

Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai
Facultatea de Litere
Catedra de lingvistică generală și semiotică

Doctoral dissertation

The Theoretical Fundamentation of Linguistics in Integralism and Generativism.

**A General Comparative Approach
with an Application to the Problem of Determination**

abstract

Scientific Coordinator

Prof. Dr. Mircea Borcilă

PhD Candidate

Asist. univ. Dina Dehelean
(căș. Vîlcu)

Cluj-Napoca
2013

KEYWORDS

integralism, generativism, epistemology, pozitivist, antipozitivist, cultural sciences, natural sciences, speaker, language (idiom), language, universals, speech, planes of language, competence, performance, determination, actualisation, definite article, elocutional, linguistics of speech, semantic content, significatum, designatum, sense, syntax, rules, hypothesis, determiner.

ABSTRACT

The dissertation approaches two of the most famous, most productive and promising language study orientations from the twentieth and twenty first century: *integral linguistics* and *generative-transformational linguistics*. Our enterprise is of a comparative and analytic nature, having the purposes: 1) to create a perspective over the theoretical fundamentation of linguistics, as it is seen in the two orientations and 2) to apply the research to the problem of *actualisation*, the essential operation of *determination*. This last topic was approached in the final chapter of the dissertation, being prepared and anticipated, however, through a concentric study of all the aspects we considered relevant for its understanding and interpretation. We treated, thus, the universal plane of language, the plane on which *speaking* is situated, trying to find an equivalent for this in generative linguistics, we analysed in detail the types of content involved in the process of actualisation, and after that we briefly described the operations of determination. In the end, we analysed the actualisation in its main coordinates, as it is presented in the integral linguistics, trying then to identify, within the generative-transformational linguistics, specific instruments which could contribute to treating this linguistic phenomenon. We also approached more problematic, but extremely interesting aspects, like the actualisation of the proper names or the possible ways of realising the actualisation in the case of other parts of speech besides the noun, and also the matter of actualisation of expletives, specific to some languages, or of the *bare nouns* - the nouns without a determiner. The section of *Conclusions and openings* finalised the dissertation, sketching the main ideas from each of the chapters of the present work and describing the accomplishments, but especially the projects this research makes possible.

We present shortly, in the following lines, the content of each chapter, trying to render, as briefly as possible, the investigation we developed.

1. *Introduction*

The section opening the present paper is divided in a few parts which have the role of clarifying as much as possible the premises we started from, the instruments we intended to use and the objectives we proposed. Thus, in *The History and Structure of the Dissertation*, we presented the different successive transformations the initial plan of the paper got through and the shape it finally received.

A significant part from the *Introduction* was dedicated to a *Motivation* which has the purpose of presenting and justifying some of the options we made even before starting the present paper. They were related, first of all, to the two linguistic research directions we chose, the integralism and the generativism. We described the immediate context, the one of university studies, in which we acquired the first knowledge related to the two types of linguistics, but also the arguments which convinced us to clearly opt for the integral linguistics. However, we did this only after trying to understand both theories as well as possible. We emphasised the relationships which can be established between integralism and generativism, the points in which the two theories meet or could meet, but also the ideas which are objectionable from the opposing perspective.

Another factor which determined us to place face to face the integralism and the generativism is the context they make possible for studying the notions approached in the third and fourth chapters of the paper: *determination* and its initial moment, *actualisation*. The integralism offers, as it is well-known, the points of reference and the necessary premises for the study of all planes of language: *universal*, *historic*, *individual*, while generativism is characterised by Eugeniu Coșeriu as “linguistics of speech”. It is exactly the plane which could facilitate the study of the phenomena of determination and of actualisation from a generative perspective. Using studies already developed around this problem and exploring the potential the generativism has for researching the phenomena which are of interest for us here, we tried to valorise and to contextualise, at the same time, the instruments which the two theories could offer for the study of these problems, of great interest for any linguist.

We do not forget or ignore here *pragmatics*, a type of research which succeeded, by studying in its framework different aspects of language and especially of its completion in speech, to bring a new perspective in this scientific domain. Additionally, *cognitive linguistics*, which appeared more recently in the panorama of linguistic studies, benefits, in

our opinion, of an undeniable development potential and successfully completes the scene of linguistic research.

We restate our conviction that integral linguistics has all the possibilities of revealing, investigating and interpreting the linguistic phenomena in their entirety.

