, IAm linguistics is characterized by its receptivity. In this respect it resembles, to a certain point, Soviet linguistics during the years immediately following Marxism: it is inclined to absorb information and to adopt and apply methods which have already been tried elsewhere, however without the intention to participate in the international dialogue of linguistics, but rather for immediate and local purposes. By the way, the adopted methods are not necessarily selected because of their newness or intrinsic quality. The foremost problem of IAm linguistics is to overcome its backwardness in the general field of scientific linguistics as such. Thus, everything which appears to be scientific is in principle equally good and worth adopting. One often hears or reads the phrase: 'In IAm we have not yet this or that type of study'; a typical aspiration of most IAm linguistics is therefore to accomplish such investigations as are lacking in IAm, conforming to European and recently also to United States models.95 All this can undoubtedly be justified by the actual objective situation, as was seen above, but at the same time it implies a previous renunciation to carry imported theories and methods further. IAm linguistics certainly want to contribute to the qualitative progress of LINGUISTICS IN IAm and to elevate it to the level of European or North American linguistics, but they are usually not inclined to contribute to qualitative progress — theoretically and methodologically — of LINGUISTICS AS A WHOLE. In this respect they rather aim at a quantitative progress, i.e. to extend already existing scientific linguistics to fields either unexplored or barely explored. Thus, IAm linguistics is a linguistics which generally does not strive for originality and which has no theoretical or methodological ambitions.96 Its motto is absorbing and applying, rather than creating and renovating. During the last years a methodological advance has been perceivable, but, strictly speaking, through the importation of new methods, rather than through an internal methodological renovation or development of original methods. For the same reason

94 Strictly speaking these two attitudes could be reduced to just one, since in both cases we have to do with what is regarded by IAm linguistics as its specific task. It is, however, proper to examine them separately.
95 In certain cases this leads to the explicit adaptation of particular models, e.g. of a certain European book.
96 Sometimes this lack of interest is presented as a virtue and eventual theoretical and methodological speculations are considered as inopportune or as not corresponding to the proper task of IAm linguistics.
Pedro Rona), dialectology (Coseriu, Rona), besides several particular problems such as translation (Olaf Blizn), interlinguistic contacts (Rona, Juan Meo Zilio), extra-linguistic expressive activities (Meo Zilio), and the teaching of grammar (Piccardo). As to languages the following were included: Romance languages (Coseriu), Spanish of Uruguay and America (Rona, Vázquez, Meo Zilio), Italian (Meo Zilio), native languages (Benigno Ferrario [d. 1959], Blizn, Vázquez), Sanskrit (Nicolaus Aluchow). Secondly the DLM undertook to discuss critically the main trends of modern linguistics and the respective methods, examining their value in each case. The formula characterizing the critical activity of Montevideo is: 'scope and limits', since it tried in each case to determine the validity and at the same time the limitations of the various views and methods under discussion. Thus Coseriu examined the distinction between language and speech and the validity of Saussureanism in this connection (*Sistema norma y habla*, 1952); the relation between form and substance in the sounds of language, the interrelation between phonetics and phonemics and the scope and limits of the various phonemic theories and of glossesmatism (*Forma y sustancia en los sonidos del lenguaje*, 1958); the range and limits of dialect geography (*La geografía lingüística*, 1958); the foundations of grammar and the scope and limits of grammatical logicism, psychologism and formalism (*Logismo y antilogismo en la gramática*, 1957); the relation between functioning and change in language and between description and history in linguistics, the rational sense of phonetic laws and the foundations and postulates of diachronic structuralism (*Sincronía, diacrónia e historia*, 1958).

Coseriu and Vázquez outlined a scheme for the unification of the phonics sciences, fixing their application levels (*Para la unificación de las ciencias fónicas*, 1953).

Piccardo critically examined two basic points of grammatical theory: the problem of word categories (*El concepto de 'partes de la oración*', 1952) and the problem of sentence (*El concepto de 'oración*', 1954); Rona, partly developing ideas of Coseriu, examined the specific problems of Hispano-American dialectology and established a number of new methodological principles for this discipline (*Aspectos metodológicos de la dialectología hispanoamericana*, 1958). Thirdly the DLM undertook to elaborate a linguistic theory in accordance with the reality of language, in its functioning as well as in its historical development, a task undertaken by Coseriu, who performed it simultaneously with his critical activity. The basic principle of this theory is that the first condition of any linguistic theory is its adequacy to its object and that its basis must necessarily be the 'original knowledge', i.e. the knowledge which man possesses about himself as a speaker. It follows from the latter that the different lin-
guistic theories are necessarily based on valid intuitions, although they will eventually become partialized, distorted, and dogmatized in the course of further elaboration. In the construction of his theory, Cseriu therefore starts by noticing the essential exactness of two traditional intuitions: the intuition referring to the dynamic, i.e., creative character of language, affirmed since Humboldt by linguistic idealism, and the intuition concerning the systematic character of language, also already expressed by Humboldt, but developed above all by linguistics of positivistic origin (Seassure, Bloomfield and their followers). Consequently, he tries to reconcile these two equally correct intuitions and to justify rationally their unity, and thus he comes to a conception in which language is regarded as a creative activity implying at the same time a systematic technique, and in which any essential difference between the functioning and the change of language is denied. This leads him further to distinguish between external and internal structures of historical languages and between several structure levels of the linguistic technique (norm — system — linguistic type), as well as to a theory of contexts and of the use of non-linguistic instruments on behalf of linguistic technique. The theory developed by Cseriu as a whole is structuralist and functionalist, but not formalistic. It is equally removed from those formalizations which ignore the substance in the two sides of language as also from those which exclude the meaning as uninvestigable or try to reduce it to different phenomena (situation, distribution, etc.).

