



The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics
NUMBER 87 JUNE 2007 71-86

A Note on the Prague School

Jun Qian

Abstract

The 80th anniversary of the Prague Linguistic Circle offers an occasion to think about how to document the Prague School related events, how to keep whatever related to the Prague School, and how to make the Prague School resources easily accessible. In the following I will first chronologically list some Prague School related events in the past ten years (1996–2006). Then I will refer to several personal communications as related to certain aspects of the Prague School theory. Finally I will propose when faced with this age of globalization and digitization what can be done so as to maximally utilize the Prague School resources.

The following chronological list of Prague School related events are highly selective. Under the heading of the year are listed the events that occurred in that year.

1996

(1) From March 28 to 30, 1996, an international conference was held in Prague to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Prague Linguistic Circle and to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Roman Jakobson. Some of the papers presented at this conference are included in *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers Volume 3* (1999).¹

(2) Professor Josef Vachek (1909–1996) passed away on March 31. He was probably the last of the pre-war Prague School members. The international linguistic community's knowledge of the Prague School is largely due to his persistent effort (e.g. Vachek 1960, 1964a-b, 1966, 1968, 1983; Mathesius 1975). These efforts should be viewed in relation to the long-term unfavorable or hostile climate against the Prague School, in relation to the post-war behavior of some of the pre-war Prague School members such as Jan Mukařovský (1891–1975) and František Trávníček (1888–1961; cf. Toman 1995: Chapter 12; Firbas 1997), and in relation to the fact that further volumes of *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* (TCLP, 1929–1939, 8 volumes) and *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* (TLP, 1964–1971, 4 volumes) “were strangled by political authorities” (Vachek, foreword to *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers Volume 1*).

(3) *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers Volume 2* was published. The first volume was published in 1995. Both volumes were reviewed by Qian (1997).

1997

Professor Oldřich Leška (1927–1997) passed away on August 9. He succeeded Miloš Dokulil as chair of the Circle in 1996 (Eva Hajičová was the chair between 1997 and 2006). Leška was co-editor of the first three volumes of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers (PLCP; PLCP 1, 3, and 4 include his papers)*.

1999

Prague Linguistic Circle Papers Volume 3 was published. It was reviewed by Qian (2000) and Salzmänn (2001).

2000

Professor Jan Firbas (1921–2000) passed away on May 5. He was best known for his work on functional sentence perspective (FSP, cf. Firbas 1992; Chamonikolasová 2001; Qian 2001a; Svoboda 2003). Of the post-war Prague School's work on FSP, Firbas is noted for his concept of communicative dynamism (CD), František Daneš (b.1919) for his concept of thematic progression (TP, Daneš 1974), and Petr Sgall (b.1926) for his study of topic-focus articulation (TFA, cf. Sgall 2006:227–301). Their work is representative of the post-war Prague School approach to syntax.

A collection, which was originally intended to celebrate Firbas's 80th birthday, came as a commemorative volume in 2003, i.e. *Language and Function: To the memory of Jan Firbas* (ed. by Josef Hladký, preface by Eva Hajičová and Petr Sgall). The book was reviewed by Kirtchuk-Halevi (2003) and Salzmänn (2005).

2002

Prague Linguistic Circle Papers Volume 4 was published. It was reviewed by Qian (2002a), Webb (2002), and Salzmänn (2004).

2003

(1) Josef Vachek's (1960) *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (avec collaboration de Josef Dubský) was translated into English, entitled *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics* (edited by Libuše Dušková). It was reviewed by Qian (2004), Verleyen (2004), and Holes (2005).

(2) Stephen Rudy, professor of Russian and Slavic languages at New York University "died of head injuries after an accidental fall at home on Aug. 11." (OBITUARY, <http://www.thevillager.com>).

.com/villager_19/stephenrudy.html) He was only 54. Rudy did a lot of work to preserve Jakobson's linguistic legacy (Rudy 1990; Jakobson 1985, 1987, 1988; Waugh and Rudy 1991). His untimely death put an end to his plan to publish all that are not included in Jakobson's eight-volume *Selected Writings* (1962-1988) as Volumes 9 and 10. Since Volume 8 is Completion Volume I, Volumes 9 and 10 would be Completion Volumes II and III.

2006

(1) *Language in its Multifarious Aspects* (556pp.), Petr Sgall's collection of twenty-six papers, edited by Eva Hajičová and Jarmila Panevová, was published. It came on the occasion of Sgall's 80th birthday. The articles are selected from among his 1956-2003 publications and comprehensively reflect his views on and research achievements in various linguistic fields.

