

Reçu le: 21/02 / 2025 Accepté le: 17/05 / 2025 Publié le: 01/06 / 2025



Linguistics and the Problems of Textual Knowledge

 **Abdelkader Fehim Chibani**

Abdelkader.fehimchibani@univ-mascara.dz

Mustapha stambouli University / Algérie

اللسانيات وإشكالات نصية المعرفة

 **عبد القادر فاهيم شيباني**

Abdelkader.fehimchibani@univ-mascara.dz

جامعة مصطفى اسطمبولي / الجزائر

RÉSUMÉ :

This research inquiry aims to uncover the most important secrets related to the text of the book: "Lectures in General Linguistics" attributed to Ferdinand de Saussure, which is still considered one of the foundational references in linguistic knowledge.

This research has been able to reveal the most significant critical observations and some slips in the editing of the book's text, and to monitor some forms of distortion that affected those sensitive concepts that founded the linguistic knowledge exclusively related to the principles of general linguistics. This text was intended to epistemically incline towards creating a significant distinction in the history of linguistic studies of linguistics as a project that enhances the distinctive presence of Ferdinand de Saussure's thought, while most of the accusations continue to chase the editors of this text.

Keywords: Ferdinand de Saussure, Albert Sechehaye, Charles Bally, Courses in General Linguistics, Linguistics.

ملخص البحث

يهدف هذا الاستقصاء البحثي إلى رفع الغطاء عن أهم الأسرار المتعلقة بنص كتاب: "محاضرات في اللسانيات العامة" المنسوب إلى فيرديناند دوسوسير، والذي مازال يعتبر من أهم المراجع التأسيسية في المعرفة اللسانية.

استطاع هذا البحث أن يكشف عن أهم الملاحظات المفصلية الخطيرة، وبعض الانزلاقات في تحرير نص الكتاب، وأن يرصد بعض صور التشويه التي طالت تلك المفاهيم الحساسة التي أسست للمعرفة اللسانية المتعلقة حصراً بمبادئ اللسانيات العامة. لقد أريد لهذا النص أن ينزع نزوعاً إبستمياً نحو افتعال حظوة فارقة في تاريخ الدراسات اللغوية للسانيات بوصفها مشروعاً يعزز حضوراً متميزاً لفكر فيرديناند دوسوسير، فيما ظلت جل الاتهامات تلاحق محرري هذا النص. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يناقش المقال الآثار المترتبة على هذه النتائج لدراسة اللسانيات السويسرية، مؤكداً على الحاجة إلى إعادة تقييم نقدية لكتاب "محاضرات في اللسانيات العامة" باعتباره نصاً معاد بناؤه وليس تمثيلاً مباشراً لفكر دوسوسير. يدعو المقال إلى العودة إلى المخطوطات الأصلية لدوسوسير ومراسلاته لفهم أفضل لإسهاماته النظرية، بعيداً عن التشوهات التي أدخلتها عملية التحرير. في النهاية، يؤكد هذا البحث على أهمية النزاهة النصية في بناء المعرفة ويدعو الباحثين إلى التعامل مع النصوص التأسيسية بمنظور نقدي وأكثر دقة.

كلمات مفتاحية: فيرديناند دوسوسير؛ ألبرت سشيهاي؛ شارل بالي؛ محاضرات في اللسانيات العامة؛ اللسانيات.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is no disagreement that the act of translation permeates the joints of linguistics and its systems, whether under the umbrella of the universal and general language project or the linguistic modeling approach adopted by this field of knowledge. We believe it is important for those interested in the philosophy of science, those working on translation theory, as well as those concerned with the theoretical aspects of linguistics, to play a role in providing a decisive answer to this complex issue, which fundamentally relates to deconstructing the phenomenon of "text centrality." Among its examples is the inflation of the "Saussurean textuality" phenomenon in particular. Perhaps one of the requirements of this investigation is to track the impact of these deviations and transgressions by tracing the traces and details of the shift from attempts to understand the text to establishing science—a path that linguistics must first and foremost clearly define its origins and rules. Perhaps Louis Hjelmslev was one of the few who noticed the sensitivity of this situation in the scientific transition when he precisely distinguished in his famous hierarchy between the semiotics of scientific descriptive language and the semiotics of non-scientific descriptive language. Initiating this investigation may seem urgent in the context of a clear ambiguity in the principles of exploring linguistic knowledge and its mechanisms, which have led linguistics in its most prominent developments to leap texts into sensitive epistemic contexts.