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

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

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

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

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

62 Thus at least three of the six items in the program of the Instituto de Filología of Santiago have a localistic character: a) the study of the peculiarities of Chilean Spanish (pronunciation, grammatical forms, vocabulary, anthroponymy, toponymy); b) the elaboration of a linguistic atlas for Chile and a complete dictionary of Chileanisms; c) the elaboration of a Chilean linguistic bibliography (BFUCH 4.5, 1946-6); two of these items show at the same time a peculiaristic orientation ("peculiarities", "Chileanisms"). The history and description of non-American Spanish are not included in this program.

63 For this reason most investigations on American Spanish are rather collections of material complementary to the Grammatica of the Spanish Academy and particularly to its dictionary, than studies properly speaking. Even the general contributions about the Spanish of this or that country do not present the whole Spanish language of the respective country (or at least systematic examples of it), but in fact single aspects considered as differential. In reality one can say that there are many comparative examinations of American Spanish (as far as it differs from General Spanish and from the Spanish of the Real Academia), but that genuine descriptions of the varieties of American Spanish are lacking.
in Spain, the possible diffusion of these same facts in other levels of the same Spanish or in other regions of America is left out of consideration. 5.2.1. The exceptions, at least the deliberate exceptions, are not very numerous in this case either. Peculiarism seems to be slowly overcome by dialect geography and by a few systematic local studies. The reactions to localism are, however, fewer. European students as Corominas, Terracini, Kräger, Gandariz, Ferrara, and others were not localists, of course: they simply continued in IAm an earlier activity, already directed towards other interests; and due to the very nature of their object, the grammarians usually are not localists either, as they are concerned with Spanish grammar as such rather than with Hispano-American grammar. A clearly non-localistic attitude has been characteristic for the DLM, as is shown by the languages it has dealt with (cf. 5.1.2) and by other signs. Nor would it have been possible for the old Instituto de Filología Clásica de Buenos Aires to be localistic, given its specialization (cf. 2.1.2, and 3.2). Non-locally limited interests are also shown by the DFL (cf. 2.1.7) and by some isolated scholars.

5.2.2. The great exception in this respect was, however, the Instituto de Filología de Buenos Aires, which since its beginning was a center for Hispanic, not simply Argentine studies. Amado Alonso kept up and stressed this orientation, always working on a general Hispanic level, even when dealing with American and local problems, which permitted him to correct a number of errors committed because of the narrow localist outlook. This same attitude to overcome localism by viewing local Hispanic facts in a broader Hispanic perspective, is revealed moreover in all the publications of the Instituto, especially in the BDH and the RFH. Amado Alonso's attitude was transmitted to his disciples, first of all to Ángel Rosenblat, who even in his studies on local facts, proceeds as a Hispano-Americanist and a Hispanist (not simply as an Argentineanist or a Venezuelanist). This attitude has partly been kept up also as a proper tradition of the IAA (cf. 2.1.1. and 3.1.5).

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

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

---

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

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

46 Cf. e.g. his famous article 'Esamen de la teórica indigenista de Rodolfo Less', RFH 1.313-50 (1939).

47 This does not imply, of course, any concession to peculiarism. On the contrary, Amado Alonso expressed his opposition to such an attitude in terms which deserve to be fully quoted: 'I suppose that a word such as yapa is as common in Peru as padre or mama. But the compilers of vocabularies include yapa and not padre nor mama. Why is this so? Because yapa is a curiosity in Madrid. In other words, the guiding principle for the inclusion of a word is a fact which is external to the system being studied; it is included because it is unusual in another area. All the pieces that make up the machine and how they work do not matter, only those individual pieces which seem surprising somewhere else.' (RFH, 3.162, 1944). Further on Alonso observes that such a proceeding is legitimate only, if one wishes to establish a supplement to the Dictionary of the Academy, but not, if one has to describe a modality of American Spanish. Many Hispano-American dialectologists consider Amado Alonso as their ideal master, but his teachings in this respect were not faithfully followed indeed.
6. WORK FIELDS: RESULTS SO FAR OBTAINED

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

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

6.1.1. The first Hispano-American synthesis in lexicology (i.e. the collecting of lexical Americanisms), Augusto Malaret's Diccionario de americanismos (Mayaguez, P. R., 1925), belongs to a prior period; but the third revised and enlarged edition of this work was published in the period dealt with here (Buenos Aires, 1946). Another very rich synthesis, however in various aspects inferior to that of Malaret, is Francisco Javier Santamaria's Diccionario general de americanismos, 3 vols. (Mexico City, 1942-43).84 There is no synthesis comparable to these two in Brazil.

6.1.2. In Hispano-American dialectology a fundamental stage is represented by the BDH (cf. 2.1.1.) which, however, is not really a synthesis but rather a corpus of dialectological studies. For Brazil there is nothing comparable to this corpus (also because dialect studies are not very numerous there anyway); on the other hand there is available for Brazil an important historical-descriptive synthesis: Serafin Silva Neto's Introdução ao estudo da língua portuguesa no Brasil (Rio de Janeiro, 1963), the like of which is lacking in Spanish America.85

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

excellent is Ángel Rosenblat's initiation, La lengua y la cultura de Hispanoamérica, Tendencias actuales (Berlin, 1933), several times republished (last edition: Caracas, 1962).86 In Brazil, a work similar to that of Alonso as far as the basic attitude is concerned is Silvio Eliá's O problema da língua brasileira (Rio de Janeiro, 1961).87

6.1.4. In the field of school grammar an important stage was reached by the renovating work of Amado Alonso and Pedro Henriquez Ureña, Gramática castellana (2 vols.; Buenos Aires, 1935), several times republished. There is nothing equal in Brazil, although there exist a number of school grammars written by linguists (Nascimento, Rocha Lima, Silva e Bueno, Celso Cunha).