(2) Professor Patrick Sériot and Margarita Schönenberger from Université de Lausanne in Switzerland translated *Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes* (ed. by Jakobson, 1975) from Russian into French (573pp). For information on Sériot and his colleagues' work one can visit their website <http://www2.unil.ch/slav/ling>.

3. The above description focuses on the scene in Europe. In this section I refer briefly to my work (1998, 2001b) with a focus on some personal communications (e-mails) produced during the period when I was writing a Chinese introduction to *Praguiana: 1945-1990*. These communications are replies to my inquiries about various aspects of the Prague School theory and are of value from the perspective of linguistic historiography (see Toman 1994 and Newmeyer 2001 for the use of personal communications).

In 1998 *Structural-Functional Linguistics: The Prague School* (in Chinese, 70+427pp.) was published. The monograph begins with three introductions by Petr Sgall, Catherine Chvany, and Edward Stankiewicz respectively.

In 2001 *A Roman Jakobson Anthology* (XLII+373 pp.) was published. It consists of 23 papers. Except *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis: The Distinctive Features and their Correlates* (1952), which was translated by the late Professor Wang Li (1900-1986) and published in a Chinese journal, the rest 22 papers were translated and annotated by me and probably for the first time became available in Chinese.

In 2004 *Praguiana: 1945-1990* (ed. by Luelsdorff, Philip A., Jarmila Panevová, and Petr Sgall) was reprinted by Peking University Press, together with a 42-page long Chinese introduction of mine. Unfortunately, the editor changed my title from *The Prague School in its Post-Classical Period* to *Introduction*, and she deleted my footnote of acknowledgement, which runs as follows:

"This research was supported by a Peking University grant. The author is grateful to Professors Catherine Chvany, Edward Stankiewicz, Jarmila Panevová, and Petr Sgall for their help."

As is known, Catherine Chvany (b.1927) and Edward Stankiewicz (b.1920) were Roman Jakobson's students at Harvard, both being distinguished Slavists and versed in the Prague School theory (e.g. Chvany 1996; Stankiewicz 1976, 1977, 1983, 1987, 1991, 1999), while Jarmila Panevová and Petr Sgall are eminent present-day Prague School linguists (e.g. Sgall et al. 1986). *Praguiana: 1945-1990* covers a variety of diversified subjects and it was largely

through their unfailing help that the challenging task of writing an introduction in Chinese was accomplished. Perhaps I should have specified their help by quoting their e-mails to me in my footnotes. To illustrate their help, some personal communications are quoted as follows.

The following three e-mails are Stankiewicz's answers to my inquiries about Jakobson's binarism, the term 'morpheme', and Leška's concept of transposition:

[1] "You know very well that I have criticized Jakobson for his exaggerated and misleading binarism. Specifically in my Prague paper of 1999 I point out that even in mathematics that speak of symmetry, asymmetry and dissymmetry, i.e., my reference to complementarity and "neutral terms" (e. g. the third person which refers to a third person or absence of a person, as in impersonal verbal constructions). Jakobson pushed the concept of economy too hard, and thus he misinterpreted certain relations (not only in morphology but also in phonology and in syntax). The relations of complementarity I illustrated on multiple examples." (Edward Stankiewicz, personal communication, January 30, 2004)

[2] "Now, as for your questions. The terms phoneme and morpheme have both been coined by Baudouin de Courtenay. He also defined the phoneme as a "bundle" (this was Jak.'s English translation of the term) of distinctive features. By definition both terms define the ultimate units of the two levels of language. Properties can always be added or reduced giving rise to new phonemes or morphemes. American descriptivists (as well as Kuryłowicz) have defined the phoneme and morpheme as sums of positional variants (allophones and allomorphs), an approach which denied the abstract character of the linguistic units, and created altogether a mess. (e.g., the past t. of *sleep*: *slept* was analyzed as past t. morpheme *-t* and the allomorph *slep-* of *sleep*). That's why they never developed the theory of morphophonemics. (The fault was largely Baudouin's). Why don't you come for a while to Yale to think over and discuss all these problems? Warmest greetings, Edward." (Edward Stankiewicz, personal communication, February 1, 2004)