In *Introduction*, we defined integralism as “integral linguistics”, an “integral theory of language”, not only because this is the name Eugeniu Coşeriu considered could define his theory of language, but also from all the reasons we enumerated in those first pages: integral linguistics accepts divergent points of view, which it embeds or interprets from its own perspective; moreover, this type of linguistics benefits from a solid theoretical and philosophical basis, which allows it to make the correct connections with the thinking of the great philosophers on language and, at the same time, on cognition; the same integral linguistics offers the adequate research framework for all the manifestations of language, avoiding partial analysis and offering the instruments necessary for investigating the linguistic phenomenon in its entirety.

We finalized the *Introduction* with a section of terminological *clarifications* which we considered necessary precisely for avoiding, as much as possible, any misunderstanding concerning the choice of words and for indicating the way in which certain terms, extremely important for the whole paper, were translated and defined.

2. *Integralism and generativism. A comparative perspective*

From its very beginning, we saw this exercise as a succession of concentric circles, leading the study from the widest framework, that of theoretical fundamentation of the two directions of language research to its applicative aspects, the extensive case study dedicated to actualisation. This is why the first section of the work, *Integralism and generativism. A comparative perspective* analyses the epistemological basis assumed by the two linguistic orientations, with all involved consequences, at the levels of methodology, of construction and definition of the object of study.

Since both integralism and generativism relate, to a certain extent, to structuralism, we started by analysing the modality in which this happens. Our conclusion was that generativism's relating to structuralism is almost entirely a negative one, since the premises, the theoretical framework defined or construed, but also the working instruments and methodology proposed as part of this first real linguistics, defined as a meditation on language, but also as analysis of its manifestations, are rejected. This opposition of generativism – of Noam Chomsky himself, in the beginning – to structuralism was seen as

part of what was later called the “linguistic revolution” initiated and developed in America, then almost everywhere in the world.

Among other things, Chomsky reproached to the structural linguists the fact that they did not approach the problem of language acquisition or the one of the knowledge possessed by the speaker-listener, but also their limitation to a very narrow system of grammatical analysis. It is true that generativism managed to surpass, in a very positive sense, certain limits of the linguistics of a structural type. Redefining the concept of *langue* in direct connection to the speaker-listener is one of these aspects. However, in the enthusiasm of opening new horizons in the research of the linguistic phenomenon and of innovating all the methods and work instruments, as well as the terminology, many of the accomplishments of the linguists who preceded generativism were ignored or unjustly criticised. Moreover, the generative linguists sometimes used exactly the methods they criticised, assuming them from the structuralist writings or reinventing them, like in the case of the notion of *transformation*, so intensely used in the early stages of generativism.

Unlike this attitude, Eugeniu Coșeriu, the initiator of integral linguistics, manifested from the beginning an unlimited opening to all the linguistic research which had been performed before he started his work of language investigation, as well as to all which was written after that. In our dissertation we mentioned many times Coșeriu’s confessions concerning his constant relationing to Saussure. He often declared that he developed his linguistic work through a constant dialogue with the Swiss linguist, integrating in his own theory everything which he considered valuable from Saussure’s work, developing some of his intuitions, explaining aspects which seemed totally criticable and composing many of his ideas and principles in answer to ideas and principles which could be found in the work of the Swiss linguist.

The epistemological basis of integralism, respectively of generativism, can be delineated, explicitly or implicitly, with all the consequences resulting from assuming certain principles and values. Thus, generativism defines itself, in all its developments, as a positivistic research direction. The implications of this option are as follows: 1) trying to define linguistics as a natural science, of the same category as physics, biology, etc., even subordinated to biology; 2) adapting the methodology of linguistics in order to correspond to the study of language as a natural object: emitting hypothesis; adopting some conclusions concerning the language resulting from its investigation of a naturalist type; the causal approach of the study of language; emitting some propositions on language in terms of truth or falsity; trying to adapt, in this way, to the type of scientificity and of exactity proper to the

natural sciences; 3) adopting the terminology specific to the natural sciences or creating one in the pozitivist spirit of the natural sciences; 4) constituting the object of study *language* through its determinations of a biological nature, detached from the aspects of relativity of any kind – its reduction to an abstract concept, separated, in spite of the options innitally declared by Chomsky, from the implications which the activity of the speaker-listener has upon it; 5) the cauzalist approach of the phenomenon of linguistic creativity.

