

More Saussure

If we study speech from several viewpoints simultaneously, the object of linguistics appears to us as a confused mass of heterogeneous and unrelated things. [This] procedure opens the door to several sciences—psychology, anthropology, normative grammar, philology, etc.—which are distinct from linguistics, but which might claim speech, in view of the faulty method of linguistics, as one of their objects.

As I see it there is only one solution to all the foregoing difficulties: *from the very outset we must put both feet on the ground of language and use language as the norm of all the other manifestations of speech.*

Linguistics is only a part of the general science of semiology [which would concern all systems of signs: “the alphabet of deaf-mutes, symbolic rites, polite formulas, military signals,” mime, railway semaphores, stoplights, etc.]

Language is not a function of the speaker; it is a product that is passively assimilated by the individual.

Synchrony and *diachrony* designate respectively a language-state and an evolutionary phase.

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