[3] "Within the next few days I hope to send you the obituary I wrote about Oldrich Leška, who had spent some time in my dept. at the University of Chicago. I had a whole team working with me on the structural description of the Russian dialects. In 1970 (a year before I moved to Yale) I submitted 3 volumes of our results to The Office of Education which had sponsored the project. I never published them in a book form because certain problems were left unresolved (especially in morphology). I am aware of Leška's theory of transposition (which was in part influenced by Karcevskij) and I refer to it in my obituary, but I do not like it (though I do not criticize it in my obituary). The drastic transformation of functions referred to in Leška's "transposition" undercuts the theory of the invariant in which I follow both K. Bühler and Jakobson. The Russian forms *poshli!* *pojexali!* are indeed forms of the past tense. When used as commands they are still forms of the past that present an expected action as completed; hence they are used only in the perfective (we don't say *exali!* *xodili!*) and the expressions carry the connotation of a command only in a given colloquial and semi-metaphorical context. For our friend Leška the imperative *znaj!* ("know") is a mere variant of the unreal modal *znaj ja* "had I but known", a view that denies the strict correlation between form and meaning (ignoring, of course, the existence of homonyms). But *znaj ja* changes the form (the pronoun follows the verb) and the form is no longer an imperative, but a modal (historically there might have

indeed been a semantic connection since the imperative, like the modal, expresses the expectation of an event). But the attempt to reduce these different forms and meanings to the status of variants plays havoc with our basic understanding of language as a system of signs endowed with invariant and distinctive meanings. I hope I have answered your question to your satisfaction. With warmest greetings. Edward.” (Edward Stankiewicz, personal communication, February 11, 2004)

The following four e-mails are Chvany’s replies to my inquiries about Jakobson’s (1936) idea of the general meaning of a case, the concept of opposition, the possible division of morphemes, and the invariant meaning:

[1] “Hi Jun, Happy New Year (both European/American style and Chinese Year of the Monkey). You have my Selected Essays, don’t you? Ch. 13 is on Jakobson’s cube I think I also sent you my article from *Case in Slavic* (Brecht & Levine eds 1986). I’m not sure Jakobson’s 1936 idea was fully accepted but it was certainly required reading among American Slavists and their graduate students, as was the 1958 version. The cube was very popular but Jakobson’s inclusion of G2 and L2 and making them LESS marked than the much less restricted G1 and L1 was not widely accepted, i.e., the 1936 scheme was preferred (see in my References, one to an article by D. S. Worth of the 1980s: something like “G2 L2 revisited” – one might say it was accepted esp. by those who didn’t actually work on case. At the same time, Kuryłowicz’s distinction between syntactic and adverbial cases was an important rival, and I think corresponds better to current work in syntax. There was also an important critique by Timberlake in IJSLP 1987 (of Waugh & Halle eds 1984, Roman Jakobson, Russian and Slavic Grammar) where several problems with Jakobson’s analysis are discussed.

Even now when it is no longer embedded in a Slavistic canon, any Slavist would be expected to know about Jakobson’s features, and might have to defend views that disagree with one or the other Jakobsonian version (I found that some Slavists were quite careless in their reading and didn’t really know the difference between the two versions – and Jakobson certainly did not provide helpful footnotes that said “this version of 1958 differs from my theory of 1936 in such-and-such ways”. That’s why I liken his work to an “objet d’art” and the 1984 collection to a retrospective show by an artist, who might show different/successive versions of the same motif, without annotations. (I think I also sent you my 1987 review article in RLJ “Two Jakobson retrospectives and a research agenda”, right?)

Obviously, the accusative does NOT have a “general meaning” (Gesamtbedeutung) of directionality, that is perhaps the “Hauptbedeutung” – the meaning it has in directional phrases opposed to locative phrases, and also in the cardinal transitive sentences with active agent and affected object, but certainly not in stative sentences (*dejstvie imeet mesto v Sochi* ‘the action takes place in Sochi’) – also RJ’s features oppose A to D, not A to L. There is also an important article by Knorina (also among my References) on the functional load of the cases, showing that some pairs almost never contrast (if I recall correctly, G and L which RJ has differing only by “marginality”). (Catherine Chvany, personal communication, January 23, 2004)

In one of my e-mails in January 2004, I asked Chvany about the concept of opposition: “it seems that Jakobson reduced ALL oppositions to binary and privative. If so, I can understand why binary (a logical operation, as Jakobson believed), but am uncertain about privative op-

position (marked/unmarked). If confined to just a single language, say, Russian or English, could ALL morphological oppositions be reduced to privative? Furthermore, does Jakobson's concept of morphological correlations (semantically defined) have a general or even universal validity?" Chvany answered:

[2] "Dear Jun,

Yes, Jakobson was a "reductionist". But one problem that arises is WHAT is included in "ALL OPPOSITIONS" – it may be fairly clear that bound morphemes (inflectional affixes) opposed to their absence (Signe zero: *l'opposition de quelque chose avec rien*) which trivializes 'binary' i.e. as I have written in several places, it is the same as calling the meanings discrete, i.e. as sets of one, opposed to the null set which, by convention, is a member of every set. And in that sense, that grammatical meanings are decomposable into discrete features in [sic] But oppositions among 2 overt morphemes are not privative but equipollent (e.g. *the/a* are actually *the/0* and *a/0*). Once one leaves the bound morphology and gets into analytic forms, like passives, or causatives, there is no "opposition", in the sense that an active form does not signal "non-passive" the way "present" signals "non-past". If you still have my Peirce Seminar Paper of 1999, I detail these matters there. Also on how oppositions work, see Ch 15 of my SEofCVC book, and in more details in 1988 American Contributions to the International Congress of Slavists – on how to account for the multiple meanings of Bulgarian forms in spite of relative poverty of morphology – some meanings (marked) are stable, denoted by certain morphs, while other meanings – the "unmarked ones" which mean the opposite by virtue of opposition with the marked one – are less stable, may be removed by context. One thing that is quite amazing for intellectual historians is how Jakobson managed to have even very short little papers and casual remarks take on such authority!" (Catherine Chvany, private correspondence, January 29, 2004)

Shortly afterwards, I raised the question of morpheme: "Dear Catherine, thanks a lot for your instruction on the notion of opposition. Another question. You know the Prague School used to think that phoneme could not be further divided. Then they changed this position and defined phoneme as a bundle of "distinctive features" (simultaneous co-existence of properties). By analogy, morpheme can be likewise further divided. If yes, what is the term for those smaller units (components)? What might be such an example in English?" And Chvany answered as follows:

[3] "I think there are two possibilities, for instance in Russian oblique plural cases D *-am*, I *-ami* one could call the *-am* a "submorpheme" signifying obliqueness or marginality (but then what about L *-ax*, maybe it would be *-a* plus the low-tonality feature that is shared by all 3?). But that has not been a very productive approach (English has also some not-quite-morphemes called synstemes, like initial GL and FL and SL, where GL is used for groups of words having something to do with light and also with stickiness (*gleam, glow, glint, glisten* ... and *glue*...)). About these and many more see thesis by Margaret Magnus in Trondheim Norway (she is American, however, and has a web site)

Most of Jakobson's work on morphology involves distinctive SEMANTIC features, so that

he claims that “the ending of the instrumental case” (having different forms in various declensions, singular and plural) has the features +marginal and - for the 2 others, or the form of the past tense has the features +finite, +past, also whatever aspect features it may have. The agreement features of a verb are “portmanteau” morphemes, carrying (redundant) information about person, gender and/or number (copied from those of the subject, if any), even if no segment or phonetic feature of the morpheme can be identified with one of those meanings: that is, in *pisala* ‘I /you/she wrote’ the *-a* stands for both singular and feminine, and for any of the 3 persons if the subject is a woman.

Hope this is what you were asking about.

Best,

Catherine” (Catherine Chvany, private correspondence, February 1, 2004)²

Another question I asked Chvany is on invariant meaning: “In relation to his idea on functional transposition (e.g. a past form expresses an action in the future, as in *nu, mne pora, ja poshel.*), how could the invariant meaning of the past form or rather of any sign be determined? Is the so-called invariant meaning equal to general meaning?” And Chvany replies:

[4] “Dear Jun,

This is a problem linguists create for themselves: they posit an invariant meaning and then any exceptions force them to modify the theory, when the problem is they have incorrectly translated the “invariant meaning”. For instance, the past tense affix (-L- in Russian) does not invariantly mean “past time” for it appears not only in “future” uses like *ja poshel* ‘I’m off’ ‘I’m out of here!’ but in hypothetical or contrary-to-fact conditions (usually the latter with the extra modal marker *by*). The invariant meaning is “distance in time or reality” from the speaker’s position (the latter word is not too good, but I can’t do better at the moment). In Jakobsonian terms “past time/tense” is the Hauptbedeutung of the past tense morpheme (the most common meaning), not the invariant general meaning (Gesamtbedeutung).