As for integralism, Eugeniu Coșeriu realised, in relation to Ferdinand de Saussure, and also to the tendencies from the linguistics contemporary to him, among which the most manifest were already the ones rooted in Noam Chomsky's work, a clear anti-positivistic epistemological approach, confirmed and consolidated throughout his work. The implications of this option are: 1) defining linguistics as a cultural science; 2) adopting a methodology specific to the study of language as a cultural object: rejecting the use of hypothesis and adopting the speaker's knowledge of the language as a basis of study; the finalistic approach of the study of language; trying to define a type of scientificity and of exactity specific to the cultural sciences (not less scientific than that of the natural sciences, only different from this); 3) using the terminology specific to the cultural sciences or borrowing terminology realised at an intuitive level in diverse idioms; 4) constituting the object of study *language* through its characteristics of a cultural nature, in the spirit of linguistic relativity and in direct relation with the activity of the speaker-listener and placing the language at the basis of all cultural/spiritual activities of the humans; defining the language through universals (*semanticity, alterity, creativity, historicity* and *materiality/teriority*); 5) the finalistic approach of the phenomenon of linguistic creativity.

The first section of this paper was meant to clarify the epistemological basis of the two linguistic orientations approached, extremely important and relevant for the following chapters, given the fact that the options realised at this level are the ones which determine the ulterior research endeavours.

3. *Elocutional competence*

As part of these endeavours, we mention here the tripartition of the planes of language realised by Eugeniu Coșeriu, a tripartition which will constitute the basis of the whole conception on language adopted and developed in integralism. The tripartition of the planes of language (*universal, historic, individual*) is extremely relevant both for the fact that it further orients the language research, and for the solutions it provides for the problematic matters in

other linguistic orientations, bringing essential clarifications in certain points, representing otherwise sources of endless confusion.

The tripartition of the planes of language is detailed in certain characteristics which further orient the domains of research. Thus, for each of the three planes a type of content is specific (*designation, signification, respectively sense*). From the point of view of the *activity/energeia*, language is represented, in the three planes, in the following manifestations: *speech in general, historical language, discourse*; as *competence/dynamis: elocutional competence, idiomatic competence and expressive competence*, and as *product/ergon: the totality of manifestations, (abstract historical language) and text*.

The phenomenon of actualisation, whose approach represents the last stage of the present work, happens at the confluence between the historical and universal planes and is defined as „the orientation of the significata towards the designata”. This is why we considered that the second section of the present paper must treat the universal plane of speech, where the *designatum* is situated and the elocutional competence, specific to the same plane.

Another reason for dedicating the second section of the paper to the plane of speech is related to the fact that generativism has always been defined, from an integralist point of view, precisely as linguistics of speech (in spite of its claims of an extensive treating and explaining of the linguistic phenomenon). Coşeriu himself offers arguments for this definition. One of the most important of these arguments is the way in which we should understand the indistinct concept of *meaning*, through which the content is defined in generativism. Understood as *sense* in the common interpretation of the native English speaker – a very large interpretation, the concept of *meaning* does not correspond in any way to the one of *sense* from the integral linguistics. After analyzing some examples given by Chomsky himself, in which the concept of *meaning* is used with a certain interpretation, Coşeriu gets to the conclusion that *meaning* corresponds, probably, to the *designatum* in integralism – the type of content specific to the universal plane.

The deliniation of generativism as a grammar of language functioning in speech is part of the same area of Coserian arguments. This is the interpretation to which considering the language as a system of rules for the production of sentences is a better match. The universal plane of language is the one to which generativism is somehow oriented, given its attempt to generalize the rules and the conclusions concerning the language and its modes of manifestation. Even if this endeavour is impossible to realise, generativism tries to reach universal through generalisation. From an integralist point of view, a function or a category is

defined for all the languages as a possibility, and after that the existence of that function or category can be verified in different languages. According to the same point of view, universality is not deduced, does not result from empirical generality. In generativism, the speaker-listener is situated at the same universal plane of language. The purpose of research in generativism is defining the speaker's linguistic competence (even if the term *competence* ceases, at a certain moment, even to be used within the theory, the definition of a correspondent concept, taking different terminological forms, remains the assumed purpose). The targeted speaker is, however, an abstract one, reduced to the biological faculties which make the speech possible and which are common to the species.