2. The Aims and Goals of Knowledge

There is no disagreement that the act of translation permeates the joints of linguistics and its systems, whether under the umbrella of the universal and general language project or the linguistic modeling approach adopted by this field of knowledge. We believe it is important for those interested in the philosophy of science, those working on translation theory, as well as those concerned with the theoretical aspects of linguistics, to play a role in providing a decisive answer to this complex issue, which fundamentally relates to deconstructing the phenomenon of "text centrality." Among its examples is the inflation of the "Saussurean textuality" phenomenon in particular. Perhaps one of the requirements of this investigation is to track the impact of these deviations and transgressions by tracing the traces and details of the shift from attempts to understand the text to establishing science—a path that linguistics must first and foremost clearly define its origins and rules. Perhaps Louis Hjelmslev was one of the few who noticed the sensitivity of this situation in the scientific transition when he precisely distinguished in his famous hierarchy between the semiotics of scientific descriptive language and the semiotics of non-scientific descriptive language (Hjelmslev, 1961, p. 12). Initiating this investigation may seem urgent in the context of a clear ambiguity in the principles of exploring linguistic knowledge and its mechanisms, which have led linguistics in its most prominent developments to leap texts into sensitive epistemic contexts.

Translation plays a vital role in transferring knowledge and culture between languages, but it faces several scientific challenges related to the transfer of linguistic knowledge. Among the most prominent of these challenges are linguistic and cultural differences. Languages differ in their grammatical and morphological structures, making the accurate transfer of meaning a significant challenge. For example, some languages use different word orders or expressions that do not exist in other languages. Additionally, some concepts are tied to a specific culture and may not exist in another, making their translation difficult without additional explanation.

Another challenge facing translation is the loss of implicit meanings and connotations. Words may carry multiple meanings depending on the context, and there may not be an equivalent word in the target language that carries the same semantic range. Moreover, texts contain implicit meanings and nuances that may be lost in translation if not accurately conveyed. This makes the translation process more complex, especially when dealing with literary or philosophical texts that heavily rely

on context and subtle connotations.

Literal translation versus free translation poses another dilemma. Literal translation may result in unnatural or incomprehensible texts in the target language, while free translation may lose some precise details or alter the original meaning of the text. This balance between adhering to the original text and considering the target language reader is a significant challenge for translators.

Linguistic specificity also presents major challenges in translation. Some languages contain words or expressions that are difficult to translate accurately, such as proverbs or idiomatic expressions. Literary texts, in particular, contain aesthetic and creative elements that may be lost in translation, affecting the quality of the translated text and its ability to convey the same impact as the original.

Technical challenges are no less important. Despite significant advancements in machine translation, it still faces difficulties in understanding context and precise meanings. Specialized texts in fields such as law, medicine, or science require specialized translators to understand the precise terminology and convey it correctly. This requires a high level of expertise and knowledge in the relevant field.

The loss of linguistic identity is another issue. Translation may lead to the loss of some elements of cultural identity associated with the source language. Additionally, translation may influence the target language by introducing new expressions or structures that may alter the nature of the language over time.

Within the framework of linguistic theory, there are debates about whether translation should be faithful to the original text or more considerate of the target language reader. Studying the differences between languages within the framework of comparative linguistics can help improve translation, but it also highlights the complexity of the language transfer process.

Finally, translation and the philosophy of language raise profound issues. Some philosophical or theoretical concepts may be tied to a specific language and lose their meanings when translated. There is a debate about whether language shapes thought, and thus how ideas can be transferred across different languages. These issues reflect the significant challenges faced by translators and researchers in the field of translation and emphasize the importance of understanding cultural and linguistic depth in the process of knowledge transfer.

3.The Aims and Goals of Knowledge

The aims and goals of knowledge are an explicit justification for its scientific nature or lack thereof. Therefore, these fundamental and important questions may not arise significantly when it comes to actual sciences such as chemistry, physics, and mathematics, but they become crucial and urgent when it comes to sciences that have acquired the scientific label merely by imitating the material sciences, such as the humanities. This transgression in scrutinizing these goals is linked to a naive assumption that we implicitly accept, perhaps with high certainty and without doubt, as if these knowledges inherently contain goals that are taken for granted. Strangely, we often cannot even initiate a simple discussion about the true aims of these sciences -on this scale -in light of their declared objectives. The question begins with the initial verification of the extent to which these knowledges can achieve actual results in this regard, given the long history they have spent in debating their theories without reaching conclusions that lead to solutions for the problems they claimed to address. Here lies the question about the true scientific nature of these fields... We often do not notice this situation... In this context, we are talking about a reference for these goals, which are often determined outside the pragmatism of science itself, and perhaps the question is difficult to formulate; if scientificity in its splendid form often turns into certainty with its validity... Today, talking about the certainty that establishes the scientific nature of linguistics, which presents itself as

