**University of Texas Press Slavic Series, No. 6**



# The Prague School

## Selected Writings, 1929–1946

Edited by Peter Steiner

**Translated by John Burbank, Olga Hasty, Manfred Jacobson, Bruce Kochis, and Wendy Steiner**



University of Texas Press, Austin

# Theses Presented to the First Congress of Slavic Philologists in Prague, 1929

## The Prague Linguistic Circle

***Bibliographic Note*: Prague Linguistic Circle, "Thèses," *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*, 1 (1929), 7–29. Translated from the Czech original, "Teze předložené Prvému sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze," in J. Vachek (ed.), *U základů pražské jazykovědné školy* (Prague, 1970), pp. 35–65.**

*The Prague Linguistic Circle came into being on the afternoon of October 6, 1926, when five Czech and Russian linguists (Bohuslav Havránek, Roman Jakobson, Vilém Mathesius, Jan Rypka, and Bohumil Trnka) gathered to hear a lecture by their German colleague, Henrik Becker. As the meetings among these scholars multiplied, it became apparent that a new kind of intellectual association was in the making. The Circle's chairman, Vilém Mathesius (1882–1945), recollected some ten years later that "in the period between October, 1926, and June, 1927, nine meetings with lectures and discussions were held; in the following season, however, this number was already reached by the end of March, 1928. By the end of June that year the number of lectures had gone up to eleven, despite the fact that in April no meeting took place because of the Hague International Congress of Linguists held that month."*[1]

*The April break mentioned by Mathesius was not, however, a waste. For the first time the Prague structuralists had an opportunity to present themselves as a group at an international forum.*[2] *The experience of the Hague Congress set the structuralists thinking about another international meeting scheduled for the following year in Prague—the International Congress of Slavists. Jakobson wrote to Trubeckoj on April 6, 1929, reporting:*

> *Suddenly it occurred to the most active core within the Circle that as a parliament of opinions, as a free tribune for discussions, the Circle had become an anachronism and that it should be reformed into a closely knit group united by its scholarly ideology . . . This process is now successfully realized. A sort of steering committee arose consisting of Mathesius, the very talented linguist Havránek, Mukařovský, Trnka and myself. . . . The Circle composed a list of principal problems to*

*which the interested participants of the [Slavic] Congress should react. . . . The Circle is preparing theses concerning all these problems and has decided to invite the Russian linguists most sympathetic to the Circle's ideas to participate in the elaboration of the theses, among them you, Karcevskij, Durnovo, Larin, Tynjanov and Bubrix.*[3]

*Despite its collective origin, the "Theses of the Prague Circle" is not a series of disconnected pronouncements. It is a unified text propounding a new and original view of language and linguistic phenomena (including verbal art). What unites the "Theses" is its functionalist standpoint, the recognition that language is above all a tool of communication and all its forms are in some respect connected with this goal-directedness.*[4] *And even though some of the formulations contained in the "Theses" became obsolete in the subsequent development of the Prague School, as a whole it boldly charted the general direction of Prague structuralism for the next twenty years.*

*A French translation of the "Theses" by Louis Brun was printed in the preparatory materials for the Congress. It was intended for publication in the first volume of the* Proceedings *together with several theoretical papers by Jakobson, Mathesius, Mukařovský, and Trubeckoj which would elaborate some of its points in more detail.*[5] *However, only the second volume of the Congress* Proceedings *was actually published, and thus the "Theses" (minus point 10 presented to the third section of the Congress) inaugurated the Circle's new series,* Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague.

*The reception of the "Theses" by the participants of the Congress was somewhat mixed. As Jakobson wrote in his short report, "there were no substantial objections to the theses defended by the Circle at the Congress and especially the resolution about the task of Slavic structural linguistics was accepted unanimously. If, however, it had been submitted to a secret ballot, it would certainly have provoked a few votes against it. Such was, at least, the impression gained from talks in the corridors."*[6]

*There are several volumes and many articles dealing with the history and theories of Prague structuralism. For linguistics, consult Josef Vachek,* The Linguistic School of Prague *(Bloomington, 1966), and for information about the multifaceted achievements of this group, see Ladislav Matejka (ed.),* Sound, Sign and Meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle *(Ann Arbor, 1976).*

## NOTES

1. "Deset let Pražského lingvistického kroužku," *Slovo a slovesnost,* 2 (1936), 13. Quoted from "Ten Years of the Prague Linguistic Circle," in J. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague: An Introduction to Its Theory and Practice* (Bloomington, 1966), p. 142. For a list of lectures delivered at the Circle compiled by B. Kochis, see L. Matejka (ed.), *Sound, Sign and Meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle* (Ann Arbor, 1976), pp. 607–622.

2. "Thèses présentées au Premier Congrès International de Linguistes à la Haye par R. Jakobson, S. Karcevskij, V. Mathesius avec Ch. Bally et A. Sechehaye," *Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistes tenu à la Haye, du 10–15 Avril 1928* (Leyden, s.a.), pp. 85–86.

3. Quoted from R. Jakobson (ed.), *N.S. Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes* (The Hague, 1975), p. 122.

4. See, e.g., R. Jakobson, "Efforts Toward a Means-Ends Model of Language in Interwar Continental Linguistics," *Selected Writings,* 6 vols. (The Hague, 1975), vol. 2, pp. 522–526.

5. For more information about the content of this volume, see R. Jakobson and F. Slotty, "Die Sprachwissenschaft auf dem ersten Slavistenkongress in Prag vom 6–13 Oktober 1929," *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch,* 14 (1930), 384–391.

6. "Romantické všeslovanství—nová slavistika" [Romantic panslavism—new slavistics], *Čin,* 1 (1929–1930), 12. Quoted from R. Jakobson, "Retrospect," *Selected Writings,* vol. 2, p. 711.



## I. METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS STEMMING FROM THE CONCEPTION OF LANGUAGE AS A SYSTEM AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS CONCEPTION FOR SLAVIC LANGUAGES

(the synchronic method and its relation to the diachronic method, structural comparison versus genetic comparison, the accidentality or the developmental regularity of linguistic phenomena)

### (a) The Conception of Language as a Functional System

Language like any other human activity is goal-oriented. Whether we analyze language as expression or communication, the speaker's intention is the most evident and most natural explanation. In linguistic analysis, therefore, one should adopt the functional perspective. *From the functional point of view, language is a system of goal-oriented means of expression.* No linguistic phenomenon can be understood without regard for the system to which it belongs. Slavic linguistics can no longer ignore this pressing set of problems.

### (b) Tasks of the Synchronic Method: Its Relation to the Diachronic Method

The essence and nature of a system of language can best be discovered through a synchronic analysis of today's languages which alone provide

complete material and which can be directly experienced. Consequently, *the elaboration of a linguistic characterization of the contemporary Slavic languages* is both the most immediate and the most neglected task of Slavic linguistics. Unless such a course is taken, no deeper study of the Slavic languages is possible.