From all these reasons, generativism is considered, from an integralist point of view, "linguistics of speech". We considered that this domain of research corresponds to the plane of speech in integralism and intended to analyse the possibilities the two linguistic orientations offer for the study of the phenomena of determination and of actualisation. For reaching to these conclusions, we studied the instruments which each of the two types of linguistics disposes of (generativism, on the one hand, and the universal plane of language – the plane of speech in integralism, on the other hand). We realised this in the first chapter of the section with the title *Speech and linguistics of speech in integralism and generativism*.

Because in generativism the dichotomy *competence/performance* is used intensely (at least in the initial stages), doubling somehow the Saussurean one *langue/parole*, we analysed, initially, the relationship between the concepts *performance* and *parole*, starting again from the Saussurean roots of the matter discussed. Looking at things from an integralist perspective, the relationship between the two terms within the Saussurean dichotomy is not different in the case of Chomsky's dichotomy. Besides the positive aspects we can notice, *performance* is defined again as strictly dependant on the *competence*, a relationship which Coşeriu conceived in a totally different manner: *language* and *speech* do not constitute two distinct realities, but rather two distinct modalities of showing the same reality, whose simultaneous and inseparable moments are.

We then analysed the relationships between language and speech in the two linguistic orientations, enumerating both the arguments which support the identity between language and speech, and the ones rejecting this idea. We got to the conclusion that, from an integralist perspective, we can say that, in some situations, speech is equivalent to language – or rather, from the perspective of this linguistic orientation, we can find arguments for such equivalence, since the speech has a double valence, allowing this interpretation. The conceptual frame of integral linguistics situates speech in the universal plane of language

from the point of view of activity/ *energeia*. However, from a generativist perspective, language and speech cannot be equivalent. First of all, the manifestations of speech are not part of the research preoccupations of the generativist linguists. On the contrary, an abstract concept of *language* (with the meaning of an *idiom*) is what makes the object of study, a concept enriched on the way with the contribution of a supposed (idealised, we must mention) speaker, generativism being defined by Chomsky himself as a „theory of linguistic competence”.

The second and the third chapter of the second section are dedicated to the semantic content, as it is conceived and defined in integralism, and also in generativism. In view of discussing the phenomenon of *actualisation*, we insisted on the types of content specific to the universal and to the historical planes: the *designatum* and the *significatum*. We marked the difference which needs to be made between this concept and the one of *reference* and we mentioned the spheres it can cover, insisting on the fact that the designatum can constitute itself as a state of facts, as a designated object, and also as a corresponding mental state. The designatum does not necessarily represent the extralinguistic object, the one from reality; it can also represent the corresponding mental content.

After defining the significatum as the content specific to the historical plane, we enumerated and exemplified a series of arguments which justify the clear differentiation of the planes at the level of content. We described evident situations in which a designatum can be reached from the direction of different significata, as well as situations in which the same significatum can lead to different designata. The judgments of conformity which characterise the planes of language (*congruent*, in the universal plane, *correct*, in the historical plane and *adequate* in the individual one) also provide arguments supporting the difference existing between the planes of content. We analysed, as well, the implications which the differences between the types of content have in the process of translation, and the possible equivalence which can appear between the planes of content in the case of scientific terminologies. We finalised the chapter dedicated to the semantic content in integralism with the presentation of the two stages of semiotic articulation, in which all the types of content are engaged.

The semantic content from a generativist point of view is a chapter which analyses the successive conception of content in different stages of the theory. The work in this area was more difficult because of various factors, first of all because of the changes which appear at a conceptual level in the definition of the semantic content, and also at a terminological level. In the *phrase structure grammar* stage, the semantic content (*meaning*) is considered totally dispensable, Chomsky implying that the relevance of this aspect is as little as that of the

