B.P. HASDEU AND THE PLACE OF PHRASEOLOGY AMONG THE SUBDIVISIONS OF GLOTTICS

Cristinel MUNTEANU[*]

Abstract: *In a concise study from 1882, B.P. Hasdeu presented his own classification of the linguistic sciences (seen as subdivisions of glottics [=the science of language] and justified the distinctions made according to mainly formal and semantic criteria. At the same time, Hasdeu also took into consideration two physical-psychical aspects of linguistic units, namely their fluid and condensed features. As a result of combining these criteria and aspects, a series of sub-sciences were individualized (whether their object was either the word or the sentence). I aimed at demonstrating that the respective criteria also allow the individualization of phraseology (or the delimitation of its object). However, it seems that the time of phraseology had not come yet, since Hasdeu left a "blank space" in his classification – the very place of phraseology.*

Keywords: *B.P. Hasdeu, classification of language sciences, phraseology.*


1. In a concise, but at the same time very important study, *Un nou punct de vedere asupra ramificaţiunilor gramaticei comparative* [*A New Point of View on the Branches of Comparative Grammar*] (published in 1882), the Romanian linguist B.P. Hasdeu proposed an authentic and interesting classification of the linguistic sub-disciplines, seen as parts of Glottics. By analysing the criteria on which the respective classification was based, I aim at demonstrating that Hasdeu could have also included phraseology among the sciences indicated by him, provided he had paid more "theoretical" attention to phraseological units, taken as *sui generis* linguistic units. (Otherwise, his contributions regarding the research of the origin of some Romanian idioms are well-known; thus, his interest in phraseologisms was merely from an etymological perspective.)

2. B.P. Hasdeu starts by taking as a point of departure for his discussion the "three essential factors" involved in the production of language, identified by August Schleicher as follows: *sound* (Rom. "son"), *form* and *meaning* (see Schleicher, 1859: 35; also cf. Swiggers, Van Hal, 2014: 93-94). This way, words are represented in his highly suggestive figure (below) as triangles, each of their sides corresponding to one of the three factors. Under no circumstances should we associate Schleicher-Hasdeu's triangle with the famous semiotic triangle of Ogden and Richards, since the issue of reference is not taken into account. According to Otto Jespersen (1922: 76), Hegel's influence can be sensed in

[*] "Danubius" University of Galaţi; e-mail: munteanucristinel@yahoo.com

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)

Schleicher's case, since Hegel prefers the tripartite distinctions (or "trilogies", as the Dane linguist named them).



2.1. If we are to consider the two sides of the linguistic sign pointed out by Ferdinand de Saussure, namely the *signifié* and the *signifiant*, then we could say that – in Hasdeu's case – the *sound* (Rom. "sonul") is the *signifiant* (the material aspect), while the *meaning* is the *signifié*. What about the *form*, which, undoubtedly, is largely related to the signifiant? The "latent idea" is, according to Hasdeu (1882: 28, 31), either "the hidden meaning, devoid of *expression*", or "the meaning lacking *form*". Hence, the form is the sound expression, namely the signifiant. Is it worth taking into account both the *sound* and the *form* when referring to words? Of course it is, but only in the first part of Hasdeu's analysis, in order to justify the doctrine of phonology.

2.2. Once the "coagulation" (Rom. "închegarea") or the "cementing" (Rom. "cimentarea") of a word produced, Hasdeu further takes into consideration only the *form* and the *meaning*. If we are to use Coseriu's terms (following Saussure and Hjelmslev as well), *the form (as expression) is substance already "formed"*, otherwise the sound would have no linguistic value. I will deal with these aspects later, when analysing the way in which Hasdeu approaches the problem of sound "deduplication". On the other hand, the *form*, as understood by the Romanian scholar, especially *the grammatical form*, is not completely meaningless, probably resembling, more or less, the «categorial signification» from Coseriu's theory (see Coşeriu, 1994: 67-68).