*The conception of language as a functional system also has to be considered in the study of past stages*, whether in their reconstruction or in the study of their evolution. *There is no insurmountable barrier between the synchronic and diachronic methods, as claimed by the Geneva School.* If linguistic elements, from a synchronic standpoint, must be examined in terms of their systemic function, linguistic changes demand the same of diachronic investigation—an evaluation in terms of the system which is the subject of these changes. It would be illogical to presuppose that linguistic changes are only destructive interventions, purposeless and heterogeneous from the viewpoint of the system. Linguistic changes often reflect the needs of the system, its stabilization, its realignment, and so forth. Diachronic study, therefore, not only does not exclude the notions of system and function, but, on the contrary, is incomplete without them.

On the other hand, *neither can a synchronic description absolutely exclude the notion of evolution*, for such a synchronic moment reflects the disappearing, present, and coming stages. Stylistic elements perceived as archaisms as well as the distinction between productive and nonproductive forms are evidence of diachronic phenomena which cannot be eliminated from synchronic linguistics.

### (c) New Possibilities for Using the Comparative Method

Until now the comparative study of Slavic languages has been limited to genetic problems, primarily to the discovery of common elements. But it should be used more widely; it is the proper method for discovering *the structural regularity of systems of language and their evolution*. Valuable material for this kind of comparison is found not only in unrelated languages or in remotely related and structurally distinct ones but also in the languages of a single family, such as the Slavic languages, which in their historical development manifest sharp differences against the background of numerous essential similarities.

#### *The Consequences of a Structural Comparison of Related Languages*

A step by step comparison of the evolution of the Slavic languages would destroy any belief in the accidental or episodic character of the development in the history of these languages. For it would reveal the regular connection between specific convergent and divergent phenomena. Such a study would result in a typology of the evolution of the Slavic languages, a unified summary of these changes.



Comparative study provides valuable material for both general linguistics and the history of the separate Slavic languages, thus discrediting once and for all the unproductive and misleading practice of isolating phenomena in historical investigation. Comparative study reveals the basic tendencies of a language's evolution and makes it possible to utilize more successfully the principle of relative chronology, which is more reliable than indirect chronological data drawn from literary monuments.

#### *Regional Groups*

The discovery of tendencies in the evolution of particular Slavic languages and the comparison of these tendencies to those in neighboring languages, Slavic and non-Slavic (e.g., the Finno-Ugric languages, German, the various Balkan languages), will provide the basis for investigating which regional groups each Slavic language has belonged to during the course of history.

### (d) The Regularity of Linguistic Evolution

In disciplines concerned with evolution, linguistics among them, the notion of the accidental origin of phenomena is now giving way to that of the regularity of evolutionary phenomena (nomogenesis). This is why the theory of convergent evolution is gaining ground from the theory of mechanical and accidental expansion in the explanation of grammatical and phonological changes.

#### *The Consequences: 1. For the Expansion of Linguistic Phenomena*

Even the expansion of linguistic phenomena changing a language system is not mechanical but is determined by the readiness of the receiving parties, which is parallel to a developmental tendency. Accordingly, controversies about whether a given case involves a change radiating from a common center or a result of convergent evolution lose their significance.

#### *2. For the Problem of Disintegration of the Proto-language*

This approach also alters the meaning of the disintegration of the proto-language. The criterion for the unity of the proto-language is the extent to which its dialects are capable of experiencing common changes. Whether these convergences originate from one center or

not is a secondary matter difficult to resolve. As long as convergences predominate over divergences, it is advantageous to presuppose, conventionally, a proto-language. The question of the disintegration of proto-Slavic can also be resolved from this standpoint. The notion of linguistic unity which has been used here is, of course, only an auxiliary methodological concept appropriate for historical research but not suited for applied linguistics, in which the criterion of linguistic unity is the attitude of the speaking collective toward its language and not objective linguistic characteristics.

## II. TASKS OF THE STUDY OF A LANGUAGE SYSTEM, THE SLAVIC SYSTEM IN PARTICULAR

### (a) Research on the Sound Aspect of Language

*The Importance of the Acoustic Aspect*

The problem of the intentionality of phonological phenomena necessitates that in studying their external aspect one examine them first from the acoustic standpoint, because the speaker is concerned with an acoustic representation rather than a motor one (e.g., the different details in the articulation of Czech *ř* or Russian *l* do not matter as long as the acoustic result is the same).

*The Necessity of Distinguishing a Sound as an Objective Physical Fact, as a Representation, and as an Element of a Functional System*

Recording by means of instruments the objective acoustic and motor preconditions of subjective acoustic-motor representations is valuable as an index of the objective correlatives of linguistic values. But these objective preconditions have only an indirect relation to linguistics and therefore should not be identified with linguistic values.

But even subjective acoustic-motor representations are elements of a language system only insofar as they serve to differentiate meaning in it. The sensory content of such phonological elements is less essential than their interrelations in the system (*the structural principle of the phonological system*).

*The Fundamental Tasks of Synchronic Phonology*

1. One must describe the phonological system, that is, establish the set of simplest acoustic-motor representations which create meaning in a given language (*phonemes*). In doing so, one must specify the relations among phonemes, that is, establish *the structural scheme of the given system*. It is especially important, therefore, to define phonological correlations as a special type of meaning-creating difference. A phonological correlation consists of a series of phonemes opposed to one another according to a common, abstract principle (e.g., the following correlations exist in Russian: dynamic stress vs. lack of vocalic stress, voiced vs. voiceless consonants, soft vs. hard consonants; in Czech: long vs. short vowels, voiced vs. voiceless consonants).

2. One must determine *the combinations of phonemes realized* in a given language compared to all the theoretically possible combinations of these phonemes, the variations in the sequence of their grouping, and the scope of these combinations.

3. One must also determine the degree of utilization and the frequency of realization of the given phonemes and combinations of phonemes of different scope. One must likewise study the functional capacity of various phonemes and combinations of phonemes in a given language.

4. An important problem of linguistics, Slavic linguistics in particular, is *the morphological exploitation of phonological differences* (*morphophonology* or, *by abbreviation*, *morphonology*). Morphonemes, the complex representations of two or more phonemes capable of replacing one another within the same morpheme according to the conditions of the morphological structure of a word, play an essential role in Slavic languages (e.g., in Russian there is the morphoneme *k/č* in *ruk/č—ruka, ručnoj*).

It is necessary to establish in precise synchronic fashion all the morphonemes for each Slavic language or dialect and the place that a given morphoneme can occupy within a morpheme.

Carrying out this phonological and morphonological description of all the Slavic languages and their dialects is an urgent problem of Slavic studies.