a science that formally establishes the foundations of scientificity in the references of the question, the systematicity of concepts, and frameworks for procedure and application; shows us that it is from this point precisely that the question about the actual epistemological reference disappears before establishing theories, mobilizing concepts, and coining terms, especially if these knowledges grow in a context that is misleading with discoveries that take the form of epistemic endeavors in a history of knowledge that charts its own path unusually; as if it contributes to building a history for itself in the name of science, without being able to pose the question we have referred to...

4. Scientific Relativity in the Humanities

The question will be important in sparking a debate about "scientific relativity" in many of the humanities presented in our current era, as these knowledges are not, in fact, sciences of the human - as they claim- and are originally nothing but a series of debates that objectify the human in a way that mimics the science of matter... I believe that the threads and secrets of this relationship are initially linked to the source of these debates, which base their knowledge on a dialectic between science and text or the proposition of "science and text"; although we implicitly acknowledge the absence of any precise scientific description of this type of textuality that produces knowledge; which these knowledges see as producing science? And we do not know, fundamentally, if this approach could be considered a metaphor in modern science for producing scientific knowledge (*savoir scientifique*)? Let us contemplate this relationship. Does it not mimic the image of knowledge in these sciences with the pattern of cognitive construction associated with theological reading?

5. Saussurean Textuality

In reality, we are talking about a "textual science" that has become one of the most controversial models, as soon as knowledge in it relates to the proposition of the "absent text," whether interpreted or artificially brought into existence potentially. It is enough to stop at one of the pillars of linguistic thought; I mean here Ferdinand de Saussure, to find simply that we have, over decades, produced an intellectual model around "de Saussure" as a cognitive model, considered in a context of unjustified assumptions, as if it were an unrepeated and unprecedented cognitive model. We are talking here about a "model" of knowledge and not about the person of de Saussure himself -so as not to anger some- this model we still refuse to apply to others... It is the model that we see as the only epistemically indispensable reference in redirecting research in language under the umbrella of a scientific reference that is not fundamentally based on a scientific foundation, so it is not surprising that after a hundred years we find "de Saussure" returning again! And perhaps he is repeated in more than one context, or becomes the reason for approving research branches in language in the name of scientific specialization, branches that remain striking in that they are drawn without a clear horizon and do not lead to a specific outcome. It seems that we are following a clever plan in these knowledges to establish a textual centrality "logocentrism" that allows us to justify the scientific nature of linguistics. If we have previously founded it on a textual epistemological reference, then it is not surprising that words, punctuation, paragraphs, finishes, and drawings become of utmost importance in building that dubious scientificity, and perhaps these textual details will be an argument in explicit resistance to anything that criticizes the non-scientific nature of any of those discoveries -as it seems to us- and yet you will find that the question may disappear: if you ask what these discoveries have contributed to science today. Simply nothing in the pragmatic sense of science. Those who are affiliated with this euphoria in the name of science cannot be convinced that they are not contributing anything to science itself.

6. Linguistics and Grammar

When we compare linguistics with classical language sciences, we find how grammar, for example, despite being a "machine science," has been able to settle its results, and the reason for this -in my opinion- is related to clarity in purpose, without any pretense in the condition of scientificity,

yet we find that grammar itself has provided us with the most influential propositions that are still quoted in linguistic theories under different names, while the latter has failed to answer us about the nature of language and concluded by describing it as that unknown, as titled by Julia Kristeva in one of her books "Le langage, cet inconnu", as linguistics, after decades, still discusses its simplest outputs, such as the ongoing debate to this day about the credibility of the distinction between language and speech. If we were to examine the most important of these outputs, we would find that they justify their scientific nature on a crude hermeneutic on a textual scale. Linguistics in its scientific endeavor is nothing but an attempt to reorganize the results of ancient linguistic research, and the difference perhaps lies in its ability to contextualize knowledge and change its names with the force of terminological presence, it excels in the principles of building descriptive language to scientific standards, but unfortunately, it is not scientific in the full sense of the word, and if it were, it would have been more appropriate for it to settle the discussion of the materiality of language first, simply it will not do that because it is aware of the consequences of this settlement, and I am not inventing anything here; Louis Hjelmslev's glossematics itself acknowledges the existence of a hierarchy of languages that preserves the status of "scientific descriptive language" as well as "non-scientific descriptive language" on the level of semiotic hierarchy (Hjelmslev, 1961, p. 12).