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)

3. The originality of Hasdeu's thinking also resides in the dynamic way in which he envisages the functioning and the evolution of language due to the dialectic relation between the two "universals" identified: *the fluid aspect* vs. *the condensed aspect*. We find here the germs of a conception which could have been applied (or at least invoked), *inter alia*, when explaining linguistic changes, and we cannot but regret the fact that Eugenio Coseriu was not aware of this study when he elaborated his masterpiece *Sincronía, diacronía e historia* (Montevideo, 1958). *Cum grano salis*, if we are to consider the five universals of language identified by Coseriu (*creativity*, *alterity*, *historicity*, *semanticity* and *materiality*), we could say that *the fluid aspect* would correspond to *creativity* (which leads to dynamism and variety in language), while *the condensed/solid aspect* would correspond to *alterity* (which assures the homogeneity of language); the idea of alterity appears, in fact, at Hasdeu (1882: 28), as well, when he states that "speech is a means for mutual understanding" (while *historicity* is implicit, since it results from *creativity* and *alterity*).

3.1. What is more, if we consider the fact that B.P. Hasdeu focuses on "the primary factors of language", the *form* and the *meaning* (that is the *expression* and the *content*), then we could notice that the other two universals, *materiality* and *semanticity* can also be taken into discussion. However, one must not obstinately look for such things in Hasdeu's works, since, frequently, what we find already justified in Coseriu's theory is only intuited in Hasdeu's doctrine.

3.2. We now touch upon an old philosophical problem. Can the things which are in an incessant becoming, in a continuous flowing, in other words *fluid*, be studied as a particular scientific object? May Hasdeu have been wrong when he proposed a doctrine such as noematology or when he determined the fluid character of syntactic structures? Let us read carefully the author's words: "The latent idea and the syntactic structure are the two *somehow fluid* principles…" (Hasdeu 1882: 29). Thus, the Romanian linguist is aware of the fact that not everything that is "fluid" can be studied. In the case of noematology, for instance, he envisages what is not fixed in language, but, nevertheless, is established as knowledge of "things" and of general principles of thinking. Although it implies many intricacies, such an "object" can also be investigated by a special science.

4. Finally, taking into consideration, on the one hand, the *form* and the *meaning*, and, on the other hand, the physical-psychical aspects (as aggregation states, as Hasdeu metaphorically called them), the distribution of the disciplines proposed by the Romanian linguist (obviously, according to the distribution of their corresponding objects) would be the following:

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)

Linguistic aspects / "Natural" aspects	FORM	MEANING
FLUID	Syntax	Noematology
CONDENSED	Morphology	Semasiology

4.1. As already remarked, Hasdeu (influenced by Schleicher) starts, first of all, from a syntax (let us call it SYNTAX$_1$) which deals with the "proposition" (Rom. "propoziţiune") as a whole, just as lexiology [sic!] deals with the word as a whole, and then he talks about a syntax (SYNTAX$_2$) which deals with the "proposition" from the point of view of its form. Let us remember that, in Hasdeu's conception, form is not simply expression, but it presupposes – in the case of words – at least the categorial signification. Consequently, we could say, in an analogical manner, that the form of the "proposition" as well presupposes a type of condensed grammatical meaning, but it is difficult to establish which it would be in Hasdeu's opinion (may it be the structural/syntactic signification in Coseriu's terms?).

4.2. In any case, it seems almost certain that – if we are to refer to SYNTAX$_1$ – the global meaning of a "proposition" results, in Hasdeu's opinion, from the sum of the significations of the words syntactically "linked" (α-β-γ) + the latent idea (or the sum of the latent ideas). Thus, we are not very far from the Coserian way of seeing the sense of a discourse/text or of a concrete speech act as a result of the combination between significations and designation, but we have to admit that – in such a case – Hasdeu's "theory" about the meaning/sense of the "proposition" remains somehow rudimentary.