### (b) Research on the Word and Word-Combinations

*The Theory of Linguistic Designation—The Word*

From the standpoint of function, the word is *the result of the linguistic act of designation* (naming), which is sometimes inseparably bound to the correlating (syntagmatic) act.[1] The linguistic approach that analyzed speech as an objectified mechanical fact often denied the existence of the word altogether, but from the functional standpoint *the independent existence of the word is completely evident*,

although it manifests itself with various intensity in different languages and is only a potential fact. By means of the act of designation, speech analyzes reality—whether external or internal, material or abstract—into linguistically graspable elements.

*Each language has its own system of designation.* It uses various designating forms with varying intensity, e.g., the derivation of words, the compounding of words and fixed word groups (in Slavic languages, particularly in popular speech, new nouns are for the most part formed by derivation), has its own classification of designation, and produces its own characteristic vocabulary. The classification of designation manifests itself above all in the system of word categories, whose scope, precision, and interrelation must be studied for each language in particular. Moreover, there are also classificatory differences within particular categories of words: for example, for nouns, such categories as gender, animation, number, definiteness; for verbs, the categories of voice, aspect, tense.

The theory of designation analyzes in part the same linguistic phenomena as the traditional theory of word-formation and syntax in the narrow sense (the theory of the meaning of the parts of speech and their forms), but the functional conception makes it possible to connect separated phenomena, to establish the system of individual languages, and to explain what the older methods only stated—for example, the functions of temporal forms in the Slavic languages.

An analysis of the forms and typologies of linguistic designation still does not sufficiently determine the character of the vocabulary of a language. To characterize it one must still study the average semantic scope and definiteness in linguistic designations in general and in separate designational categories in particular. One must identify the conceptual spheres prominently represented in a given vocabulary; one must establish the role of linguistic affectivity and intellectualization. One must also ascertain how a given vocabulary is augmented (e.g., by its borrowing or translating foreign forms of designation). In short, one must study the phenomena usually relegated to semantics.

*The Theory of Correlation—Word-Combination (Syntax)*

Except for fixed word-combinations, *the combination of words in a sentence is the result of the correlating act,* which, of course, often manifests itself in the form of a single word. *Predication is the fundamental correlating act,* and at the same time it is the intrinsic sentence-creating act. Therefore, functional syntax is primarily concerned with the study of predicative types while also taking into account the forms and functions of the grammatical subject. The



function of the subject can best be seen in a comparison of the topical partition of the sentence[2] into theme and comment with its formal division into grammatical subject and predicate. For example, it turns out that the grammatical subject in Czech is not as thematic as the grammatical subject in French or English and that the topical partition of the Czech sentence into theme and comment, because of its freer word order, makes it possible to eliminate the discrepancy between the theme and the grammatical subject which other languages eliminate in other ways, for example, by means of the passive.

The functional conception makes it possible *to recognize the interconnection of different syntactic forms* (compare the aforementioned connection between the thematic nature of the grammatical subject and the development of passive predication) and thus to recognize their systemic solidarity and concentration.

*Morphology (The Theory of Systems of Lexical Forms and Groups)*

The functions of words and the formations of lexical groups resulting from the linguistic acts of designation and correlation comprise formal systems in language. These systems are studied by morphology, in the broad sense of the word, which (unlike traditional word-formation, morphology, syntax) does not parallel the theory of designation and correlation but cuts across both.

*The tendencies comprising the morphological system gravitate toward two centers of cohesion:* they maintain forms that have the same meaning but differ in function, and forms that differ in meaning but have the same function. It is necessary to establish the importance of these two tendencies for each particular language as well as the extent and the organization of the systems dominated by them.

In characterizing morphological systems, one must state the importance and scope of the analytic and synthetic principles in the expression of individual functions.

## III. PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH INTO THE DIFFERENT FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE, PARTICULARLY IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

### (a) On the Functions of Language

The study of a language demands a precise differentiation of its linguistic functions and their modes of realization. If one does not take

these functions and modes into account, the description of language, whether synchronic or diachronic, is distorted and incorrect. The phonic, grammatical, and lexical structure of a language changes according to these functions and modes.

1. One must differentiate *internal speech* from *externalized speech*. For the majority of speakers, expressed speech is only a special case, because they think in linguistic forms more often than they speak. Therefore it is erroneous to generalize and to overestimate the significance, for language, of its external phonic aspect, and one must pay special attention to potential linguistic phenomena.

2. The *intellectuality* and the *emotionality* of utterances are important indices of the character of a language. They either complement each other or compete for dominance.

3. *Externalized intellectual speech* has a predominantly social direction (that is, it is designed for communication with someone). *Emotional speech* often has the same social direction, that is, it seeks to evoke certain emotions in the listener (emotive speech), or it is a discharge of emotion which occurs without regard to a listener.

*In its social role* one must distinguish *speech according to its relation to extralinguistic reality*. It has either *a communicative function*, that is, it is directed toward the object of expression, or *a poetic function*, that is, it is directed toward the expression itself. One must distinguish two directions of gravitation concerning speech *in its communicative function*: one for context-bound speech, that is, for speech that relies upon extralinguistic elements for completion (*practical* speech), the other for speech that aims at creating maximally closed wholes through completeness and precision, word-terms and sentence-judgments (*theoretical* or *formulative* speech).

It is advisable to study those forms of speech in which one function totally predominates and those in which manifold functions interpenetrate. The different hierarchy of functions in each case is essential here.

Each *functional speech has its own system of conventions—its language proper* (*langue*). It is incorrect to identify one function with language (*langue*) and another with the actual speech (*parole* in Saussure's terminology), for example, the intellectual function with language and the emotional function with the actual speech.

4. The modes of the utterance fall into two oppositions: first, *the oral utterance* (which subdivides according to whether the listener sees the speaker or does not) versus *the written utterance*, and second, *alternately interrupted (dialogic) speech* and *unilaterally uninterrupted (monologic) speech*. It is important to establish which modes are associated with which functions and to what extent.



One must also study systematically *the gestures* which accompany and complement oral utterances in direct contact with the listener. These are important for the description of regional linguistic groups.

5. An important factor in the stratification of language is *the relationship among the interlocutors*: the degree of their social cohesion, their professional, territorial, and familial connections, and also their membership in multiple collectivities, as expressed in the mixture of linguistic systems in the languages of cities. This category includes the problem of *languages for interdialectal communication* (so-called *general languages*), that of *specialized languages*, that of *languages adapted for communication with a foreign-language milieu*, and that of *urban linguistic stratification*.

Even in diachronic linguistics one must devote attention to the profound reciprocal influence of these linguistic formations, i.e., not only to the regional influence but also to the influence of functional languages, modes of utterance, and languages of different groups.

The study of this functional dialectology has hardly been begun in the field of Slavic languages. For example, we still lack systematic analyses of the devices of linguistic emotionality, and the study of languages in cities should be organized immediately.

(b) On Standard Literary Language

*Political, socio-economic, and religious conditions* are *only external factors* in the formation of a standard literary language. They help to explain why a standard literary language developed from a regional dialect, or why it originated and became established in a certain period, but they do not explain why and how it differs from the common language.