colour of the speaker's hair. Thus, we can totally ignore the *meaning* in the process of building a grammar. The *standard theory* does not give more importance to the semantic content; what is different is the fact that it appears as the 'semantic component', added to a structure generated by the syntactic component. The third component in this representation is the phonological one. *The extended standard theory* presents as main notions of language structuring the elements: *D-structure* (formerly called *deep structure*), *S-structure* (the *ex surface structure*), *PF* (*phonological form*) and *LF* (*logical form*), the last two being interface levels. In spite of the terminological innovations, this stage of the theory does not seem to bring anything new in the way semantic content is viewed; it continues to be seen as dependent on the syntactic structure. *The modular theory*, the *government and binding* stage of generativism, brings an apparent change related to the semantic content. This potential is visible first of all in the *Projection Principle*, formulated as follows: The lexical structure must be represented categorically at every syntactic level. From the components of this theory we analysed in more detail the one known as the *θ Theory*, given the interest this component represented for us from the point of view of the semantic relations implied. Universal grammar was declared, in this stage of generativism, a system virtually free of rules, the representations at different levels being projected from the semantic properties of the lexical units. We considered this option as the one which brings generativism closest to a possible semantic theory, or to a complete, assumed approach of the semantic component – an option which remained without a continuation in this direction. From the *minimalist programme* and the *optimal theory* we were mostly interested in the concept of *numeration*. Trying to understand and interpret the difficult and abstract concept, we appealed to an integralist 'translation' of it, getting to the conclusion that we have to do with a designational representation, a transfer from a lexical unit (we cannot use, in this context, the concept of *significatum*) to a reality more or less concrete.

The chapters in which we presented the semantic content in the two linguistic theories and especially the insistence on the necessary differentiation between the planes of language were written with the purpose of preparing the ground for the approach of the process of actualisation, realised at the confluence between the historical and universal levels, from the *significatum* towards the *designatum*.

4. *The determination*

The next section was focused on the problem of *determination*. However, we could not follow our initial plan of treating in detail each component of this process. For doing this, a

separate doctoral dissertation would be necessary. This is why we described, in their essential coordinates, the operations of determination (*actualisation, discrimination, delimitation and identification/individualisation*), this chapter opening the way to the final one, which approaches the process of actualisation. The description of the operations of determination closely follows their enumeration and definition in the Coserian study *Determinación y entorno. Dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar*, the one which was actually at the basis of the whole work we developed here. This study is also the main one referred to when the new types of linguistics promoted by Eugeniu Coșeriu are discussed – the linguistics of speech and the linguistics of text. The study is also the main reference for the operations specific to determination and for the circumstantial instruments of the linguistic activity – the contexts.

We mention again the fact that this compendious section closely follows the Coserian study in which the operations of determination are extensively presented. In order not to overload the text with references, we mention from the beginning the fact that we present the operations of determination accordingesxto COȘERIU 1955/1967: 293-307.

We started the section entitled *The determination* with a succinct presentation of its initial moment: *the actualisation*. We did nothing more but render the definition and briefly describe actualisation, since the whole next section is dedicated to this phenomenon. Following the points of reference in the Coserian study, we presented what “to actualise” a noun means: the orientation of a conceptual sign towards the domain of objects, or, more exactly, the operation through which the nominal signification is transferred from „essence” (*identity*) to „existence” (*ipsity*) and through which the name of a „being” becomes the denotate of an “entity”, of an “existential”, which receives its signified identity through the act of denotation itself. In other words, we are talking about the primary integration between present “cognition” and previous “knowledge”, which manifests through denotation of what we are acquainted with by the name of what is already known”.

The operations of determination ulterior to actualisation are grouped in the category of *discrimination*. Through discrimination, the denotated entities are presented as examples of a “class” or representatives of a „type”, or as parts of an “extended object” (in case of collective nouns).

Discrimination contains, in its turn, three types of operations: *quantification, selection* and *situation*. *Quantification* is the operation through which the number or countability of denotated objects is established. Unlike quantification, *selection* is a “real”, external discrimination. Besides the fact that it implies quantification (but not the one numerically

defined), selection also involves *application* of the noun [*nombre*] to a group of particulars and, at the same time, marks separation or opposition (asserted or denied) between the denotated objects and the rest of their “class” or “type”. *Situation* is the operation through which the denotated objects are “situated”, in other words are related to the “persons” involved in discourse and are positioned in function of the space and time related circumstances of the discourse itself. Its specific verbal instruments are the *situators*, which can be: *possesives* (*my, your, his, her, our, your*, the plurals [and their feminine forms for some languages]) or *deictics* (*local markers: this, that*, their plurals [and their feminine forms for some languages]).

Delimitation groups the operations which have, in comparison with the ones of discrimination, a totally different regime related to the designative possibilities of the sign. They modify these possibilities, circumscribing “denomination” (partialising the “concept”) or limit the denotation, extensively or intensively. The operations of delimitations are: *explanation, specialisation* and *specification*.