4.3. We should also observe the fact that Hasdeu did not theorise a discipline corresponding to onomatology in the column of the "proposition", that is one whose object is the "proposition" taken as a whole from the perspective of condensation. In the grid below, I marked by a blank case the place which should have been filled by such a discipline[1].

[1] I could have added another column for the *sound* (Rom. "son") as well, with PHONOLOGY placed on the same row with the *condensed* aspect and a question mark (**?**) on the row of the *fluid* aspect. Actually, Hasdeu himself admits that the sound deduplicates ("splits") itself in the two aspects ("in a non-articulated or fluid sound, i.e. confuse, and in an articulated or condensed sound, i.e. clear"), but

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)

Linguistic units / "Natural" aspects	WORD	PROPOSITION
FLUID	Lexiology	Syntax
CONDENSED	Onomatology	**?**

4.4. Since (1) we already know what exactly ONOMATOLOGY investigates (→ the proper name) and (2) we suspect that the term "proposition" designates something more than the sentence studied by the nowadays grammar, probably referring to a unit similar to sentence and also to complex sentence, then – analogically speaking, too – we could conclude that the blank case should be attributed to PHRASEOLOGY. Certainly, we mean a broad phraseology, whose object would rather correspond to the concept of «repeated discourse» (from Coseriu's integral linguistics), a phraseology which is to deal with everything that is repeated in a (more or less) fixed form in the speech of a particular community: set phrases and idioms, sayings and proverbs, famous quotations, etc. Following Hasdeu's style, one may say that what is proper name to word is phraseologism (= repeated discourse) to syntactic "structure".

5. Unfortunately, in Hasdeu's epoch, the time of phraseology – as a discipline interested in the study of these special linguistic units – had not yet arrived, and we cannot but regret the fact that the Romanian scholar was not equally inspired to propose a specific doctrine for the condensed syntactic "structures". As a matter of fact, one can observe from the synthesis which he presents in the end of his study from 1882 (see below) that the distribution of the linguistic disciplines is rather asymmetrical.

---

he states that, at that phase of science, he does not know "in what way and to what extent the theory of the non-articulated sound could constitute a separate doctrine within Glottics" (Hasdeu, 1882: 30).

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)



Bibliography

Coseriu, E., *Sincronía, diacronía e historia. El problema del cambio lingüístico*, Universidad de la Republica. Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias, Montevideo, 1958.

Coşeriu, E., *Prelegeri şi conferinţe (1992-1993),* [supplement] in *Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară*, T. XXXIII, 1992-1993, Seria A, Lingvistică, Iaşi, 1994.

Hasdeu, B.P., „Studie de ştiinţa limbei. Un nou punct de vedere asupra ramificaţiunilor gramaticei comparative", in *Columna lui Traian*, ianuarie (1), 1882, pp. 19-31.

Hasdeu, B.P., *Studii de ştiinţa limbii*, Prologul editorului, studiu introductiv şi note de Cristinel Munteanu, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2013.

Jespersen, O., *Language. Its Nature, Development and Origin*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1922.

Munteanu, C., „Din nou despre noematologie: contribuţia lui Nicolae I. Apostolescu", in *Limba română*, Chişinău, XXIV, nr. 5, 2014, pp. 78-93.

Schleicher, A., „Zur Morphologie der Sprache", in *Mémoires de L'Academie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, Tome I, Nº 7, St. Petersburg, 1859, pp. 1-38.

Swiggers, P. & Van Hal, T., „Morphologie du langage et typologie linguistique: La connexion 'Schleicher – Saint-Pétersbourg'", in V. Kasevich, Y. Kleiner, P. Sériot (eds), *History of Linguistics 2011. Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference of the History of the Language Sciences (ICHOLS XII), Saint Petersburg, 28 August – 2 September 2011*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2014, pp. 87-102.

BDD-A29970 © 2018 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:54:58 UTC)