*This difference cannot be accounted for simply by the conservative nature of the standard literary language*. Conservative as its grammar and phonology may be, its vocabulary is constantly changing. It never merely represents the past state of some local dialect.

*The distinctiveness of the standard literary language is caused by its role*, particularly by the greater demands placed on it than on common language. It serves to express the life of culture and civilization (the process and results of scientific, philosophical, religious, social, political, administrative, and juridical thought). This task, and its goal of professional instruction and formulation, *expands and changes* (intellectualizes) its vocabulary. Matters which do not have a direct relationship to everyday life and new phenomena require new expressions which the common language does not pos-

sess or did not possess up to that time. And the need to express oneself precisely and systematically about everyday matters leads to new word-concepts, expressions for logical abstractions, and a more precise definition of logical categories through linguistic means.

*This intellectualization of the standard literary language* also results from the need to express *the interdependence and complexity of mental processes*, manifested not only in expressions for pertinent abstract concepts but also in syntactic forms (e.g., in the elaboration of the complex sentence through more precise formulae). Furthermore, this intellectualization manifests itself in a stringent control (censorship) *of emotional elements* (the cultivation of the euphemism).

*This attentive and more exacting attitude toward language* is linked to *the more regulated and more normative character of the standard literary language*. Such language is characterized by a *greater functional utilization of grammatical and lexical elements* (especially a heightened lexicalization of phrase words and delimitation of functions as manifested in the precision and differentiation of expressive means) and by *more elaborate social forms of language* (linguistic etiquette).

The development of the standard literary language increases the role *of conscious intentionality*. This is manifested in various forms of linguistic reform (especially purism), in linguistic politics, in a more consistent regard for the linguistic taste of a period (the esthetics of language in its historical transformations).

The characteristic features of the standard literary language are best represented in uninterrupted speech and particularly *in the written utterance*. Written speech strongly influences spoken standard speech.

*Spoken standard speech* is less removed from the common language, but the boundaries between the two are fairly clear. Uninterrupted speech, especially in public utterances, lectures, and so forth, is more removed from the common language than alternately interrupted (dialogic) speech, which stands between the canonic forms of the standard literary language and the common language.

Characteristic of the standard literary language is, on the one hand, *the striving for expansion* to the role of a "koinē," and on the other, *the striving to become the monopolized sign of a ruling class*. Both of these tendencies manifest themselves in the change and the preservation of a language's phonic stratum.

All of these properties of the standard literary language should be taken into account in the synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Slavic standard literary languages. They should not be analyzed as if



they were dialects, nor should their analysis be limited to extrasystemic or developmental factors.

(c) On Poetic Language

Poetic language for a long time has remained a neglected sphere of linguistics and the intensive elaboration of its fundamental problems has begun only recently. The majority of Slavic languages have not yet been studied from the perspective of the poetic function. Although literary historians have from time to time touched on these problems, they have not until now had sufficient preparation in linguistic methodology. They have thus been unable to avoid certain crucial errors which preclude the successful study of the concrete facts of poetic language.

1. It is necessary to elaborate *the principles of the synchronic description of poetic language* while avoiding the repeated error of identifying the poetic and communicative languages. From a synchronic standpoint, poetic speech has the form of poetic expression (*parole*), hence of an individual creative act evaluated, on the one hand, against the background of the immediate poetic tradition (poetic language—*langue*) and, on the other, against the background of the contemporary communicative language. The relation between poetic speech and these two linguistic systems is quite complex and polymorphous, and should be carefully studied both synchronically and diachronically. An important property of poetic speech is the foregrounding of linguistic conflict and transformation; the character, tendency, and scale of the transformation are very diverse. For example, a rapprochement of poetic expression and communicative language may be conditioned by the opposition to the given poetic tradition. The interrelation of poetic expression and communicative language may be very clear in one period but almost imperceptible in another.

2. The individual levels of poetic language (e.g., phonology or morphology) are so closely bound to one another that it is impossible to study one level without regard to the others though literary historians have often done so. *From the thesis that poetic speech is directed at expression itself it follows that all the levels of a system of language that play only an ancillary role in communicative speech acquire a greater or lesser autonomous value in poetic speech. The linguistic devices grouped in these levels and the interrelation among the levels, often automatized in communicative speech, tend to become deautomatized in poetic speech.*

The degree of deautomatization of linguistic elements is different

in each poetic expression and each poetic tradition. The result is a specific hierarchy of poetic values in each case. The relation between poetic expression and the poetic and communicative languages is always different. The poetic work is a functional structure, and the individual elements cannot be understood outside their connection to the whole. Objectively identical elements can acquire absolutely different functions in different structures.

Even the acoustic, motor, and graphic elements of a given speech, which are not normally exploited, can be deautomatized in poetic language. Nevertheless, the relation between the phonic values of poetic speech and the phonology of communicative speech is incontestable, and *only the phonological viewpoint is capable of revealing the principles of sound structures in poetry*. Poetic phonology includes the degree of utilization of the phonological inventory in relation to communicative speech, the principles of grouping phonemes (especially in *sandhi*), the repetition of phoneme groups, rhythmics, and melodics.

Verse is characterized by a particular hierarchy of values. *Rhythm* is the organizing principle, and the other phonological elements of verse—melodics, the repetition of phonemes and phoneme groups—are closely associated with it. The canonic devices of verse (rhyme, alliteration, etc.) originate from the fusion of various phonological elements with rhythm.

Neither an acoustic nor a motor point of view, objective or subjective, can solve the problems of rhythm. Only a phonological interpretation can do so that distinguishes the phonological basis of rhythm from concomitant extra-grammatical and autonomous elements. The laws of verse technique can be established only on a phonological basis. Two apparently identical rhythmic structures belonging to two different languages can be essentially distinct if they are composed of elements having a different role in the pertinent phonological systems.

The parallelism of phonic structures realized in verse, rhythm, rhyme, and so forth, is one of the most effective devices for deautomatizing the different levels of language. The confrontation of sound structures resembling each other emphasizes the similarities and dissimilarities among syntactic, morphological, and semantic structures. Not even rhyme is an abstractly phonological fact; both the juxtaposition of similar morphemes (grammatical rhyme) and the failure to do so reveal morphological structures. Rhyme is also closely bound to syntax (what elements of word collocations are emphasized or juxtaposed in rhyme) and to the lexicon (what is the importance of the words emphasized by rhyme, what is the degree of their semantic affinity). Syntactic and rhythmic structures are closely related whether their boundaries coincide or not (enjambement). The autonomous value of the two structures is emphasized in either case. The rhythmic and syntactic structures in a poem are emphasized both by rhythmic-syntactic patterning and by deviations from these patterns. Rhythmic-syntactic figures have a characteristic intonation, and their repetition produces a melodic impulse deforming the familiar intonation of speech, in turn revealing the autonomous value of both melodic and syntactic verse structures.