6.1.5. For the native languages a general synthesis is Antonio Tovar's Catálogo de las lenguas de América del Sur (Buenos Aires, 1961), an outcome of his activity in Tucumán, which contains short characterizations of these languages and their classification, as well as 168 pages of bibliography.88

6.2.0. In the period with which we are concerned here, three disciplines are prevailing in IAm linguistics: dialectology, lexicology and stylistics (which in the opinion of most IAm linguists belongs to linguistics),89 all three applied to the national languages. For Brazil historical linguistics must be added, which even prevails there over the others (cf. 6.4.2.).

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

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

84 Cf. in the same author, El castellano de España y el castellano de América. Unidad y diferenciación (Caracas, 1962). The work of the Spaniard Américo Castro, La peculiaridad lingüística rosiplastique et su sentido histórico (Buenos Aires, 1941; new ed. 1960) is impressionistic and very questionable; the same problem is dealt with in Rodolfo A. Borrero, 'Acército del argentino medio frente a la lengua' and Ángel J. Battistessa, 'El argentina y sus principales interrogantes frente a los problemas de la unidad de la lengua', both in Presente y futuro de la lengua española. Actas de la Asamblea de Filología del I Congreso de Instituciones hispánicas 1. 193-8, and 199-208, respectively (Madrid, 1964); and in Rosenblat's important historical study, 'Las generaciones argentinas del siglo XIX ante el problema de la lengua', Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, 12th period, 5,539-84 (1960), also published separately (Buenos Aires, 1961).


86 An initiation including also the North American languages is Dick E. Barra Graasso's Lenguas indígenas americanas (Buenos Aires, 1958). I have not yet seen Matiaso Charka, Introducción de lenguas indígenas brasileiras (Rio de Janeiro, 1965).

Aspectos metodológicos point out above (cf. 5.1.2. and fn. 91), in which the necessity to distinguish in dialectology the different levels of language and to fix the dialect zones on an IAm scale⁵⁵⁶ beyond national borders is maintained. Ambrosio Rabanales’ Introducción al estudio del español de Chile. Determinación del concepto de chilenismo (Santiago, 1953) can also be named.¹²⁶ The descriptive studies are in turn numerous, and some of them contain methodological observations too.

Concerning the methods of investigation, a first immediate progress was made through research trips and inquiries, either direct or by correspondence, for which Tomás Navarro’s Cuestionario lingüístico hispanoamericano (Buenos Aires, 1943; 2nd ed., 1945) was an important instrument. More decisive progress, going far beyond simple inquiries, was represented by the introduction of dialect geography. So far the only linguistic atlas for an American Spanish region is found, preceded by an ample study, in Tomás Navarro’s El español en Puerto Rico. Contribución a la geografía lingüística hispanoamericana (Río Piedras, P.R., 1948). Since this work, however, dialect geography has advanced in Argentina (Vidal de Battini), in Uruguay (Rona), and above all in Colombia, where the ICC has become the foremost center for dialect geography in Spanish America, and where the preparation of the ALEC (cf. 2.1.5.) has fairly advanced.¹³⁴ Linguistic atlases are either in preparation or at least being planned for other IAm countries too.¹³⁶ The onomasiological studies related to dialect geography, see 6.2.2. Besides these methodological improvements and partly independent of them, general studies, usually of a differential nature, on Spanish spoken in different Hispanic-American countries⁵³⁷ or smaller regions⁵³⁸ have continued to be published.

¹²³ Rona himself applied these principles in "Vulgarizaciones o adaptación diacrónicas de neologismos o coloquiales", Revista Nacional 205.385-409 (also published separately: Montevideo, 1962), and in "El uso del futuro en el verso americano", FT 7.121-44 (1961).
¹³⁴ Cf. the discussions by Rona, BFM 7 and by Juan M. Lope Blanch, NRFF 12.410-2.
¹³⁵ See: Tomás Buesa Oliver and Luis Flórez, El Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC), Cuestionario prelininar (Bogotá, 1954 [published 1960]) and Cuestionario para el Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia. Segunda edición, en experimentación (Bogotá, 1960); a third edition without the names of the authors was published in 1961); also several articles by Flórez: "El español hablado en Colombia y su atlas lingüístico", Presente y futuro de la lengua española 1.5-77 (with 30 maps); "El Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC). Nota informativa", BICC 16. 77-125 (with 23 maps); "Principios y métodos del Atlas lingüístico-etnográfico de Colombia (ALEC)", BICC 19.201-9.
¹³⁶ In Uruguay Adolfo Berro García has been preparing a linguistic atlas; in Chile the Instituto de Filología de Santiago has planned a similar work; another atlas has been planned for Costa Rica: cf. Arturo Agüero, "El español de Costa Rica y su atlas lingüístico", Presente y futuro de la lengua española 1.135-52. For Brazil a linguistic atlas has been planned by the Casa de Rui Barbosa (Rio de Janeiro).
¹³⁷ The outstanding among these studies are the following: Humberto Toscano Mateus, El español en el Ecuador (Madrid, 1952); Beatriz E. Vidal de Battini, El español en la Argentina (Buenos Aires, 1964); a first and shorter version was published in 1954); and, for his manner of posing problems, the pamphlet by Ángel Rosenblat, Lengua y cultura de Venezuela (Caracas, no date). Presente y futuro de la lengua española 1. includes articles on the Spanish of Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, Puerto Rico, by Lope Blanch, Oren. Toscano Mateus, Luis De Giuseppe, Rubén de Rosario; and on Argentinean Spanish, by Luis Alfonso and Vidal de Battini.
¹³⁸ Such as the remarkable study by Vidal de Battini, El habla rural de San Luis, I (BDH 7; Buenos Aires, 1949). In Brazil an important analogous study on a regional variety of Portuguese is: Antenor NASCIMENTO, O "linguário carioca" (Rio de Janeiro, 1953). About the phonetic aspects of a local variety of American Spanish the most comprehensive contribution is Luis Flórez, La pronunciación del español en Bogotá (Bogotá, 1951).
¹³⁹ Among these studies the following particularly deserve to be mentioned: Rosenblat, "Notas de morfología dialectal", BDH 2. 102-316 (Buenos Aires, 1946), and Lope Blanch, Observaciones sobre la sintaxis del español hablado en México (México, 1955).
cana relativo a la muerte (Mexico City, 1963). A methodologically interesting contribution, whose subject is a native language, is Anselmo Ragúelo's Los nombres de parentesco en la famíila mapuche, *BFuCh* 7.342-59.133

