

Tomáš Hoskovec
Cercle linguistique de Prague

A history of sound, sign, and meaning The Prague Centre perspective and prospect

Résumé. — Présentée au séminaire transatlantique du Cercle Benveniste de Calgary le 22 octobre 2021, cette leçon a inauguré la série *Problèmes de philologie englobante | Issues on encompassing philology* ; elle a été suivie, les 21 novembre et 17 décembre 2021 respectivement, par l'exposé du même auteur intitulé « A treatment of sound, sign, and meaning : the Prague Centre experience and practice » et par le débat des « Thèses de Prague 2016 » [cf. *Texto !* vol. XXII, n° 1 (2017)], l'ensemble étant destiné à faire mieux comprendre l'originalité de la linguistique pragoise, tant sur le plan de l'histoire des idées que dans les perspectives actuelles.

Par son titre, la leçon inaugurale renvoie au volume *Sound, Sign and Meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle* (Michigan Slavic contributions No. 6, Ann Arbor), préparé par Ladislav Matějka en 1976 pour commémorer le 50^e anniversaire du Cercle linguistique de Prague dont le souvenir était alors à Prague même banni jusqu'au nom. Sous le titre de « Sound, Sign, and Meaning II », le Cercle linguistique de Prague organise une école d'été qui aura lieu à Prague du 31 juillet au 4 août 2023. La série *Archives du Cercle linguistique de Prague* dont les premiers trois volumes sont annoncés, dans les notices bibliographiques, comme étant à paraître, fait partie des préparatifs pour commémorer, en 2026, le 100^e anniversaire du Cercle.

Mots clés. — sémiologie, linguistique, structuralisme, structuralisme fonctionnel, philologie englobante, foyer pragois de structuralisme fonctionnel, école de Prague, histoires des idées.

Key words. — semiology, linguistics, structuralism, functional structuralism, encompassing philology, Prague Centre of Encompassing Philology, Prague School, history of ideas.

I.

In the unfortunate times of our present, in which even the most shameless lie may be called an alternative truth, acquiring thus legitimacy for subsequent public discussions, a public speech entitled *A history of whatever* – in the occurrence, a history of sound, sign, and meaning – proves equivocal: will it be an alternative history in respect of what really happened in the past? Fortunately enough, that will not be the case. Nonetheless, we have to recognize that the history of whatever is always an intellectual construction: it is important that the construction be done honestly in an objectifiable way; it is important that the historical construct pay constant attention to the true nature of whose history is being constructed; and it is important that the historian never forget that history is *historically* a literary genre committed to illuminate our present understanding of our present times, which historically again, has usually been conceived as illuminating men's own topical lives and acts through exempla carefully chosen from the past.

The historian of thought and ideas encounters the same crucial question as do his fellow-historians of states and countries, of social institutions and artistic movements, of cultures and languages, and, naturally, of particular human beings: what is the identity of their objects founded upon? In other words, what is the *same* in the constantly changing? The historian of thought and ideas searches in what people wanted to understand, and why; in how people understood their understanding, and what they held for the means to achieve it; in how they thought to recognize that

they have already understood what they wanted to, and what attitudes they would adopt towards the results thus achieved. In respect of all that, the history of sound, sign, and meaning is a history of European scientific research into the nature of language communication.

It would be not only of small use, but utterly misleading to proceed by listing whatever has been meant, in the past, by the words *sound*, *sign*, *meaning*. On the contrary, any scientific history of a set of concepts (one isolated concept does not make sense, until opposed to some other concepts) requires a clear-cut a priori understanding, as well as the boldness not to take into consideration events and ideas that are traditionally studied under their headings, unless they meet the aprioristic conditions consciously chosen. In this case, due to very particular philosophical circumstances, linguistics as a fully autonomous science could have never existed before the European 19th century started, and it may still totally disappear in this third decade of the 21st century, without even noticed by current academia: there already are numerous chairs and departments of linguistics with no linguistics inside. All of that are consequences of the malaise the institutionalized linguistics still prevalently experiences when affronting – to say nothing about manipulating – the key-concept of the autonomous linguistics, the Saussurian linguistic sign, a unit having both sound and meaning.

II.