*Poetic vocabulary* is deautomatized in the same way as the other levels of poetic language. It is reflected against either a given poetic tradition or communicative language. Unusual words (neologisms, barbarisms, archaisms, etc.) have a poetic value in that they differ in their phonic effect from words current in communicative speech whose phonic details, as a result of frequent usage, are not perceived but only apperceived. Moreover, unusual words enrich the semantic and stylistic variety of the poetic vocabulary. Neologisms in particular deautomatize the morphological composition of words. The choice of words not only involves unusual isolated words but whole lexical contexts which interfere with one another and dynamize the vocabulary.

Syntax furnishes rich possibilities for poetic deautomatization because of its multiple bond with the other levels of poetic language (rhythmics, melodics, and semantics). Those syntactic elements which are seldom utilized in the grammatical system of a given language acquire a particular charge; for example, in languages with free word order, sequencing acquires a crucial function in poetic speech.

3. *The scholar must avoid egocentrism, the analysis and evaluation of poetic facts of other periods or nations from the perspective of his own poetic habits and the artistic norms stressed in his education.* An artistic phenomenon of the past, of course, can endure or be revived as an active factor in a different milieu. It can also be a component of a new system of artistic values, but at the same time, of course, its function changes, and the phenomenon itself is subject to appropriate changes. The history of poetry should not project this phenomenon into the past in its transformed appearance but should restore it to its original function, in relation to the system in which the phenomenon originated. Each period requires a clear immanent classification of its special poetic functions, i.e., an inventory of its poetic genres.

4. What has been least elaborated methodologically is the poetic semantics of words, sentences, and larger compositional units. The diversity of functions fulfilled by tropes and figures has not been studied. Besides the tropes and figures comprising an author's presentation, the objectified semantic elements projected into artistic reality in the plot structure are essential, though they have been studied least of all. For example, metamorphosis resembles comparison; plot is a semantic compositional structure, and problems of plot composition cannot be excluded from the study of poetic language.

5. Questions of poetic language have for the most part played a subordinate role in literary historical studies. *Yet, the organizing feature of art by which it differs from other semiotic structures is an orientation toward the sign rather than toward what is signified.* The orientation toward verbal expression is the organizing feature of poetry. The sign is the dominant of an artistic system, and if the literary historian makes what is signified rather than the sign the major object of his research, if he analyzes the ideology of a literary work as an independent, autonomous entity, he violates the hierarchy of values of the structure that he studies.

6. The immanent characterization of the evolution of poetic language is often replaced in literary history by a cultural-historical, sociological, or psychological deviation, that is, by an appeal to heterogeneous phenomena. Instead of the mystique of causal relations between heterogeneous systems *it is necessary to study poetic language in itself.*

The poetic exploitation of different Slavic languages provides extremely valuable material *for comparative study* because divergent structural facts appear here against the background of numerous convergent facts. Among the most immediate tasks are the comparative study of the rhythm, euphony, and rhyme of Slavic languages.

## IV. THE IMMEDIATE PROBLEMS OF CHURCH SLAVIC

(a) If by *Old Church Slavic* one means the language which the apostles [Cyril and Methodius] and their disciples used for liturgical purposes which became between the tenth and twelfth centuries the standard literary language of all the Slavs practicing the Slavic liturgy, then one cannot, for methodological reasons, allow Old Church Slavic to be simply identified with one of the historical Slavic languages and be interpreted from the standpoint of historical dialectology.

In a language which from the beginning was not destined for a local need, which was based on the Greek literary tradition, and which later acquired the role of a Slavic "koinē," one must presuppose *a priori*, artificial, amalgamated, and conventional elements. *Therefore one must interpret the development of Old Church Slavic on the basis of the principles which govern the history of standard literary languages.*



(b) The literary monuments of the tenth to the twelfth centuries show that there were *several local recensions of Old Church Slavic.* If we see it as a standard literary language, however, *we are not justified in recognizing only one of these recensions as correct Old Church Slavic* and ignoring the others as deviations. The local recensions [literary dialects] must be discovered by an analysis of the norms established by the scribes of the tenth to the beginning of the twelfth centuries. These literary dialects must be carefully distinguished from living Slavic dialects which infiltrated the literary monuments as errors and episodic deviations from the norm adopted by the scribe.

Like the South Slavic recensions and the Russian ones derived from them, the relics of the Czech recension and its traces in the oldest Czech ecclesiastical texts require a painstaking elaboration within the framework of the history of Old Church Slavic.

(c) *Determining the living Slavic dialect that the apostles took as the basis of the Slavic standard literary language* is, of course, an important problem for the consideration of the origin and the composition of Old Church Slavic as well as for the history of living Slavic languages. This dialect cannot be directly deduced from any of the literary dialects preserved in Slavic literary monuments. In order to determine it, one must employ a historical-comparative analysis of the standard literary dialects of Old Church Slavic and of its two writing systems. A comparative analysis of the oldest data on the two alphabets helps to clarify the original composition of the alphabet and its phonological value.

(d) It is more appropriate to use the term "Middle Church Slavic" in the study of the further fortunes of this language in its various twelfth-century recensions when the considerable phonological changes that had occurred up to that time in individual languages were included in it as norms.

(e) The scholarly investigation of the history of Church Slavic up to modern times is a very urgent and heretofore completely neglected task of Slavic studies.

Equally urgent and methodologically important problems of Slavic linguistics are *the history of the Church Slavic stratum in the na-*

*tional Slavic standard literary languages*, especially in Russian, and the study of the relations between this and the other strata of these languages. The Church Slavic elements in the Slavic standard literary languages must be studied according to their functions in different periods; at the same time, it is necessary to solve the problem of their value with respect to the demands made on the standard literary language.

## V. PROBLEMS OF PHONETIC AND PHONOLOGICAL TRANSCRIPTION IN THE SLAVIC LANGUAGES

It is necessary to unify *the principles of phonetic transcription* for all the Slavic languages, i.e., the principles of the graphic *reproduction of the most varied speech sounds* by which the phonological composition of the different languages is realized.

In the interest of the synchronic and diachronic elaboration of the Slavic languages and of Slavic dialectology in particular, it is likewise an important task to establish *the principles of phonological transcription*, i.e., the principles of the graphic reproduction of *the phonological composition* of the Slavic languages.

It is also necessary to establish *the principles of a combined phonetic and phonological transcription*.

The lack of a standardized phonological transcription enormously complicates work on the phonological characterization of the Slavic languages.

## VI. PRINCIPLES OF LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY, THEIR APPLICATION, AND THEIR RELATION TO ETHNOGRAPHIC GEOGRAPHY IN SLAVIC REGIONS

(a) *The establishment of the spatial* (or temporal) *boundaries* of particular linguistic phenomena is a necessary *methodological device of linguistic geography* (or history), but one must not make this device the self-sufficient goal of theory.