Identification (or *informative specification*) must be considered an autonomous type of determination, whose instruments are called *identifiers*. Identification is the operation through which the significatum of an ambiguous form is specified, with the purpose of ensuring its understanding by the actual or virtual interlocutor (e.g.: “foaie de hârtie”, “foaie de varză” [sheet of paper, cabbage leaf], “language” (as different from *tongue*), Sp. „el sol *the currency*” (not *the sun*), Fr. „pomme de terre” (potatoes, not *apples*).

Identification does not direct a virtual and universal significatum towards the denotation of the real and the particular; it does not “limit” the denotation, but specifies a precise significatum to the interlocutor. In other words, it does not direct a semantic value towards “things”, but directs the interlocutor towards a semantic value. Identification is, in consequence, an operation which is not realised with significata (like the three ones presented before), but with *forms*, with the purpose of *attributing significatum* for the interlocutor: it is executed for the forms to become unequivocal; in other words, for the listener to allot them certain significata, not some different ones.

5. *The actualisation*

The final section of the present work (*The actualisation*) can be considered an ample study case. We tried to understand and to describe to what extent the two linguistic orientations can provide the instruments through which this moment of orientation of the significatum towards the designatum can be observed, analysed and presented. We first

approached actualisation as it is conceived in integralism, starting with the study *Determinación y entorno*, and trying to develop the potential of the theory to analyse in greater detail the fundamental operation of determination.

Before analysing the situations described in this study, we tried to identify cases in which actualisation is not realised or is realised in the absence of an explicit instrument, and we got to extremely interesting conclusions, but also to a discussion on some aspects of actualisation which will have to be continued.

We then presented the verbal instruments of actualisation, insisting on the relationships between function and form. We presented the definite article, considered as the most representative instrument of actualisation, at the level of nominal actualisation. The perspective which we approached here is not the one of the definite article with the functions it can have, but the one of the function of actualisation, which can be realised through various instruments, the most important of them being the definite article. A really interesting and challenging section of this chapter was the one dedicated to the analysis of the proper names from the point of view of actualisation, of the relationship between significatum and designatum, and also the discussion on the possibilities of actualisation of other parts of speech, among which the verb and the pronoun.

In the last part discussing the process of actualisation from an integralist perspective we analysed its implications at the level of stylistic intention and of translation.

The generativist perspective on actualisation proved to be an extremely challenging one. So much was already realised in this linguistic orientation, that during the diverse investigations on so many idioms a lot of problematic, but at the same time interesting cases were discovered. We got the most out of it, of their categorisation, description of the situations in which they can appear, and we observed that generativism has a lot of interesting instruments for the investigation of this phenomenon.

In the first stages of generativism we only notice the preoccupation for the status of the definite article, analysed and described only for English. Further research stages reveal cases extremely interesting from the point of view of actualisation, like, for example, the nouns without a determiner, the expletives or the empty subject. We discovered also the extremely interesting hypothesis of Steven Paul Abney, named *DP hypothesis (determiner phrase hypothesis)*, according to which the head of the noun phrase is no longer a noun, but a determiner, *NP* being thus transformed into *DP*. This hypothesis was later developed by Roberto Zamparelli as the *hypothesis of the multi-layer determiner phrase*, analysed in the pages of the last section.

We closed the final chapter with a brief comparison of the ways in which the phenomenon of actualisation is analysed in integralism, respectively in generativism, in which we underlined once again the common points and the differences in the approach of this process from the perspective of the two linguistic orientations.

6. *Conclusions and openings*

At the end of our doctoral activity, we can only hope that this will be able to leave an open gate for the continuation of the work which was started here.

The study *Determinación y entorno* never received all the attention which it deserves from the linguists, an aspect which was noticed by its author himself. We mentioned the explanation which Coşeriu offers for this situation, one residing in the complexity of the study which is at the basis of our work. About each and every section of the study, Coşeriu says, a whole treaty can be written. Everything is there *in nuce*. *Determinación y entorno* still has a lot to offer to any linguist willing to engage into thorough lecture, one that can only be revealing and, at the same time, challenging and productive.