Other problems linguists create involve trying to translate a morpheme that represents several semantic features with one word when they should decompose it, e.g., a “tense” morpheme may be decomposed into “+deixis” +/-distancing +/-proximate (or +/-distal/remote), perhaps also have some aspect feature (like the French imperfect)...

In Bulgarian the -X- morpheme of the aorist supposedly the “witnessed past” is also used as a “future” for imminent disasters, more actively than Russian *ja poshel* constructions: *umrjax!*

not *I died but “I’ve had it/I’m as good as dead/I’m about to die” That same morpheme is also used in imperfective conditions: *Ako bjax..* If I were ... (but I’m not...). But once linguists call -X- forms “witnessed pasts” and L-forms with zero 3rd person “unwitnessed” then what do they do with those examples, or with -L-forms in expressions of surprise at witnessed events: they create another “L” form borrowed from Albanian, the “admirative”.

In my Ch. 14 I believe and in the Xth Congress paper I have another account. Distancing in time OR reality, for both X and L, but X is deictic (most often a shifter) while L is tactic (Jakobson’s tense vs. taxis). The English D-preterite is also “distanced in time or reality” but it is not used for imminent events, as it is felt to be “remote” in opposition to the “proximate” present

perfect. In Bulgarian, however, the X-form is felt as “close, proximate, often as witnessed” – but not invariantly, but as a result of opposition with the more “remote” L-forms with 0-auxiliary (marked taxis with L and 0-auxiliary for suspension of speaker’s responsibility for the statement).

As I recall, Richard Brecht wrote something about the *ja poshel* items. In Russian that usage is quite restricted, I believe because Russian, unlike Bulgarian, has no “remote” constructions (like the Bulgarian “renarrated” or “non-evidential” forms) to oppose it to. In English such use of the preterite is impossible, and “future” expressions, many of them slangy, use forms of the perfect (as in example translations above) (The English “present perfect’s” meaning is “proximate”: *I have been happy here* means you still are or at least the feeling is still relevant today, while *I was happy here* means you no longer are). (Just as THIS is +proximate, in opposition to -proximate THAT)

As you point out, resorting to “transpositions” undermines the concept of invariance. In the Waugh and Rudy volume that I reviewed in WORD 1996, there was a polemic between Waugh (who believes in markedness shifts) and her ex-husband Sangster (who doesn’t). Shapiro uses shifts all the time, as did Jakobson, but as I point out if you allow for equipollent oppositions you don’t need shifts and you can decompose “grammemes” into features that are stipulated as invariant. If you find homonymy or contradictions, then you haven’t found the correct “interpretant” of the invariant. (That is, instead of one +/- universal aspect and shifting values – e.g., Perf is M in Russian but in English Progressive is M (as Friedrich and others have claimed) – UG menu offers several options, and some languages use both oppositions, namely Bulgarian,

which has +/- Perfective in lexical stems and +/- continuative carried by an affix, potentially on a P stem, though ++ and – combinations are rarer than the +- and -+ ones and involve some literary device.

Hope this very condensed version is helpful (you have my book, look at my ch. on Bulgarian oppositions).

Best regards,

Catherine” (Catherine Chvany, personal communication, February 9, 2004)

Personal communications as above contain points worthy of further consideration.

From my own experience, these personal communications are illuminating and of considerable help. The issue is how personal communications as above could be reasonably shared as part of academic resources so as to facilitate the study of the Prague School and benefit a wider circle of students. There are hundreds of personal communications kept in Roman Jakobson Papers (Manuscript Collection __ MC72. Institute Archives and Special Collections. The Libraries. MIT). However, unless they go digital and are put on a website, their use is extremely limited.

Perhaps one way out is to include these personal communications in the footnotes. Unfortunately, not everyone understands the value of such footnotes. My experience of writing a Chinese introduction to an upcoming reprint of Jan Firbas 1992 showed that editors sometimes are more concerned with the convenience of type-setting and could tolerate neither footnotes

nor endnotes. For example, I quoted as a footnote a personal communication from Svoboda to explain the term diatheme and the Latin phrase *in medias res*:

“1. Dia- in diatheme has the meaning of Greek “dia” = “through”. The history of this term goes back to 1978 when I examined the thematic elements in detail and wished to differentiate the two basic types of theme. My original suggestion was “the point of departure”, but Prof. Firbas regarded this term as too much used in a general way that it might mislead the reader, and he asked me to find some other name for this unit. I based my solution on the fact that one of the three main functions of this kind of theme is to mediate the rhematic information into the thematic sphere of the following discourse in a gradual way. For example: “Once upon a time there was a king. The king had three daughters. He thought that he loved all of them in the same way, but he ...” Rheme proper “a king” is followed by a (dia)thematic element “the king”, and only after that it is referred to with the minimum language means “he”. It is THROUGH (dia) the thematic element “the king” that the item is gradually established in the thematic sphere and can be later used in its minimum form. The course of events may follow some other direction but if the item “king” is to be introduced again, it is re-introduced, not as rheme proper or as theme proper, but as a non-minimum thematic unit – diatheme. Of course, the sequence need not always be “rheme proper – diatheme – theme proper”, but it seems to be most frequent especially in texts that are hearer/reader-friendly and do not force the addressee to exert too much effort to follow the speaker’s/writer’s line of thought.”

2. As to the title of the first chapter of Jan Firbas’ introduction, you understand it perfectly well. He tries to introduce the reader into the middle of things, into the middle of FSP problems, which are to be dealt with later on. There is another, slightly different meaning used by Firbas in his book and a number of papers: When dealing with the Presentation Scale and the Quality Scale of dynamic semantic functions, he speaks of the way of starting the discourse with the Quality Scale instead of the Presentation Scale by using the stylistic device “in medias res”. For example: If the above fairy-tale started with “A king had three daughters”, it would skip the Presentation Scale (somewhere lived a king), and directly (in medias res) introduce “a king” as if it had already been introduced (but it was not). (By the way, “a king” is here a diatheme through which “king” is introduced into the discourse.)” (Aleš Svoboda, personal communication, February 20, 2007)

Footnotes or endnotes like this are of remarkable help to readers, but they had to be deleted to meet the editor’s requirement.

4. Faced with this age of globalization and digitization, what can be done so as to maximally utilize the Prague School resources?

First, it is desirable that the Prague School writings in the past published in languages other than English (Czech, French, German) should be translated into English (e.g. Mathesius 1907, 1929, 1941, 1942; Trávníček 1937, 1939, 1961), and the Prague School writings coming up in the future should be in English.

When the whole world becomes a global village, the role of English as an internationally accepted academic language has become an established fact. True, articles in *TCLP* are multi-lingual, but the Prague Linguistic Circle in those days probably did not expect its writings to be read, taught, and studied beyond Europe and North America (in China, for example). The

fact that the Prague School writings are translated, one after another, into English points to such a need (e.g. Mathesius 1961/1975; Vachek 1960/2003). Furthermore, the fact that Chinese presses are increasingly interested in reprinting linguistics books in English also indicates the market value of English.

Second, the high-tech offers an unprecedented opportunity to digitize and store the Prague School writings on a website, or to live-broadcast conferences and talks (e.g. Vilém Mathesius Center Lecture Series), accessible to the international linguistic community. In my view all the articles in *TCLP* and in *TLP* as well as photographs of the Prague School members should be put on a Prague-based website so as to facilitate the study of the Prague School (please visit <http://digitalcollections.harvard.edu/> to see how photographs can be digitized and viewed as visual resources). Technically there is no problem to do so. Considering the problems like the tight budget of many linguistics programs, to go digital will not only help remedy the unfavorable situation but also help the Prague School to keep going international. In this aspect *Brno Studies in English (BSE)*, a Masaryk University-based journal, sets a good example. It has an on-line version at <http://www.phil.muni.cz/angl/bse/bse.htm>, from which one can have access to articles published in *BSE* from 1959 to 2003, e.g. articles by Josef Vachek, Jan Firbas and their colleagues. In contrast *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics (PBML)*, at <http://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pbml.html>, a Charles University-based journal, offers tables of contents for the volumes 71–85 (1999–2006) and index to the volumes 61–70, only several articles of which are downloadable. Apparently much remains to be done to facilitate the study of Petr Sgall and his colleagues' work

5. To conclude: the past ten years witnessed the activeness of the revived Circle and continued interest in the Prague School. The various responses to the Prague School indicate the impact and richness of the Prague School's legacy. Meanwhile, the changing age characterized by globalization and digitization calls for further effort on the side of the Prague School to facilitate the access to the Prague School resources.

Notes

1 In Luelsdorff (1994), important older contributions by Dokulil (on word formation), Skalička and Sgall (on the types of languages) and others were published. The papers by Hajičová (on information structure), Panevová (on valency) and Sgall (on the underlying sentence structures and semantic interpretation) included in this volume characterize to what degree the classical Prague School approaches offer starting points for a formal description based on syntactic dependency and integrating information structure into the underlying representations (see also Hajičová, Partee and Sgall 1998). More recently, especially the project of Prague Dependency Treebank has been useful, see e.g. Böhmová and Hajičová (1999).