The spatial expansion of linguistic phenomena cannot be conceived as the anarchy of individual isoglosses. A comparison of isoglosses shows that it is possible to join *several isoglosses into a unity*, thus establishing the center of expansion of a group of linguistic innovations and the peripheral zones of this expansion.

The study of contiguous isoglosses shows which linguistic phenomena are of necessity *regularly connected*.



Finally, a comparison of isoglosses is a precondition for the basic problem of linguistic geography, that is, *the scientific apportionment of a language*, i.e., the breaking down of a language according to the most fruitful principles of division.

(b) If one limits oneself to the phenomena of a system of language, one can state that isolated isoglosses are in fact fictions, for apparently identical phenomena belonging to two different systems can be functionally heterogeneous (e.g., an apparently identical *i* has a different phonological value in different Ukrainian dialects: wherever consonants soften before *i* < *o*, *i* and *ï* are variants of one and the same phoneme; wherever they do not soften, there are two phonemes).

(c) Just as comparison with heterogeneous developmental phenomena is allowed in the history of a language, *the spatial expansion of linguistic phenomena can fruitfully be compared to other geographical isograms* especially to anthropo-geographic isograms (the boundaries of facts pertaining to economic and political geography, the boundaries of the expanding phenomena pertaining to material and spiritual culture), but also to isograms of physical geography (soil, flora, moisture, temperature, and geomorphology).

In doing so, one should not neglect the special conditions of geographical entities. For example, the comparison of linguistic geography with geomorphology, which is very fruitful in European conditions, plays a considerably less important role in the Eastern Slavic world than the comparison with climatic isograms. The comparison of isoglosses to anthropo-geographic isograms (date of historical geography, archeology, etc.) is possible from both a synchronic and diachronic viewpoint, but the two perspectives should not be confused.

*The comparison of heterogeneous systems can be fruitful only if one adheres to the principle that the compared systems are equal.* Inserting between them the category of mechanical causality, in order to deduce one system from the other, distorts the synthetic grouping of these systems and substitutes a leveling unilateral evaluation for a scientific synthesis.

(d) In mapping linguistic or ethnographic facts, one must remember that *the expansion* of these facts *does not coincide with a genetic linguistic or ethnic affinity* but that it often occupies a broader territory.

## VII. PROBLEMS OF A PAN-SLAVIC LINGUISTIC ATLAS, A LEXICAL ATLAS IN PARTICULAR

The Slavic languages are so closely related that the differences between two neighboring languages are often less pronounced than those between two neighboring dialects of a language such as Italian. *Geographically almost all the Slavic languages are contiguous with one another.* There is no geographical connection between the South Slavic and North Slavic groups, but each of these groups in itself constitutes a geographical whole: one extends from Venice to Thrace, the other from Šumava to the Pacific Ocean.

These conditions themselves invite the idea of *a pan-Slavic linguistic atlas* and there can be no doubt that such an atlas is needed. *A comparative etymological study of the Slavic lexicon is not possible without a precise determination of the boundaries within which particular words are distributed.* The dictionaries of Miklosich and Berneker enumerate all the Slavic languages in which there are reflexes of a pertinent proto-Slavic word, but these data do not provide a precise idea of the extension of the pertinent word, because they ignore the fact that the boundaries of such an extension always cross. A precise determination of isolexemes within a pan-Slavic framework can reveal new vistas in the history of the Slavic languages.

*Concerning the realization* of such a pan-Slavic linguistic atlas, it should be noted that its compilation will ultimately be easier than the compilation of the linguistic atlases of individual Slavic languages. The pan-Slavic atlas requires visiting far fewer places in each Slavic territory and asking far fewer questions than would be the case for a special atlas of a single Slavic region.

Practically, the work *can be organized in the following manner*: all the Slavic academies would appoint ad hoc commissions for the compilation of an atlas, and the suitable scholarly societies of those nations which do not have academies would do the same. The representatives of all these commissions would meet and agree on the following matters: (a) the density and distribution of the places from which the material would be gathered (it is important that the network of these places be of approximately the same density everywhere, but at the same time, of course, different local conditions must be taken into account); (b) a uniform phonetic transcription; (c) the text of the questionnaires, i.e., which words should be recorded. The program elaborated by such an advisory committee would be approved by all the academies, and its execution would be imposed on each one. In this way the financing and organization in the territory of each Slavic nation would be entrusted to the pertinent academy. As concerns the Slavic minorities in non-Slavic countries, the advisory committee of the academies would have to establish contact with the academies of the relevant countries in order to organize studies according to the same program.

Finally, the cost of publishing this atlas would be underwritten by all the academies of the Slavic countries under the editorship of a special committee appointed by the advisory commission of the respective academies.



## VIII. METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF A SLAVIC LEXICOGRAPHY

The study of the origin of individual words and changes in their meaning is as necessary for general psychology and cultural history as for linguistics in the narrow sense of the term, but lexicology, the theory of vocabulary, cannot stop at such a study. Vocabulary is not a mere accretion of individual words; it is a complex system, all of whose elements are interrelated and mutually exclusive.

The meaning of a word is determined by its relationship to the other words in the vocabulary, i.e., by its place in the lexical system, and one can determine its place only in terms of the structure of this system. Special attention must be devoted to this study, for until recently words as members of lexical systems have been almost ignored and the structures of these systems have not been discovered. Many linguists believe that vocabulary, unlike morphology, which necessarily constitutes an orderly system, is a chaos which can be organized only artificially by putting words into alphabetical order. This is an evident error. Lexical systems are, of course, so much more complex and comprehensive than morphological systems that linguists perhaps will never succeed in organizing them with the clarity and economy of morphological systems. But *if individual words in the lexical awareness are mutually exclusive and interrelated, they constitute systems formally analogous to morphological systems, and linguists must study them.* In this still almost virgin domain, linguists must not only concern themselves with the material itself, but they must also work out correct methods of research.

*Every language in every period has its own lexical system.* The individuality of each of these systems stands out with particular clarity when they are compared. It is especially interesting to compare closely related languages, for the individual structural features

of particular lexical systems are especially prominent in the presence of extensive similarities of lexical material. In this respect the Slavic languages provide unusually suitable and gratifying fields for research.

## IX. THE IMPORTANCE OF FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS FOR THE CULTIVATION AND CRITIQUE OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES

The cultivation of language is concerned with *reinforcing those features* which *the special function of the standard literary language requires* both in the written and in the colloquial *standard literary language.*

The first of these features is *stability*. The standard literary language must eliminate any unnecessary fluctuation in order to develop a sure linguistic sense for the standard. The second is *versatility*, the ability to express the most varied nuances of content with clarity and precision, with subtlety and ease. The third is *specificity*, the reinforcement of the characteristic features of the given language. In developing these features it is often a question of adopting one of various possibilities present in a language or of transforming a latent linguistic tendency into an intentional means of expression.