In comparison with the initial plan of the dissertation, the present work represents, actually, the first half of the project. This is because the study we started from offers the perspective of a serious discussion not only with generative-transformational linguistics, a discussions which we have tried at different levels here, but also towards a dialogue with the spectacular developments from the XXth century of pragmatism. While the way opened in the Coserian study for the research of the phenomenon of *determination* was followed here, to a certain extent, the one extremely interesting dedicated to the research of the concept of *entornos* [surrounding fields] remained for us at the level of a project. The construction would have been complete provided that, besides deliniating a perspective on integral linguistics, on the one hand, and on generativism, on the other hand, finalised through the study on determination, we could have realised the same type of analysis on integralism and pragmatics (especially in its cognitive developments). Then we would have investigated the way in which the surroundings could have been treated in the two linguistic orientations. This was the initial project, from which, especially because of the reasons concerned with the necessary space, we chose to realise here only its first half considering, at the same time, that finalising the second one would be extremely interesting as a work process and as a potential result.

From the domain of determination, we actually analysed in detail only its initial moment of realisation, the actualisation, the orientation of the significata towards the designata. All the

other aspects of this phenomenon, starting with discrimination and finishing with identification, deserve a thorough study, which could bring much more light over the relationship between the significata and the designata and over the internal processes of realisation of the speech act, of realisation of the meaning at the level of the speaker and the listener.

Another area opened for further research would actually represent the continuation of one of the parts of the present work, the one concerning the comparison of the epistemological basis, the specific concepts and methodology and the possible developments inherent to integral and generative linguistics. Both these orientations in linguistic research deserve more attention not only in relation to the aspects we approached here, but also a research which could put face to face the latest developments which characterise them, updating the comparative presentation of what was already realised in the two orientations and of the potential both theories still dispose of.

We finalise here this activity, with satisfaction for an activity taken to its end, with implication and interest, with the hope that the result of this study will be convincing enough for the lecturer willing to allot some of his time, but also with the perspective of continuing the research in this field. We close here the first part of this process and leave the way open to the ones which will follow.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2. MOTIVATION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3. INTEGRALISM – AN “INTEGRAL THEORY” OF LANGUAGE.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4. TERMINOLOGICAL CLARIFICATIONS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
INTEGRALISM AND GENERATIVISM. A COMPARATIVE APPROACH.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. FROM STRUCTURALISM TO PRESENT LINGUISTICS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2. INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3. EPISTEMOLOGICAL OPTIONS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.1. Structuralist configurations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2. The positivist direction.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3. The antipositivist direction.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4. The relationship between theory and empirical research.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. METHODOLOGICAL OPTIONS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4.1. Linguistics – a natural science.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2. The “mechanisms” of linguistic competence.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3. From linguistic competence to I-language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4. I-Language L vs. I-Language L’.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5. Apophantic language – the “privilege” of natural sciences.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.6. Hypotheses: (un)confirmed instruments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.7. A “rhapsodic” concept – human nature.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. THE CAUZALIST APPROACH IN THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
6. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE OBJECT OF STUDY.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
6.1. The relationship with the Saussurean concept of “langue”.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2. The purpose of linguistic research and its influence in the constitution of the object of study.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7. THE INTEGRALIST CONCEPTION OF LANGUAGE AS AN OBJECT OF STUDY.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
7.1. <i>Energeia</i> , dynamis, <i>ergon</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2. The integralist characterisation of language through universals.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2.1. The semanticity of language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2.2. The alterity of language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2.3. The linguistic creativity.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2.4. The historicity of language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2.5. The materiality/exteriority of language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8. CONCLUSIONS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
ELOCUTIONAL COMPETENCE.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. SPEECH AND THE LINGUISTICS OF SPEECH IN INTEGRALISM AND GENERATIVISM.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1.1. <i>Parole</i> vs. <i>Performance</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.1.1. The status of the concept <i>parole</i> in the Saussurean dichotomy.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.1.2. The status of the concept <i>performance</i> in generativism.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2. Language and speech in integralism.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1. The identity speech/language. The basis of the identity speech/language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.2. Speech vs. language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.3. The logic of language and the logic of speech.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3. Language and speech in generativism.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4. Elocutional competence.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.5. Activities which accompany the language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.6. The universal plane – the plane of definition and of theory.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.7. The status of the linguistics of speech in integral linguistics.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.8. The object and the tasks of the linguistics of speech.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.9. Generativism – linguistics of speech.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.9.1. Speech – the object of study specific to transformational grammar.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.9.2. Undifferentiated semantic content.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.9.3. The “general universals” of speech.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1.9.4. The competence of the “universal speaker”	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2. THE SEMANTIC CONTENT FROM AN INTEGRALIST POINT OF VIEW.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2.1. Designatum – the specific content of the plane of speech	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1. Designatum vs. reference	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.2. States of facts or corresponding mental contents.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2. Significatum vs. designatum	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.1. Language does not create trees, but it makes them <i>be trees</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.2. Caesar and Pompei	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.3. The children are coming.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.4. With	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.5. “Plural” and “plurality”.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.6. Suspension of congruence.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.6.1. This square table is round	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.6.2. Three times three is ten.	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.6.3. Of course the trees speak!	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.7. Significatum and designatum in translation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.8. Tree or not tree?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.9. Tetramethyl	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3. The two stages of semiotic articulation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. THE SEMANTIC CONTENT FROM A GENERATIVIST POINT OF VIEW.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.1. The phrase structure grammar stage – Syntactic Structures.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2. The standard theory (Transformational grammar) – Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>defined.</i>	
3.2.1. The three components of transformational grammar	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.2. The creative force of the syntactic component.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.3. Subcategorization vs. selection rules.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.4. On the “universality” of the lexical units	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.4.1. The semantic aspect	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.4.2. The syntactic aspect	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3. The extended standard theory – Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>defined.</i>	
3.4. The modular theory/Government and binding (L. Haegeman). Principles and parameters.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>Bookmark not defined.</i>	
3.4.1. A new discussion on grammaticality.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.2. Categorial selection/semantic selection.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4.3. θ Theory	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5. The minimalist program and beyond – the optimal theory.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.1. A new vision on the human language.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.2. Categorial selection/semantic selection – a revised version	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.3. Rules and transformations – a new conformation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.4. The concept of <i>numeration</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.4.1. The definition and interpretation of the concept	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.4.2. Representations of the lexical properties	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5.4.3. Some problems	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.6. Conclusions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
THE DETERMINATION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. A GENERAL PERSPECTIVE.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2. THE OPERATIONS OF DETERMINATION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2.1. The actualisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2. The discrimination	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.1. The quantification	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.2. The selection	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.3. The situation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3. The delimitation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.1. The explanation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.2. The specialisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.3. The (distinctive) specification	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4. The identification/individualisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
THE ACTUALISATION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1. GENERAL COORDINATES.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2. AN INDIVIDUAL SIGNIFICATUM (?)	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3. WHAT IS (NOT) ACTUALISED, ACTUALLY.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