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

The leading proponent of stylistics in Hispano-America was Amado Alonso, who devoted a great part of his activity to it. Among his theoretical and methodological contributions the following must be remembered: 'Carta a Alfonso Reyes sobre la estilística', published in the newspaper *La Nación* de Buenos Aires (February 9, 1941) and 'The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts', *MLN* 57,489-96 (1942).134

In Brazil Mattoso Cámara drew a theoretical sketch of stylistics together with a short stylistic characterization of the Portuguese language, *Contribuição para uma estilística da língua portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro, 1952; 2nd edition, 1953: Contribuição à estilística portuguesa). Coseriu wrote about several theoretical problems of stylistics; thus, about the position of stylistics in relation with other linguistic disciplines, in *Sistema, norma y habla*, particularly 63, and 'Determinación y entorno' (cf. 5.2.1.); about the different possible stylistics, in *Reseñas* 7-8 (Montevideo, 1955); about the conditions and modality of metaphorical creation, in *La creación metafórica en el lenguaje* (Montevideo, 1956). An important and philosophically well-founded theoretical work on the relation between language and literature and on the work of verbal art is Félix Martínez Bonati's *La estructura de la obra literaria* (Santiago de Chile, 1960). An excellent introduction to stylistics (even the best preface to prestructuralist stylistics of all I know) is Roberto Fernández Retamar's *Idea de la estilística* (Universidad Central de Las Villas [Santa Clara, Cuba], 1958).135 A criticism of Spitzer's stylistics was tried by Ángela Váz Leão in *Sobre a estilística de Spitzer* (Belo Horizonte, 1960); a criticism of Devon's stylistics is found in Coseriu's *Reseñas* cited above.

As to the application of stylistics, Amado Alonso's most important achievement is *Poesía y estilo de Pablo Neruda* (Buenos Aires, 1940; 2nd ed., 1951).136 Mattoso

---

133 The work of Rosenblat referred to in fn. 20 contains genuine historic-critical monographs on lexicographical problems, although written in a popular style. The lexicographical contributions on slang, which remain to be mentioned in this domain, are usually due to non-specialists. An important exception is Antonio Nasconets, *A gíria brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1953). To Nasconets we also owe a Diccionario de sinónimos (Rio de Janeiro, 1957).


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

136 Less accomplished (and less stylistic) is his work *Ensayo sobre la novela histórica. El modernismo en La Gloria de Don Ramón* (Buenos Aires, 1943). Cf. also the other essays included in *Matería y forma en poesía*. Alonso's contributions to stylistics of the Spanish language belong to a period prior to that here considered.

---


138 Reprinten — the latter with many modifications and under the title 'Americanismo en la forma interior del lenguaje' — in Amado Alonso, *Estudios lingüísticos. Temas españoles* 230-87 (Madrid, 1951) and *Estudios lingüísticos. Temas hispanoamericanos* 73-101 (Madrid, 1953), respectively.
the phonemic theory is found in Mattoso Câmara’s Para o estudo da fonética portuguesa 7-52.

6.3.3. There are many more contributions to the theory of grammar and to the discussion of grammatical notions. The main studies on the foundations of grammar are: Csereru, *Logismo y antilogismo* y ‘Determinación y entorno’, 1959 on basic grammatical notions, the two studies by Piccardo cited in 5.1.2. Important and modern are further Ana Maria Barreiro’s ‘El pronombre y su inclusión en un sistema de categorías semánticas’, F 8.241-72 and ‘Las clases de palabras en español, como clases funcionales’, RomPh 17.301-9. Concerning the distinction between coordination and subordination Eduardo J. Prieto’s small pamphlet *Parataxis e hipotaxis* (Rosario, 1959) can be remembered; on the neutralization in grammar: Mattoso Câmara, ‘Sur la neutralisation morphologique’, TIL 2.767-77. About several other grammatical notions and problems: Csereru, ‘El plural en los nombres propios’, RBF 1.1-15; ‘Sobre el futuro romance’, RBF 3.1-18; and Sobre las llamadas ‘construcciones con verbos de movimiento’: un problema hipónico (Montevideo, 1962). Among other contributions the following can be mentioned: Luis Cifuentes García, ‘Aocrea del aspecto’, BFUC 8.57-65; Gustavo Carrillo Herrera, ‘Las oraciones subordinadas’, BFUC 15.165-21; José Joaquín Montes, ‘Sobre la divisió de la gramática en morfología y sintaxis’, BICC 18.679-85. An attempt to adapt Templier’s structural syntax to some aspects of Spanish is Jorge Páramo Pomarred, ‘Elementos de sintaxis estructural’, BICC 16.185-207. A number of grammatical distinctions drawn with modern criteria, although not further developed, are found in the program of Rabanales recorded in 6.3.5. Grammatical notions are moreover exposed and discussed in Mattoso Câmara’s *Introdução* and also in Luis Jaime Cisneros, *Lengua y estilo*, I (Lima, 1959).