The Prague Centre perspective and prospect, as the subtitle of the lecture announces, are the one of functional structuralism that the Prague Linguistic Circle has been developing for already one hundred years (in this consists the perspective), and the one of *encompassing philology* that largely draws on the achievements of the Paris School of interpretive semantics (in this consists the prospect). Encompassing philology – in Czech *celostní filologie*, German *Ganzheitsphilologie*, French *philologie englobante*, Italian *filologia totale*, Lithuanian *visuminė filologija*, Russian *целостная филология* – supplies adequate scientific instruments for grasping the evident and yet highly delicate empirical phenomenon of mutual human understanding in language communication (this constitutes its linguistic core); its instruments can then be adapted so as to make them effective for an inquiry into other than linguistic communication (this constitutes its semiological core). Since linguistic formations are being treated not only by linguistics and literary disciplines but also by numerous other humanities (in fact, virtually all, since all of them to a degree interpret certain written or oral texts as their sources), and since all humanities deal with semiological events (i.e., each of them interprets something that made a certain sense to a certain collective), encompassing philology is an auxiliary discipline for all humanities.

Encompassing philology, far from being some new-fangled invention of the contemporary Prague Linguistic Circle, is defined by a conceptual framework and a notional apparatus constructed by means of a conscious selection and purposeful composition of elements which have already come up in the history of linguistics at various points in time: the oldest ones about two hundred years ago (which, in fact, is not that long), the most recent within the last three decades (thanks to a critical reassessment of previous achievements); the original contribution of the contemporary Prague Linguistic Circle consists exclusively in their present rearrangement, which renders them newly topical.

III.

The standing of *philology* within current academia is a very weak one. A methodologically unified research into language and linguistic formations, literary ones in particular, is a neglected pursuit. Both in the general awareness of the research community and in the practical work of research institutions, a self-enclosed research into language (sometimes linked to either didactics or to communication theory) stands simply next to a self-enclosed research into literature (sometimes linked to history of ideas). This is not the appropriate place for an analysis of the causes of this state of affairs; let's be content with the observation that both linguistics and literary studies perceived this

separation at a certain time (a different one for each) as emancipation. While philology certainly survives in textual criticism, this subdiscipline mostly finds itself at the margin of current scientific interest and prestige.

The fact is that in the last 70 years, the prevailing form of literary studies has had only a very limited opportunity to gain any significant insight into the problematics of meaning and sense out of the majoritarian, institutionally dominant linguistics; consequently, literary studies have mainly sought a model to follow in semiotics. Actually, semiotics arose in the 1970s as a resolution of the structuralism of the 1960s, an “ontological” structuralism, misguidedly built on two works whose import it misunderstood – Ferdinand de Saussure's posthumous *Cours de linguistique générale* and Louis Hjelmslev's *Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse*, actually known by André Martinet's review only –,¹ and unable to really speak to the meaning of a text. The expression “ontological structuralism” was coined by Umberto Eco;² a noteworthy resolution of the then-current troubles of structuralism was proposed by Jürgen Trabant,³ a solidly based criticism of the frenzies of the time was made especially by Klaus W. Hempfer.⁴

Alas, the semiotic turn of the 1970s made right at the beginning an unconsidered step, one with fatal consequences, when it posited an identity between the principles of Saussurian semiology and those of Peirce's semiotics; with the result that semiotics has become a blurry science of everything, and thus of nothing. Let us highlight the differences between the two approaches. Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914; work made available only in the posthumous collected edition of 1931–1958)⁵ continues the logico-ontological tradition, spanning two-and-a-half millennia, which views the sign as a separate entity, perceived not for its own sake but rather because of something else: *aliquid stat pro aliquo*. Peirce realised that the sign – far from being a marginal and exceptional entity, as had been thought for a long time – is, or can be, anything and any time; his programmatic goal was then to classify the universe of sign-entities, which did turn his semiotics into a science of everything. Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913; made available by a collected edition of his previous publications, a symbolic work signed by his name, and the continuing edition of his unpublished papers)⁶ uses the word *sign* in a crucially different way. For Saussure, the sign is an indivisible unit, and it constitutes a sign precisely by virtue of carrying both expression (*signifiant, forme, expression*) and content (*signifié, fonction, contenu*); rather than to refer to other entities, the sign adopts various values;

¹ DE SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. 1916, ²1922, ³1931. *Cours de linguistique générale* publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Payot, Lausanne – Paris 1972. — HJELMSLEV, Louis Trolle. 1943. *Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse*. Festschrift udgivet af Københavns universitet. November 1943. København. — MARTINET, André. 1946. Au sujet des *Fondements de la théorie linguistique* de Louis Hjelmslev. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* tome 42, I, 1946, pp. 19–42.