2 Skalička considered morpheme to be characterized by "cumulation of functions" (thus constituting a bundle of "semes", e.g. the case morphemes of nouns in Czech corresponding to semes of case, number and gender), see Skalička and Sgall in Luelsdorff (1994).

Editor's Note

The full texts of the PBML contributions will be available on the web site <http://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pbml.html> from this volume. As for the publications of the Prague School scholars, financial resources are being searched for the scanning of both pre-war Travaux and post-war series of Travaux, in order to make these publications available also in an electronic form. Full texts of some of the publications of Petr Sgall and his collaborators can be found on the same web page.

References

- Böhmová, Alena and Hajičová, Eva. 1999. The Prague Dependency Tree Bank I: How much of the underlying syntactic structure can be tagged automatically? *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 71, 5–12.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana. 2001. In memory of Jan Firbas. *Brno Studies in English* 27, 7–9.
- Chvany, Catherine V. 1996. *Selected Essays of Catherine V. Chvany*. Edited by Olga T. Yokoyama and Emily Klenin. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Daneš, František. 1974. Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text. In Daneš, František (ed.), *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague: Academia. 1974, 106–128.
- Firbas, Jan. 1992. *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1997. A tribute to Professor Josef Vachek. *Brno Studies in English* 23, 9–14.
- Hajičová, Eva, Partee, Barbara H., and Sgall, Petr. 1998. *Topic-focus articulation, tripartite structures, and semantic content*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hladký, Josef (ed.). 2003. *Language and function: To the memory of Jan Firbas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holes, Jan. 2005. Review of *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics*. *Language* 81, Number 2, 521–522.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1936. Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. *TCLP* 6, 240–288. Reprinted in *SW II*, 23–71. English translation in Jakobson, *Russian and Slavic Grammar Studies, 1931–1981*. Ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1984, 59–103.
- . (ed.). 1975. *Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes*. Berlin: Mouton.
- . 1985. *Verbal art, verbal sign, verbal time*. Ed. by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- . 1987. *Language in literature*. Ed. by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.
- . 1988. *Selected Writings VIII. Major Works, 1976–1980*. (= Completion Volume I.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Kirtchuk-Halevi, Pablo I. 2003. Review of Hladký, Josef (ed.). 2003. *Language and function*. <http://linguistlist.org/issues/14/14-2977.html#1>
- Leška, Oldřich. 1995. Prague School teachings of the classical period and beyond. *PLCP* 1,3–22.
- . 1999. Prague School Linguistics: Unity in Diversity. *PLCP* 3, 3–14.
- . 2002. Anton Marty's philosophy of language. *PLCP* 4, 83–99.
- Luelsdorff, Philip, ed. 1994. *The Prague School of Structural and Functional Linguistics — A Short Introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:Benjamins. LLSEE, vol. 41.
- Luelsdorff, Philip A., Jarmila Panevová, and Petr Sgall (eds.). 1994. *Praguiana: 1945–1990*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1907. Studie k dějinám anglického slovosledu (Studies in the history of the English word order). *Věstník České Akademie* 16, 261–275.
- . 1929. Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch. *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*. 155, 202–210.
- . 1941. Základní funkce pořádku slov v češtině (The basic function of word order in Czech). *Slovo a slovesnost* 7, 169–180.
- . 1942. Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných (From comparative word order studies). *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 28, 181–190, 302–307.
- . 1975. *A Functional analysis of present-day English on a general linguistic basis*. Edited by Josef Vachek; translated by Libuše Dušková. The Hague: Mouton; Prague: Academia.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2001. The Prague School and North American functionalist approaches to syntax. *Journal of Linguistics* 37, 101–126.
- OBITUARY: Stephen Rudy, N.Y.U. professor of Russian and Slavic languages. *The Villager* Volume 73, Number 18 | September 3 - 9, 2003. http://www.thevillager.com/villager_19/stephenrudy.html
- Qian, Jun. 1997. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers, Volumes 1 & 2*. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 68,77–79.
- . 1998. *Jiegou gongneng yuyanxue: bulage xuepai* (Structural-Functional Linguistics: The Prague School). Changchun: Jilin Education Press.