128 Among the applications—besides Mattoso Câmara’s *Fonética*, the studies by Alonso, Vásquez, Silva-Fuentes and Guitarte pointed out in 4.2.2., and the pamphlet by Saopretas and Contreras referred to in fn. 66—there must be mentioned: Silva-Fuentes, ‘La entonación en el español y su morfología’, BFUC 9.5-77, and Amberto Housain, *Tentativa de descripción del sistema vocálico del português colo na área doia carioca* (Rio de Janeiro, 1959). An interesting study, which raises new problems with regard to the phonemic distribution in Spanish is Ambroso Rabanales, ‘Las siglas: un problema de fonología española’, BFUC 15.327-42. In general, studies of experimental phonetics are lacking in IAm, although there are a number of laboratories for phonetics. The only general study which can be mentioned in this field is Mercedes V. Álvarez Puebla de Chaves, *Problemas de fonética experimental* (La Plata, 1948). Among the applications: Alonso Zamora Vicente, ‘Rehabili-


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


131 The following published important grammatical studies on the national languages — in Spanish America: Rosenthal, Rosales, Lydia Contreras, Lope Cisneros, Mabel Maracorda de Rosetti; in Brazil: Nascentes, Mattoso Câmara, Maurer Jr., Carlos Henrique de Rocha Lima, Vaz Lobo, Evandro Bechara and others. In Brazil most of these grammatical studies are descriptive and historical at the same time; in Spanish America they are mainly descriptive and interpretative.

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

6.3.4. Semantics is represented in IAm by just a few contributions and generally continues to be understood as a discipline which studies the changes in the meaning of words. The best known work in this respect, Félix Restrepo’s *Diseño de semántica general. El alma de las palabras*, which reached its 3rd edition (Bogotá, 1958), does not belong to the period considered here. Francisco da Silveira Bueno, *Tratado de semántica geral aplicada à língua portuguesa do Brasil* (São Paulo, 1947; third edition, 1960: *Tratado de semântica brasileira*), is an adaptation and application to Portuguese of the classifications proposed by Albert Carnoy, *La science du mot. Traité de sémantique* (Louvain, 1927). More recent trends in semantics have not yet entered IAm investigation, if oneexcepts the neo-Humboldtian trend — present in some of Amado Alonso’s contributions particularly in ‘Preferencias mentales en el habla del gaucho’, cited in 6.3.1.) and in the already mentioned book by Schulte-Herbrüggen and the stimulus coming from anthropology, to which Ragüello’s article cited in 6.2.2. is indebted. From IAm in turn came an important novelty in semantics, which at the same time is one of the most important IAm contributions to linguistic theory. That is the functional analysis of content — an analysis which, of course, embraces both grammar and the lexical level — undertaken by Luis Jorge Prieto in a number of contributions published since 1954 and which culminated in his *Principes de noologie* (The Hague, 1964). In these Principes an attempt is made to establish minimal unities of simultaneous realization for content (nomes), analogous to the phonemes on the expression plane of language.

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

Thus linguistic taboo is treated in Csereru, *La creación metafórica* 23-7, and Mansur Guérinos, *Tabús lingüísticos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1956). Women’s language is dealt with in: Hernando Balmori, ‘Habla mujeril’, F 8.123-38. About the extra-linguistic expressive activities, Rabanales, ‘La somatolalia’, BFUC 8.355-73; and Meo Zilio, ‘Consideraciones generales sobre el lenguaje de los gestos’, BFUC 12.225-48, and ‘El lenguaje de los gestos en el Uruguay’, BFUC 13.75-165, should be mentioned, the latter being the first contribution in which a large number of gestures are interpreted in terms of functional oppositions and distinctive features.

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


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

6.3.6. Problems of philosophy of language are treated in several of Coseriu’s works, particularly in *Forma y sustancia*, in *Logicismo y antilogismo*, in *Determinación y entorno* and in *Síncronia, diacrónia e historia*, and also in Martínez Bonati’s book cited in 6.2.3. Philosophical problems are moreover discussed in the contributions on impressionism by Alonso and Lida pointed out in 6.3.1. More than by original works, philosophy of language is however represented in IAM by critical and informative contributions.125 In this connection the activity of Raimundo Lida should be named first of all, although it belongs almost entirely to a period prior to that considered here.126 In the series *Cuadernos de filosofía del lenguaje* of the Departamento de Lingüística of Montevideo the following were published: Arnaldo Gomensoro, *John Dewey y la filosofía del lenguaje* (1956), and Mercedes Rein, *Ernst Cassirer* (1959).127 In Chile, Martínez Bonati published an important study: *La concepción del lenguaje en la filosofía de Husserl* (Santiago, 1960). Moreover there can be mentioned: Víctor Li Carrillo, *Platon, Hermógenes y el lenguaje* (Lima, 1959), and about Spanish speaking thinkers: Juan David García Baeza, *Filosofía de la gramática y gramática universal según Andrés Bello*, RNC 9:657-23 (1947), Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, *Unanuano, teórico del lenguaje* (Mexico, 1954); Ángel Rosenblat, *Ortega y Gasset: Lenguaje y estilo* (Caracas, 1958).