² ECO, Umberto. ²1980. Prefazione. 1. Riflessioni 1980. In Umberto Eco: *La struttura assente. La ricerca semiotica e il metodo strutturale*. Bologna, Bompiani.

³ TRABANT, Jürgen. 1970. *Zur Semiologie des literarischen Kunstwerks*. München, Wilhelm Fink.

⁴ HEMPFER, Klaus W. 1976. *Poststrukturelle Texttheorie und narrative Praxis. Tel Quel und die Konstitution eines Nouveau Nouveau Roman*. Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München. Romanica Monacensia Band 11.

⁵ *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. 1931–1958. Volumes I through VI (edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss), 1931–1935; volumes VII and VIII (edited by Arthur W. Burks), 1958. Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.

⁶ DE SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. 1921. *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand de Saussure* rassemblé par Charles Bally et Léopold Gautier. Société anonyme des éditions Sonor, Genève ; Payot, Lausanne – Genève – Neuchâtel – Vevey – Montreux – Berne. — DE SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. 1916, ²1922, ³1931. *Cours de linguistique générale* publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Payot, Lausanne – Paris 1972. — DE SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. 2002. *Écrits de linguistique générale* établis et édités par Simon Bouquet et Rudolf Engler avec la collaboration d'Antoinette Weil. Gallimard, Paris.

the value of a sign is the resultant of systemic relationship, which makes Saussure's semiology into a science of limited, culturally delineated sign systems.

IV.

Having in mind such a preliminary view, let me sketch out the Prague-centre history of encompassing philology, when bringing into relief the relevant moments and leaving aside the irrelevant ones. Encompassing philology draws on resources which have always been clearly present in the history of scientific study of language, notwithstanding the paradigms which may have at any single moment dominated institutionalized research. They can be listed as follows.

The initial assumption needed for an emancipation of linguistics and semiology is a philosophical one: it was necessary to discard the Aristotelian-Scholastic prejudice that pre-formed thoughts come first, and only subsequently they are coded by various languages. The philosophical resolution was achieved by Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) and his authoritative account that a thought is the resultant vector of a process occurring entirely in the human mind; at the same time, Kant found an elegant retreat for the Aristotelian-Scholastic metaphysics by assigning it with a positive task: to study the inherent qualities of thought-processes.

However, an autonomous linguistics (and semiology) arises only once we realize that thinking itself is not only processual but also linguistic. This turn is performed by Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), historically the first to see and fully comprehend that a thought is essentially linguistic: it arises in language and by language; and since it is linguistic, it is, necessarily, also communicative; the birth of one person's thought in the milieu of a language is complete only once this same language calls up a response in another person; language is a social, which is to say, a cultural-historical phenomenon. Besides that, Humboldt is the first to see that linguistic units have to be understood as what we now call the Saussurian sign, i.e., as formations possessing expression and content *ex ante*, not created by a subsequent joining of an independent expression with an independent content; an expression is what it is by virtue of being the expression of a content, a content is what it is by virtue of being the content of an expression.

Step two is represented by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913). Saussure confirms Humboldt's stance both regarding the relationship between thought and language and regarding the nature of the linguistic unit, which, for the first time, he calls *the sign*, and as a novelty – without actually ever using the term – he offers “structuralism”. The essence of Saussurean structuralism is the mutual linkage of value and system: the value of any and all units is to be considered only as the resultant vector of the systemic relationship within which we observe the unit; and again, each system by consequence of the relationships that it contains provides the units involved in it with certain values. Saussurean structuralism is a necessary precondition for any scientific study of the Saussurean sign: rather than to refer, a sign attains values. Saussurean structuralism is not limited to linguistic signs; rather, from the very beginning, it also counts with sign systems of other kinds.

Step three is represented by Karl Bühler (1879–1963), a medicinal psychiatrist and experimental psychologist. Bühler neatly resolved the contemporary crisis of psychology by providing a positive programme, one which defines psychology, not as study of the contents of human awareness or of psychic processes, but rather of the *meaningful living*: humans beings, but not only humans, actively perceive the world they live in (*Umwelt*), accord meaning to what they perceive, and in accordance with the meaning they direct their behaviour in their world.⁷ In the spirit of this programme, Bühler proceeds to analyze the niveaus and links of significance in language communication in the way they are meaningful for humans (cf. Bühlerian functions, Bühlerian fields).⁸ Thus,

⁷ BÜHLER, Karl. 1927. *Die Krise der Psychologie*. Jena, Gustav Fischer.