4. VERBAL INSTRUMENTS OF ACTUALISATION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4.1. Function vs. form	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2. Function and instruments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3. The definite article – the main instrument of actualisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4. Other instruments for actualisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5. The actualisation of the proper nouns.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5.1. The specific nature of proper nouns	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5.2. The relationship between significatum and designatum in the proper nouns	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5.3. The actualisation of the proper nouns.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. OTHER SITUATIONS. OPENINGS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
5.1. Beyond noun determination. The actualisation of the verb.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.2. The actualisation of the pronoun	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.3. The stylistic intention and the translation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.4. Conclusions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6. THE ACTUALISATION IN GENERATIVISM – GENERAL COORDINATES	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
6.1. Phrase structure grammar – Transformational grammar (Syntactic Structures)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2. Standard Theory (Generative-transformational grammar) – Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (1965)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2.1. The definite article and the rewriting rules.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2.2. The definite article and the subcategorisation rules.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2.3. The definite article and the gender, number and case agreement	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3. Extended standard theory – Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use; Introduction to Government and Binding Theory.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.1. General Coordinates. The relationship language – world.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2. The modular theory	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.1. X-bar theory. The structure of the noun phrase.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.2. DP (determiner phrase) Hypothesis – Steven Paul Abney	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.3. Multi-layer determiner phrase hypothesis. Roberto Zamparelli	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.4. Genericity. Bare nouns.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.5. Expletive determiners	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.6. The empty subject	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.7. The approach of expletives. Their role in actualisation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.7.1. It/ Il/ Es	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.3.2.7.2. There/ Il/ Es	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7. THE ACTUALISATION – A COMPARISON.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
CONCLUSIONS AND OPENINGS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
BIBLIOGRAPHY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.