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

To the history of linguistics belong Terracini’s two books cited in footnote 31.128 The former is a general outline, in which, according to the conviction of the author, recent linguistics is practically identified with Croce-Vossler idealism (to which only Saussureanism is opposed). The latter contains several keen essays interpreting Bopp, Ascoli, Meyer-Lübke and Meillet, Gilliéron, Schuchardt, Claudio Giacomini.129 Very important are the studies by Gasdaru on various aspects of linguistics in the nineteenth century based on hitherto unpublished documents (from the Ascoli archive in Rome), which are published together with these studies. The most important among them are the following: ‘La controversia sobre las leyes fonéticas en el epistolar de los principales lingüistas del siglo XIX’, *AFCI* 4.211-328; ‘A propósito de Stammbaumtheorie y Wellentheorie’, *AFCI* 5.99-116; ‘Cartas inéditas de Adolfo Mussafia. La ‘ley sintáctica Tobler-Mussafia’ y otros problemas filológicos’, *Fl* 4.48-48.130

Concerning the history of Spanish linguistics some studies on Nebrija should be particularly mentioned.124 As for IAM linguistics, the main studies are concerned with

122 In 1959 further pamphlets (on Aristotele, St. Augustine, Locke, Hegel, Humboldt and Richard Rhenwald) appeared.

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

124 Two of these studies, those on Bopp and Schuchardt, were published for the first time in this book; the others had been published in European journals. Furthermore, Terracini published in Argentina: ‘W.D. Whitney y la lingüística general’, *RFII* 5.105-47. This study was also included in the Italian edition referred to in the preceding footnote.
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the four important linguists who constitute its older tradition: Bello, Cuervo, Hansen and Lenz. The essential studies on Bello are: Amado Alonso, 'Introducción a los estudios gramaticales de Andrés Bello', and Ángel Rosenblat, 'Las ideas ortográficas de Bello', both in Obras completas de Andrés Bello, respectively, 4, Gramática IX-LXXXVII and 5. Estudios gramaticales IX-CXXVIII. 229. The most ample contribution concerning Cuervo is: Fernando Antonio Martínez, 'Estudio preliminar', in Rufino José Cuervo, Obras I. XI-CXLVI (Bogotá, 1954). 230. About Lenz there must be mentioned, in the first place, the study of the Chilean Alfonso M. Escudero, 'Rodolfo Lenz', BICC 18.445-84, which takes into account almost all earlier contributions. 231. On Hansen: Eladio García, 'La obra científica de Federico Hansen', and Julio Saavedra Molina, 'Bibliografía de Don Federico Hansen' in Hansen, Estudios. Métrica-gramática. Historia literaria 1.9-26 and 3.245-55, respectively (Santiago, 1958). Much more than the title promises is offered in the important historico-critical study by Guillermo Guitarte, 'Cuervo, Henriquez Ureña and the polémica sobre el andalucismo de América', VR 17.363-416, reproduced and amplified in BICC 15.3-64. 232.

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

229 The second of these studies is a genuine history of the ideas on Spanish orthography. Cf. also the study by Picardo referred to in the preceding footnote; that of García Basco cited in 6.3.6.; Ángel Rosenblat, El pensamiento gramatical de Bello (Carcasas, 1961); and the study by the Spaniard Samuel Gill Girya, 'Introducción a los estudios ortográficos y métricos de Bello', in Obras completas de Andrés Bello. 6. Estudios filológicos I. XCI-XCI (Carcasas, 1954). Furthermore (among others): Claudio Rosales, 'Cien años de señorío de la gramática de Andrés Bello', BFOCUh 4.247-59; Juan B. Selva, Transcripción de la Gramática de Bello y el estado actual de los estudios gramaticales (Buenos Aires, 1950); Baltasar Inza Calderón, La doctrina gramatical de Bello (Panamá, 1960). In view of such abundant bibliography, it must be said that few linguistics in the world have been so minutely studied and interpreted as Bello.

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

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

232 The contributions of the authors are: Picardo, Acotaciones al Dialeglo de la lengua (Valldos) (Montevideo, 1941); Silvio Elia, O romanismo en face de filología (Pérez Alegre, 1956), republished under the title of 'Orígenes románicos da filologia moderna' in the already mentioned Ensaio de filologia 11-37; Molenhauer, 'Notas sobre el origen y la propaganda de la palabra 'lingüística' (= 'linguística') y términos equivalentes', AIL 6.435-44; Lope Blanch, 'La Gramática española de Jerónimo de Teveda', NREH 1.13-16; Emmanuel Pereyra Filho, 'As 'Regras de Ortophografia' de Pero de Magalhães Gândaro', RBP 63-31; and the two editions: Mauro Alemán, Ortografía castellana, published by José Rojas Garzón, with a preliminary study (pp. XII-XXXIX) by Tomás Navarro, 'La Ortografía de Mauro Alemán' (Mexico, 1950), and Olmar Gutierrez de silveira, A Gramática de Fermin de Oliveira (Rio de Janeiro, 1954). Contributions to the history of linguistics are also found in Silva Neto, Ensaio de filologia portuguesa (São Paulo, 1956), and Língua, cultura e civilização (Rio de Janeiro, 1960). Cf. also the informative works pointed out in 4.1.1.b. and the studies referred to in 6.6.