⁸ BÜHLER, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena, Gustav Fischer.

the relationship between language and thought is explicitly transposed into an empirically verifiable relationship of communication and action.

In its classical period (1926–1948), the Prague Linguistic Circle formulated and developed a programme of functional structuralism which integrates the insights shown in the previous steps: the structuralism of the Circle builds upon the Saussurean linkage of system and value, its functionality consists in accounting for the communicative aspect (in the Humboldtian as well as the Bühlerian sense). On top of that, the Circle supplies two highly practical solutions: first, it develops a concept wherein the sign is the entire oral or written text, while all the systemic elements – from phones all the way to thematic patterns – serve as diacritical moments, structurally differentiating one large sign from another; second, it develops a concept whereby the extralinguistic reality is always being confronted not by an isolated word but rather by the entire text, i.e., a sign evincing extreme structural complexity and highly structured meaning; thus, the barrier of ontological reference is eliminated.

The Paris school of interpretive semantics attained an elegant solution of the inherent meaning dynamics of small sign units, especially lexical ones, in their textual occurrences. If the meaning of each sign unit is determined by a defining domain, i.e., a systemic section wherein it is being viewed, then the concretization of meaning in the entirety of a text consists in the actualization of one defining domain out of many potential ones, and this choice is being directed by the global structure of the text. The technique of interpretive semantics, as developed by François Rastier⁹ via a critical reassessment of the broader French tradition (Bernard Pottier¹⁰, Algirdas-Julien Greimas¹¹), evinces deep parallels with the older techniques of functional structuralism, as they were developed primarily by Vilém Mathesius,¹² Jan Mukařovský,¹³ Jiří Veltruský.¹⁴ For both the Paris and the Prague

⁹ RASTIER, François. 1987. *Sémantique interprétative*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France. — RASTIER, François. 1990. La triade sémiotique, le trivium et la sémantique linguistique. *Nouveaux actes sémiotiques* 9. — RASTIER, François. 2001. *Arts et sciences du texte*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France.

¹⁰ POTTIER, Bernard. 1967. *Présentation de la linguistique. Fondements d'une théorie*. Paris, Klincksieck. — POTTIER, Bernard. 1974. *Linguistique générale. Théorie et description*. Paris, Klincksieck.

¹¹ GREIMAS, Algirdas Julien. 1966, 1986. *Sémantique structurale*. Paris, Larousse (1966), Presses universitaires de France (1986). — GREIMAS, Algirdas Julien. 1970. *Du sens. Essais sémiotiques*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil. — GREIMAS, Algirdas Julien. 1983. *Du sens II. Essais sémiotiques*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil.

¹² MATHESIUS, Vilém. 1928 [uere editum 1930]. On linguistic characterology with illustrations from modern English. In *Actes du Premier congrès international de linguistes à La Haye du 10–15 avril 1928*, 56–63. A.W.Sijthoff, Leiden [sine die]. — MATHESIUS, Vilém. 1931. La place de la linguistique fonctionnelle et structurale dans le développement général des études linguistiques. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* XVIII (1931/1932), n° 1 (décembre 1931), 1–7. — MATHESIUS, Vilém. 1936. On some problems of the systematic analysis of grammar. In *Études dédiées au Quatrième congrès de linguistes*. Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague 6, 95–107. — MATHESIUS, Vilém. 1939. Verstärkung und Emphase. In *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally*, 407–414. Georg et c^{ie}, Genève.

¹³ MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1936. L'art comme fait sémiologique. In *Actes du Huitième congrès international de philosophie à Prague 2–7 septembre 1934* (curauerunt Emanuel Rádl et Zdeněk Smetáček), 1065–1072. Prague, Comité d'organisation du Congrès. — MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1938. Dénomination poétique et la fonction esthétique de la langue. In *Actes du Quatrième congrès international des linguistes* [tenu à Copenhague du 27 août au 1^{er} septembre 1936], 98–104. København, E.Munksgaard. — MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1939. La valeur esthétique dans l'art peut-elle être universelle ? In *Les conceptions modernes de la raison (Entretiens d'été — Amersfoort 1938)*. III *Raison et valeur*, 17–29. Publications de l'Institut international de collaboration philosophique. Paris, Hermann (Actualités scientifiques et industrielles, vol. 851). — MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1939. La langue poétique. In *Rapports. V^e congrès international des linguistes, Bruxelles 28 août – 2 septembre 1939*. Deuxième publication, 94–102. Bruges, Comité international permanent des linguistes.