These requirements necessitate the fixing of *pronunciation* where variants are still permitted (e.g., in standard literary Czech the cluster *sh-* is pronounced both *sch-* and *zh-* as in *shoda*; in standard literary Serbo-Croatian the pronunciation of *ije* alternates between *je* and *e*).

*Orthography*, as a purely conventional and practical matter, should be simple and clear to the extent allowed by its function of visual differentiation. Frequent modification of orthographic rules, especially if the goal is not to simplify them, contradicts the requirement of stability. Inconsistencies between the orthography of domestic words and foreign words should be eliminated at least wherever they lead to confusion in pronunciation (e.g., in Czech orthography *s* in foreign words has the value of *s* and *z*).

*In forms of designation* one must take into account the individuality of the language. Without some urgent necessity one must not use forms of designation unusual in the language (e.g., compound words in Czech). *In vocabulary* one must counter the demand for lexical purism with the requirement of enriching the vocabulary and ensuring its stylistic diversification. But one must take into account



not only the richness of the vocabulary but also its precision and stability wherever required by the function of the standard literary language.

*In syntax* one must pay attention both to individual linguistic expressiveness and to the wealth of possibilities for expressing differences in meaning. It is therefore necessary to reinforce features which are intrinsic to the given language (e.g., verb constructions in Czech), but one must not for the sake of syntactic purism eliminate expressive possibilities which are justified by their function in a language (e.g., the noun construction required in juridical or other specialized speech).

For the individual expressiveness of a language, *morphology* has significance only in its general system, not in its detailed particularities. Therefore, from a functional standpoint it does not have the importance that the old-style purists attributed to it. Hence one must see to it that the gap between the written and colloquial language does not needlessly widen because of useless morphological archaisms.

A *cultivated colloquial language* is a source which constantly and safely revitalizes written language. It is a medium in which one can, with the utmost security, cultivate the linguistic sensibility necessary for the stability of a standard literary language.

The standard colloquial language and the standard literary language are the means of expression of cultural life, which, in every nation, borrows much from the overall intellectual fund of humankind. It is therefore natural that a reflection of this cultural community is also found in the standard literary language, and it would be wrong to fight it in the name of linguistic purity.

*A concern for linguistic purity* has its place in the cultivation of the language, as follows from the preceding explanation, but all exaggerated purism, whether it has logical, historical, or folkloric tendencies, is detrimental to the true cultivation of the standard literary language.

*A concern for the cultivation of language is crucial for the majority of Slavic standard literary languages* because of their relatively young tradition or their interrupted or hasty development.

*Recently there has been intensive work on the formation of Slavic standard literary languages, and this has even occurred among ethnic groups without a fixed and traditional standard literary language.* Functional linguistics should play a significant role in this work. It will choose from among the existing phonological and grammatical variants those most suitable for the literary standard ei-

ther because of their differential value or because of their capacity for expansion. It will elaborate an alphabet and an orthography subject not to the principles of phonetic transcription or diachronic considerations but to synchronic phonology, so that a maximal alphabetic economy is achieved in the expression of phonological correlations. And finally, it will elaborate a lexicon, especially a terminology, free of any purism—nationalistic, archaizing, or other—because exaggerated purism impoverishes the vocabulary and creates an excess of synonyms, an excessive etymological dependence of terms on words of everyday usage, an associative character and an emotional coloring detrimental to the terms, and, finally, an excessive local confinement of scientific terminology.

## X. THE APPLICATION OF NEW LINGUISTIC TRENDS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

### (a) In the Teaching of the Mother Tongue

1. *Historical-comparative linguistics* has contributed very little to the solution of the practical problem of how the mother tongue should be taught in secondary schools. The object of its research has been the evolution of language, and it has paid attention primarily to earlier linguistic periods or to dialects of the contemporary language rather than to the literary standard.

*New linguistic trends* can provide a more reliable basis for the solution of this practical problem. The most important points of contact between the new linguistics and the task of teaching the mother tongue in secondary schools are as follows:

The object of research of *synchronic linguistics* is the synchronic phenomena of language, hence always the language of a period, primarily the modern period. In this object it comes close to the task of the secondary school, and it does so the more the contemporary literary standard becomes the object of linguistic research.

*Functional linguistics* sees in a language a totality of goal-oriented means determined by the various functions of the language, and the goal of cultivating the mother tongue in secondary school is to develop the ability economically and rationally to exploit linguistic means according to an end and a situation, i.e., the ability to comply as well as possible in specific cases to a given language function (e.g., in a dialogue, an essay, etc.).

*The conception of a language as a functional system* and the



effort to establish the precise *characteristics* of particular modern languages can provide a more reliable basis for a school classification or explanation of linguistic phenomena.

2. The essential difference between theoretical linguistic study and the task of the secondary school in teaching the mother tongue stems from the fact that the school strives toward the best possible *practical mastery* of the language in its various functions bearing upon cultural life, hence the standard literary language in particular. In this matter there is also an important difference between the theoretical disciplines and the teaching of the mother tongue in a secondary school: the teaching of the mother tongue does not involve the acquisition of linguistic knowledge.

There is also an important difference between teaching foreign languages in schools and teaching (or better, cultivating) the mother tongue. For the mother tongue the goal is *the gradual development of linguistic readiness* which the pupils themselves get from life, a rather precise and thorough readiness for certain functions at that.

3. *The theoretical goal* in teaching the mother tongue fades into the background in the face of this practical (technical) goal, and the extent of theoretical teaching can be determined according to how much theoretical knowledge of one's mother tongue is considered necessary for the pertinent level and type of school and how much is necessary for linguistic practice in the specific functions of the standard literary language (see section 8).

4. Knowledge of the facts of historical phonology or morphology or knowledge of how dialects are classified contributes very little to *gradual linguistic development*. But *deliberation about a perfect language* contributes very much to this process. In this deliberation the pupil differentiates the linguistic means, both known and previously unknown to him, becomes familiar with how they are used, and ponders how an intended goal may be attained through them. *The pupil's own experiments* at satisfying a given functional role through the linguistic means known to him also contribute to this process. This role begins, of course, with the simplest communicative function and gradually becomes more complicated. In this way the vocabulary and the means of designation and correlation are expanded and elaborated, and the modes of their utilization (or according to traditional terms: the lexicon, morphology, semantics, and syntax in the narrow and broad senses) are recognized. Such an approach should not be limited to written utterances but should also take into account oral utterances and especially their phonic aspect.

5. This cultivation of the standard literary language cannot end be-

fore the pupil acquires an understanding of the thematic aspect of the domains intrinsic to the standard. *The elaboration of the standard literary language* in its domains where it differs from the common language should occur in the upper years of secondary school.

6. It is necessary that pupils recognize that even the standard literary language varies according to purpose, that the essence of a correct and expressive *style* consists in *its adequacy to its purpose.* It is absolutely necessary to rid schools of an evaluative stylistic hierarchy ranging from the simple to the "ornamental" style.