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

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

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

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

233 His Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana was published in Halle in 1913 and was reprinted in Buenos Aires in 1955.

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

235 Israel de Lima Coutinho, Pontos de gramática histórica (Rio de Janeiro, 1958), which has been published, I have not seen). This work is the best, by the way, but it is not the only one of its kind in Brazil.


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

238 Cf. by the same author 'La hispanización de América. El castellano y las lenguas indígenas desde 1492', Presente y futuro de la lengua española 2.189-216 (Madrid, 1964). Among other contributions to this topic there are: Marcos A. Morinigo, 'Difusión del español en el Noroeste argentino', in Programa de filología histórica 71-100 (Buenos Aires, 1959), and the book by Arístides referred to in fn. 21. A general history of the Romanization of America, however, not comparable to Rosenblat's work, was published in Brazil: Joaquim Ribeiro, História da romanização da América (Rio de Janeiro, 1959).
thesis, which had been universally admitted since the contributions of Henriquez Ureña; on this problem and the acceptance of his results by Amado Alonso, was thrown into the discussion and basically rejected. Guillermo Guitarte, with his article cited in 6.3.7, decisively contributed to this revision, along with some Spanish and North American students.

6.4.3. Scarcely cultivated in Spanish America are also certain disciplines of a historical character as etymology and historical toponymy, although there are abundant contemporaneous etymologists among the pre-scientific and non-scientific linguists, and although there exist studies on descriptive toponymy and collections of such place names as are immediately etymologizable (at least in a generic sense). The principal etymological investigations are due to Corominas (articles published in the AJL, RFH and elsewhere). Others who also dealt with etymology are: Amado Alonso, Henriquez Ureña, Krüger, Rosenblat, Hernando Balmore, Gazdaru, Cseriu, Rona, Cisneros and a few others. An exemplary etymological investigation is Rosenblat’s ‘Origen e historia del che argentino’, Fi 8.325-401. The works on historical toponymy worth mentioning first of all, also belong to Rosenblat: Argentina. Historia de un nombre (Buenos Aires, 1949), 2nd edition: El nombre de la Argentina (Buenos Aires, 1964), and El nombre de Venezuela (Caracas, 1956). In Brazil Nascentes, Augusto Magne, Silva Neto and A. G. Cunha have contributed to etymology.

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

The main contribution on the cultural influence of

---

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

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

6.5.2. Even less is found outside of the Romance field. Concerning the English language I do not know contributions worth mentioning other than those by Bertens Charnley, published in European or North American journals. Nothing has come to my knowledge concerning other modern non-Romance languages; if such contributions do exist, they did not spread and were not influential in IAm linguistics as a whole.

As far as the classical languages are concerned, I only know some contributions of a rather philological character and some grammars designed for use in teaching. Among these, Rodolfo Oroz’ Gramática latina (Santiago, 1932; 3rd ed., 1953; Portuguese translation, Rio de Janeiro, 1938) deserves to be mentioned. In Brazil two works of a good scientific level are recorded in this field: Ernest Faría’s Fonética histórica do latim
other hand, they are varying and haphazard, and show no sound selection criteria, so that unrepresentative works often are better known than representative ones. This is to some extent due to language difficulties (deficient knowledge of Spanish and Portuguese in international spheres). But primarily it is due to a wide lack of acquaintance with I4M culture, which is considered more as an object for research than as a possible contribution to research, and which usually arouses interest only among specialists of I4M studies. Thus I4M linguistics too is almost exclusively known among Ibero-Americanists, and even among these mostly as Ibero-Americanistics (not e.g. as a contribution to general linguistics), and particularly for the material it gathered. This ignorance in the linguistic as well as in other cultural fields, by the way, begins with the I4M countries themselves. Indeed, there exists a profound mutual ignorance between the Hispanic-American countries. Therefore the unity of language, traditions, and conditions implies an analogous but not a unitary development of linguistics as well as of other forms of culture in these countries. Culturally Lima, Quito, or Bogotá are much further apart from Buenos Aires or Santiago de Chile than are Paris, Rome, or New York.164 There is an even more marked lack of acquaintance, although unilateral, between Spanish and Portuguese America. Further on I4M linguistics is, of course, widely ignored by European linguistics and even more so by North American linguistics.

7.1. The scarce acceptance of I4M linguistics in Spanish America is due to its mainly local and localistic character, as well as to a great critical insecurity and to a certain timidity in evaluating directly what originates in other I4M countries, which constitutes a kind of inferiority complex of this linguistics, i.e. all that comes from Europe or the United States must be good in itself, but what comes from other I4M countries is probably bad. This explains why certain I4M works reach other I4M countries only by way of Europe. Actually only the works of Amado Alonso and his group had repercussions practically all over Spanish America. A work such as Fernández Retamar’s Idea de la estilística has remained widely unknown (otherwise it cannot be explained why other inferior introductions to stylistics were published), and the same can be said of Martínez Bonatti’s La estructura de la obra literaria. The important works of Picard too are still ignored by most Hispanic-American grammarians. Concerning the knowledge of Brazilian linguistics the situation is even worse. The vast activity of Silva Neto and such excellent works as Mattos Câmara’s Introdução (which could have been adopted as a handbook all over Latin America) and his Fontística, or such useful works as Valmir Chagas’ Didática, Silvio Elia’s

7.0. Generally speaking, the repercussions of I4M linguistics in the scientific world do not correspond to its value: on the one hand, they are less than this value; on the

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

164 Most of the publications of the Instituto Nacional de Tacuama are not listed in Silvio’s Bibliografía; there are even lacking a good number of those registered in the bibliographical repositories or reviewed (and even published) in journals, which the compiler of the bibliography apparently consulted.