¹⁴ VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří. 1976. Some aspects of the pictorial sign. In *Semiotics of Art. Prague School Contributions* (curauerunt Ladislav Matejka et Irwin Titunik), 245–264. The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA). — VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří.

stance it is symptomatic that they combine the two concepts of language which have coexisted since Humboldt and Saussure, i.e., language as an abstract system, and language as a social institution; social institutions guide the actualization of defining domains, which are, in their potentiality, deposited in an abstract system.

Encompassing philology intelligently evaluates all the historical experiences listed above and transforms them into practical instruments, which allow for both describing a language and for analyzing a linguistic formation, i.e., a text. Unlike French semantic tradition which determines, by mutual differentiations, the value of small linguistic signs only, mostly morphemes and lexemes, leaving the rest to what Émile Benveniste calls *mode sémantique*,¹⁵ encompassing philology disposes of systemic means for differentiating large signs as well, including entire texts. In principle, such means can be adopted even to non-linguistic signs, i.e., to cultural-historical events of various nature.

V.

What is the moral of such a history? First, present-day humanities provide room enough for working with the language sign (in Saussure's sense) in a way semiologically correct, philologically exhaustive and heuristically profitable; second, the crucial elements needed for such work have been available for quite some time; third, all we need is personal intellectual courage to adopt means that already are at our disposal.

In order to go any further, we must above all eliminate the principal barrier for a historical understanding of European structuralism (there was a U.S. structuralism as well) and its relationship to semiology. This barrier has been erected not by lack of knowledge, but rather by the preponderance of superficial, or indeed false knowledge. European structuralism has to be understood as *corpora* of scientific texts, produced during more than a century of varying intense and variously interrupted activity. These corpora are not “just there”; they are always consciously compiled by a researcher responsible for his selection. The criterion of the present selection is, whether and how scientific research comes to terms with the principles of Saussurean structuralism and Saussurean sign, as explained above. Within the scientific production thus selected, we discern *centres* – in Czech *obniska*, French *foyers*, Lithuanian *židiniai*, Russian *очаги*, Italian rather *centri*, German *Zentren* –, i.e., large collections of texts that are aware of one other and recognize certain shared goals, even though their procedures may differ. Methodological unity of the conceptual and interpretive apparatus is the defining quality of a yet narrower collection of texts, called *school*; as a rule, there are several schools in each centre (and the “Prague School” label as traditionally employed actually designates the Prague Centre of functional structuralism, within which numerous schools may be discerned).

Subsequently, it is indispensable to exemplify a systemic description of a language as a sign system. The crucial quality is the assumption of a top-to-bottom perspective: large signs (such as, in particular, entire texts) are not composed out of smaller ones and smaller ones are not composed out of elementary ones; on the contrary, the large and global sign is always primary, and only secondarily does it disintegrate into smaller signs, where the separation of lower-level, partial signs must always be legitimized by detecting their structural relationship to the higher-level whole. This is how

1984. Semiotic notes on dialogue in literature. In *Language and Literary Theory. In Honor of Ladislav Matejka* (curauerunt Benjamin Stolz, Irwin Titunik, Lubomír Doležel), 595–607. University of Michigan (Papers in Slavic Philology 5), Ann Arbor (MI). — VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří. 1995. Semiotics and avant-garde theatre. *Theatre Survey* 36: 1, 87–95. — VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří. 1984. Bühlers Organon-Modell und die Semiotik der Kust. In *Bühler-Studien* (curavit Achim Eschbach) I, 161–205. Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp. — VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří. 2012. *An approach to the semiotics of theatre*. Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, nouvelle série, volume 6. Brno, Masarykova universita.

¹⁵ BENVENISTE, Émile. 1969. Sémiologie de la langue. *Semiotica*, La Haye, Mouton & Co., I (1969), I, 1–12 et II, 127–135. — Reimpressum in Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* 2, 43–66. Gallimard, Paris 1974.

variously voluminous textual passages – and ultimately, single utterances qua elementary texts – separate out of a global text. Within the further structural descent, the analysis introduces the structurally-analytical unit “sentence”, defined completely independently from “utterance”, and only against the background of the structural unit “sentence” there come forward such sign units as “word” and “grammatical relationship”, as well as diacritical units such as “prosodic contour” or “phoneme” at the expression plane, “seme” at the content plane.