7. For practical reasons it is necessary from the beginning—but gradually—to emphasize that the phonological and grammatical system of the standard literary language differs from the common language ("koinē") known to the pupils from their family and everyday life, but it is not at all necessary for this reason to teach how the standard literary language corresponds to it. On the contrary, one must take great care to see to it that the pupil *does not start to distrust his own knowledge of the mother tongue.* The school should rely on this knowledge, not negate it.

8. The information about the language acquired should lead to *knowledge of the language system.* The discovery of the language system and experience with it have a significance for the pupil beyond just the cultivation of the language. An awareness of the system is important for any linguistic practice involving conscious, intentional expression and creation, precisely what is required by the functions of the standard literary language.

(b) In the Teaching of the Slavic Languages

1. It is generally acknowledged that learning a foreign Slavic language in school must have *a practical orientation.* Such learning usually has been entirely separated from scholarly knowledge—in this case seen as purely historical-comparative knowledge. For modern linguistics the separation of the historical-comparative study of a language from practical knowledge is, however, mere prejudice. Even the practical teaching of a language can and should be scientifically based.

Historical-comparative linguistics cannot provide this scholarly basis for the practical teaching of a language. Such teaching requires an understanding of the language, above all its specific function, in its specific social setting, in a certain situation, for the study of a language without regard to concrete functions is a mere abstraction. Therefore *functional linguistics,* recognizing a language as a system



of means which an individual speaker or a collective uses for the purpose of speaking, enables a scientific solution to this problem.

2. It is generally known that there are comparatively few people who have an equal command of all the functions even in their mother tongue. It often happens that an individual, perhaps even one who is philologically educated, can write only with difficulty, if at all, an application, an announcement, a newspaper article, and so forth, if it does not involve a topic from his field. This fact should suggest *directions for the practical teaching of a language.* Trade schools, for example, are concerned with a pupil's mastering the language as used for commercial purposes (the speech of commercial conversation, correspondence, and news; the language of scholarly commercial articles, etc.). Secondary schools in the narrow sense of the word, unlike professional schools, are concerned with a pupil's mastering the language of general culture (i.e., the language of the educated stratum without any special professional coloring, in both its spoken and written forms). In addition to special functions, of course, it is always necessary to recognize and master linguistic facts related to elementary social relations such as greetings, introductory phrases, questions about the weather, the time, and so on, but there are relatively few such elements. All language teaching can begin with them.

3. For teaching the Slavic languages in Slavic schools it is necessary *to take advantage of the affinities among these languages.* It is necessary to inculcate from the very beginning in teaching (lectures) and exercise books not only what is common but above all how the system of one Slavic language differs from another. Both the teaching itself and the exercise books must be differential, i.e., based on the differences between the pupils' mother tongue and the Slavic language which they are studying.

4. In teaching it is necessary to devote attention to *the particular features of the phonological system* (in pronunciation and as expressed in orthography) and *the grammatical system* of the given Slavic language and also to the main features of its lexical structure. Acquaintance with them occurs gradually in normal communications and in context, not in isolated words. The details of this process are determined by which Slavic language is being studied in which Slavic milieu, by the kind and level of the school, and by the overall education of the pupils. For example, in describing the Russian phonological system for Czechs, one emphasizes the alternation of hard and soft consonants, the reduction of unstressed vowels, and the major role of stress. In describing the Czech phonological

system for Russians, one emphasizes the role of quantity, its independence of stress, the grammatical alternation of prepalatal and postpalatal vowels under certain conditions (the consequences of so-called umlaut), and so forth. In describing the system of word-forms, one must emphasize the productive inflected forms; in describing syntactic forms, one must draw attention to the important differences (for Russian, the role of the auxiliary verb, the expressions of necessity and possibility, complex verbal expressions, the prepositions, conjunctions and their functions, etc.).

As concerns *vocabulary* we believe that knowledge of it should be broadened in context and in particular linguistic communications, so that the entire process (because of linguistic affinity) is a decoding of the studied language on the pupil's part and not the teaching of an already decoded language on the teacher's part, as has been the case in the study of completely foreign and dead (Latin, Greek) languages. In other words, understanding should prevail over knowledge. Of course, even the acquisition of the vocabulary of each particular Slavic language has its important peculiarities. For example, it is very important to point out in Russian the level of Church Slavic elements and their stylistic significance (*glava—golova, otvratit'—otvorotit', isčerpat'—vyčerpat'*, etc.).

5. But it is dangerous in the initial stages of study to establish firmly *a notion of a greater similarity between the pupil's own language and the language that he is learning* than there is in reality, for the student may transfer the functions of the categories of another Slavic language into the system of the mother tongue. This results in a peculiar "pan-Slavic language" or a Czech-Russian, Serbian-Polish, Russian-Bulgarian blend. The functions of the categories must be analyzed first of all within their own linguistic system.

6. The most important methodological-didactic problem is to compile, in accord with these directions, well-elaborated *exercise books, anthologies, and aids* which will make it possible gradually to master the language in its specific functions. A set of these aids will provide a reliable basis of linguistic knowledge with which the pupil will go into life and which he will expand according to the tasks of concrete circumstances and social milieux.

*Translated by John Burbank*

NOTES

1. The concepts of linguistic "designation" (pojmenování) and "correlation" (usouvztažnění) were introduced into Prague School terminology by Vilém Mathesius and lack any direct English equivalents. In one of his English essays Mathesius speaks of "the two fundamental linguistic activities, the semantic activity of giving names and the syntactic activity of putting the names into mutual relations," "New Currents and Tendencies in Linguistic Research," *MNHMA: Sbornik Zubatého* (Prague, 1927), p. 199. For a detailed discussion of these two concepts, see O. Leška and P. Novák, "O chápání 'jazykového pojmenování' a 'jazykového usouvztažnění': K Mathesiově koncepci funkční lingvistiky" [How to understand "linguistic designation" and "linguistic correlation": Mathesius' conception of functional linguistics], *Slovo a slovesnost*, 29 (1968), 1–9—*editor's note.*

2. In English linguistic terminology this aspect of syntax is called "contextual sentence organization," "theme/rheme," "topic/comment structure," "information focus," or "functional sentence perspective." J. Vachek defines it in his book *The Linguistic School of Prague* (Bloomington, 1966) as follows: "Viewed from this angle, any sentence-utterance is seen to consist of two parts. The first of them, now usually termed the *theme*, is that part of the utterance which refers to a fact or facts already known from the preceding context, or to facts that may be taken for granted, and thus does not, or does only minimally, contribute to the information provided by the given sentence-utterance. The other part, now usually called the *rheme*, contains the actual new information to be conveyed by the sentence-utterance and thus substantially enriches the knowledge of the listener or reader" (p. 89). For the history of this notion, see J. Firbas, "Some Aspects of the Czechoslovak Approach to the Problems of Functional Sentence Perspective," in F. Daneš (ed.), *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective* (Prague, 1974), pp. 11–37—*editor's note.*