- . 2000. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers, Volume 3*. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 73–74, 77–84.
- . 2001a. Towards a history of linguistic ideas: A Note on Jan Firbas and the Prague School. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 76, 5–12.
- . 2001b. (ed., and trans.) *Yakebuxun wenji* (A Roman Jakobson Anthology). Changsha: Hunan Education Press.
- . 2002. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers, Volume 4*. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 78, 119–127.
- . 2004. Review of *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics*. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 81, 77–81.
- . 2004. Daodu (Introduction to *Praguiana: 1945–1990*, edited by Philip A. Luelsdorff, Jarmila Panevova, and Petr Sgall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994.), in *Praguiana: 1945–1990*, 1–42. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Rudy, Stephen. (ed.) 1990. *Roman Jakobson, 1896–1982: a complete bibliography of his writings*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Salzmann, Zdenek. 2001. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers. New Series, vol. 3. Language* 77, Number 1, 181–182.
- . 2004. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers. New Series, vol. 4. Language* 80, Number 3, 623–623.
- . 2005. Review of *Language and function: To the memory of Jan Firbas*. *Language* 81, Number 2, 528–528.
- Sériot, Patrick and Margarita Schönenberger. 2006. *N. S. Troubetzkoy: Correspondance avec Roman Jakobson et autres écrits*. (Edition établie par Patrick Sériot. Traduit du russe par Patrick Sériot et Margarita Schönenberger) Editions Payot Lausanne.
- Sgall, Petr. 2006. *Language in its multifarious aspects*. Charles University in Prague: The Karolinum Press.
- , Eva Hajičová, and Jarmila Panevová. 1986. *The meaning of the sentence in its semantic and pragmatic aspects*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1976. Prague School Morphophonemics. In Matejka, Ladislav (ed.), *Sound, sign and meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1976, 101–118.
- . 1977. Roman Jakobson's work on the history of linguistics. In Armstrong, Daniel and C.H. van Schooneveld (eds.), *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his scholarship*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press. 1977, 435–451.

- . 1983. Roman Jakobson: A commemorative essay. *Semiotica* 44, 1–20.
- . 1987. The major moments of Jakobson's linguistics. In Pomorska, Krystyna et al (eds.), *Language, poetry and poetics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1987, 81–94
- . 1991. The concept of structure in contemporary linguistics. In Waugh, Linda, and Stephen Rudy (eds.), *New Vistas in Grammar: Invariance and Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1991, 11–32
- . 1999. Grammatical categories and their formal patterns. *PLCP* 3, 71–89.
- Svoboda, Aleš. 2003. Jan Firbas — An outstanding personality of European linguistics. In Hladký (2003), 1–7.
- Toman, Jindřich (ed.). 1994. *Letters and other materials from the Moscow and Prague Linguistic Circles, 1912–1945*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- . 1995. *The magic of a common language: Jakobson, Mathesius, Trubetzkoy, and the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Trávníček, František. 1937. Základy československého slovosledu (The foundations of Czechoslovak word order). *Slovo a slovesnost* 3, 78–86.
- . 1939. Slovosled při důrazu (Emphatic word order). *Slovo a slovesnost* 5, 131–144.
- . 1961. O takzvaném aktuálním členění větném (On so-called functional sentence perspective). *Slovo a slovesnost* 22.163–171.
- Vachek, Josef (ed.) 1960. *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (avec collaboration de Josef Dubský). Utrecht: Spectrum éditeurs.
- . (ed.) 1964a. *A Prague School reader in linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- . 1964b. On some basic principles of “classical” phonology. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*. Reprinted in Makkai, Valerie (ed.), *Phonological theory: evolution and current practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1972, 424–441.
- . 1966. *The Linguistic School of Prague*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- . 1968. *Dutch linguists and the Prague linguistic school*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden.
- . (ed.) 1983. *Praguiana: Some basic and less known aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*. Prague: Academia.
- . (ed.) 2003. *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics*. In collaboration with Josef Dubský; translated from the French, German and Czech original sources by Aleš Klégr, Pavlina Saldová, Markéta Malá, Jan Cermák, Libuše Dušková; edited by Libuše Dušková. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Verleyen, Stijn. 2004. Review of *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics*.

LINGUIST List: Vol-15-654. <http://linguistlist.org/issues/15/15-654.html>

Waugh, Linda R. and Stephen Rudy (eds.). 1991. *New vistas in grammar: Invariance and variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Webb, Eric Russell. 2002. Review of *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers. New Series, vol. 4*. LINGUIST List 13.3034. <http://www.linguistlist.org/issues/13/13-3034.html>