Finally, we must demonstrate a model of grasping the meaning of the text in an objectifiable way by employing dynamic selection of semes. The content units of a text are modelled as configurations of semes, i.e., the minimal diacritical moments effective in the content plane of a language. The occurrence of a seme is demonstrable by the actualization of the pertinent defining domain as against other, systemically compossible defining domains. The choice of defining domains is being determined both by the structural relationships within the given text, and by the cultural-historical anchoring of linguistic signs in a particular collective.

VI.

To conclude, encompassing philology offers both practical assistance and improved scientific self-confidence to the Humanities (*Geisteswissenschaften*, *sciences humaines*), denigrated as they often are in a presumed contrast to the “hard”, “exact”, truly “scientific” disciplines, a contrast currently mirrored in the standard usage of languages such as English (*sciences :: humanities*) and French (*sciences :: lettres*). The essence of scientific exactness does consist not in making exact measurement but rather in separating certain structural components, including those to be measured, out of the empirical reality, and then interpreting them in a methodical manner with respect to the behaviour of the whole. In this sense, there is only one science; and the scientific community, being simply one out of many various collectives within humanity, is characterized by the fact that within it, the specific norms of rational thought and objectivized procedures are especially dominant.

Tomáš Hoskovec

président du
Cercle linguistique de Prague

Španielova 1326/35, CZ–16300 Praha – Řepy
Czechia/Tschechien/Tchéquie
☎ +420.242.499.932, cercle@cercledeprague.org

Notices bibliographiques

Les références bibliographiques des textes-sources mentionnés dans la leçon, sont données dans les notes en bas de page. Les renvois aux textes de Mathesius, Mukařovský et Veltruský (notes 12 à 14) n'ont été choisis qu'à titre d'exemple. Le Cercle linguistique de Prague prépare la publication aussi complète que possible des sources historiques sous forme de trois volumes des *Archives du Cercle linguistique de Prague*. En attendant, le lecteur est invité à consulter les choix personnels des auteurs respectifs, ayant paru en tchèque. Un panorama du paysage historique du foyer pragois de structuralisme fonctionnel est offert dans le volume 7 de la nouvelle série des *Travaux* du CLP.

Vilém Mathesius (1882 – 1945)

en préparation

Papers on functional linguistics in German, French and English

Archives du Cercle linguistique de Prague, volume 1

All texts originally written by Mathesius in German, French or English, with historical translations of three texts originally written in Czech; introduced and commented on in English.

- Jan Mukařovský (1891 – 1975) en préparation
Études d'analyse immanente de l'œuvre poétique
Archives du Cercle linguistique de Prague, volume 2
Recueil des textes originaux français et allemands, enrichi de divers témoignages de l'époque ; expliqué et présenté en français.
- Jiří Veltruský (1919 – 1994) en préparation
Œuvre d'art, approche structurale – c'est-à-dire sémiologique
Archives du Cercle linguistique de Prague, volume 3
Choix des textes originaux rédigés en français ou en anglais, et de traductions d'auteur ; expliqué et présenté en français.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1947. *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt* [La langue tchèque et la linguistique générale]. Praha, Melantrich. — Choix d'études préparé par l'auteur en 1941 et revu en 1943, empêché d'imprimer par l'occupant nazi.
- Mukařovský, Jan. 1948. *Kapitoly z české poetiky* I, II, III [Chapitres de la poétique tchèque I, II, III]. Praha, Svoboda. — Édition définitive du choix d'études préparé par l'auteur, paru au préalable en deux volumes en 1941, ayant subi de graves coupures par la censure nazie.
- Mukařovský, Jan. 1966. *Studie z estetiky* [Études d'esthétique]. Praha, Odeon, 1966. — Un nouveau choix d'études rédigées avant 1948.
- Veltruský, Jiří. 1994. *Příspěvky k teorii divadla* [Contributions à la théorie du théâtre]. Praha, Divadelní ústav, 1994. — Choix d'études parues antérieurement, préparé par l'auteur.
- Hoskovec, Tomáš. 2018. Karl Bühler et le programme sémiologique du Cercle linguistique de Prague. In *Karl Bühler, une théorie du langage redécouverte – eine Sprachtheorie wiederentdeckt – a theory of language rediscovered* (curait Tomáš Hoskovec, Savina Raynaud et Federico Albano Leoni et Jürgen Trabant adiuuantibus). Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, nouvelle série, volume 7, 335–385. Kanina – Praha, OPS. — Exposé bien documenté de la dimension sémiologique du CLP, qui lui est historiquement inhérente.