165 The Afrikantisch activity displayed by Benigno Ferrario in Montevideo has had no repercussions; see his “La protolíngua a la luz de la glottología” (Área etnográfico-egipcio-bíberbá), Revista del Instituto de Antropología de la Universidad Nacional de Tacuama 23,37-63 (1941). In Brazil, too, a number of Afrikantisch contributions have been recorded, whose value I do not know. I have not seen Ernesto Zierer’s booklet Introducción a la lengua japonesa hablada (Trujillo, Peru, 1964).

166 Of linguistic interest is also his excellent annotated translation El Tarakasambara de Anamblattue, Texto sánscrito con introducción, traducción y notas (Montevideo, 1959).

167 The contributions of O. F. A. Menghin ‘Veneto-Ilirica I’ and ‘Veneto-Ilirica II’, APCI 4.151-81 and 5.61-69, and some others are also concerned with prehistory and archeology.

168 The Afrikantisch activity displayed by Benigno Ferrario in Montevideo has had no repercussions; see his “La protolíngua a la luz de la glottología” (Área etnográfico-egipcio-bíberbá), Revista del Instituto de Antropología de la Universidad Nacional de Tacuama 23,37-63 (1941). In Brazil, too, a number of Afrikantisch contributions have been recorded, whose value I do not know. I have not seen Ernesto Zierer’s booklet Introducción a la lengua japonesa hablada (Trujillo, Peru, 1964).
linguistics seems to pay more attention to the development of IAm linguistics than does North American linguistics. In fact, in the United States IAm linguistics is almost exclusively known and made use of by Hispanics and Afro-Americanists (although in this case probably more than in Europe). Thus the publications of the DLM, which have had ample repercussions in Western126 as well as in Eastern Europe,127 are practically ignored in the United States and have not been reviewed so far either in Lg, Word, or IJAL. Except for some occasional reviews by Romance philosophers and a few sporadic indications, the North American reader has available only the completely distorted, malevolent, and curiously anachronistic presentation by Robert A. Hall, Jr.: Ideals in Romance Linguistics 85-8 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1963). Strangely enough, the theory developed in Montevideo has remained unknown even to the promoters of generative grammar, although they assert a number of principles which have been maintained in Montevideo since 1952, e.g. a) the conception of languages as 'rule-governed creativity';128 b) the dynamic interpretation of language as a technique to express and understand also what is new and what was never said before; c) the criticism of antimentalism and the stressing of the importance of the speakers' intuition, which is considered as the very subject and foundation of linguistic theory; d) the necessity for re-interpreting and re-evaluating traditional grammar in so far as it corresponds to the actual functioning of language; e) the necessity for describing languages as systems for linguistic creation.129 In the transformationalists' writings one can sometimes find textual coincidences with former writings of Montevideo, coincidences which are evidently due to an analogous point of view. It is regrettable that the transformationalists should have ignored this, since generative grammar would have found in the Montevideo writings a clear distinction of levels of grammaticality, the determination of the actual nature of the speaker's intuition, and its relation to scientific analysis as well as its theoretical basis,130 and, more generally, those philosophical foundations which it lacks and is still searching, not always in adequate places. In addition, the theory developed in Montevideo has gone much further than transformational grammar, which explicitly limits itself to

126 Cf., e.g. the reviews by Martinet, BSL 52.19-23 and 263 (1958); by Pisani, AGI 61.58-68 (1956) and Padua 17.82-92 (1960); and by René Gsell, RLR 23.165-6 (1959); and N. C. W. Spence, 'Towards a New Synthesis in Linguistics: the Work of Eugenio Coseriu', Arch. 12.1-34 (1960).
127 Coseriu, Síncronia, diacronia e historia was translated into Russian in V. A. Zvesko, Ed., Novoe v linguistike 3.123-343 (Moscow, 1963).
128 Cf. Síncronia, diacronia e historia 53, fn. 47.
129 Cf. the latest formulation of such exigency in Síncronia 155: 'In fact, for the speakers themselves the present-day language is not only a collection of forms which have already been realized and can be used as models (norm), but also a technique to go beyond what has been realized, a system of possibilities (system). The description, therefore, has to account for the possibilities of all that which is a productive pattern, a schema which is applicable to the realization of that which does not yet exist as a norm. This is true not only in morphology but also in syntax, lexicon (derivation and composition of words) and even in the phonological system where the possibilities of realization are not identical for each functional unit'.
121 Cf. Síncronia 32-3.
synchrony, as it has shown that linguistic technique not only works synchronically, but also diachronically, i.e. that 'linguistic change' is the historical realization of this system of possibilities, which each language is.

8. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

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

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

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

278 It was seen that Mariano Cámara’s Introducción already had four editions and Lima Coutinho’s Gramática histórica five, and that even books implying a stricter specialization had several editions; thus, Silva Neto, Fontes do laín vulgard had three, and Faria’s Fontes histórica do laín had two editions.
institutes and specialized libraries with sufficient endowment, the training of young linguists in foreign countries, and the translation of a number of classical linguistic works, be it in the theoretical or didactic field (as e.g. Humboldt, Paul, Bloomfield, Trubetzkoy, Hjelmslev, Pagliaro, Harris, Gleason).179

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