7. Modeling in Linguistics

Let us return to the scientific nature of the idea of modeling itself; practically, it is impossible to talk about the model as general linguistics claims unless the model is purely theoretical, fundamentally abstracted from what it corresponds to; which philosophers of science see as a condition that documents the model's connection to various occurrences (Kuhn, 1962, p. 78). However, linguistics often resorts to inductive occurrences to prove the model in an attempt to prove the scientific criterion or at least to imply it... And here we can find a clear justification for linguistics' endeavor in its beginnings to transcend the acknowledgment of kinship and attempt to build Indo-European languages to theorize a universal model for languages, and perhaps it is more appropriate for general linguistics in reviewing its issues to correct its path with the proposition of "the common" rather than perpetuating the illusion of the model, if the common may permit comparison and analogy games, the illusion of the model will lead to much transgression and similarity and forced matching in the name of science, has linguistics remained on its path towards science?

8. The Enigma of Saussure's Thought

Is there a thought that can be attributed solely to Saussure, or is it merely a mirage? We say this because the question is not surprising, as there is no aspect of his scientific personality that has emerged except for one person. It is the person we came to know in 1916 through the book 'Courses in General Linguistics,' a text that did not appear until after its author's death, and in reality, he did not write a single line of it.

Strangely, this text did not go unnoticed, as it caused a real revolution in the field of humanities. This text enriched the intellectual journeys of 20th-century luminaries such as Merleau-Ponty, Lévi-Strauss, Henri Lefebvre, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and others. At the same time, the ideas in this text addressed in an unusual style some of the issues that concerned philosophers of language from Plato to Humboldt.

The analysis revisits the principles of the linguistic sign, arbitrariness, value, synchrony, and diachrony, suggesting these are not merely theoretical but foundational to linguistic studies. Despite these insights, persistent doubts about the authenticity and integrity of these principles surface, especially considering that Albert Riedlinger, a key editor who attended only the early lectures, missed later sessions crucial to the text's formation.

9. The Posthumous Birth of Courses in General Linguistics

Why might this doubt arise? And why specifically today? The reality indicates that Ferdinand de Saussure is the author of a book he did not write, and that the 'Courses in General Linguistics' book, as everyone knows, was authored by his students Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, who compiled the text from notes taken by students.

But the strangest part is that neither of them attended those lectures, specifically the general linguistics lectures. Albert Riedlinger, the third editor and conceptualizer of the book, attended only the initial series of lectures by Ferdinand de Saussure in 1907 and 1908-1909, missing the crucial 1910-1911 sessions which significantly informed the book's content.

This is because Saussure's ideas on general linguistics only crystallized in the summer of 1911, with the final lecture dated July 4, 1911, marking the culmination of nearly forty years of research. It is these same ideas that remain a subject of interest and skepticism for some, given the difficulty in achieving coherence.

10. The Revolutionary Impact on 20th-Century Humanities

We have always thought that what is important in Saussure's thought is summarized in the 'Lectures in General Linguistics,' but this text did not appear until three years after his death. In reality, it is the result of painstaking reconstruction and editing, considering the challenges faced in the arduous journey of researching Saussure's linguistic thoughts before seeking the texts and notes taken by students.

It is suspicious that when we scrutinize these texts, we find ourselves posing many questions and clearly noticing numerous gaps, discontinuities, and instances of illogical leaps. This impression arises due to the inherent uncertainties in the lectures, right up to the final editing by editors who were not original direct listeners.

10.1. Key Linguistic Concepts: Sign, Arbitrariness, and Value

There is no doubt that the materials used as sources for writing the book 'Courses in General Linguistics' are heterogeneous. This latter source inevitably creates a situation of inevitable deviation from what was presented in the lectures, resulting in interpretations and simplifications required by the process of recording each note separately. This situation is further complicated by differences in editing from one listener to another. As a result, we are faced with a number of discordant texts, incomplete sections, and contradictory sources, all of which are confusing to the concepts and ideas presented in the book, despite their apparent clarity.

Consequently, the editorial team relied heavily on the available manuscripts and student notes, necessitating selective interpretation and additional commentary, thus increasing the risk of distorting the original material. In this context, we should not overlook the fact that the editors' desire to achieve the highest degree of consistency in this book led them to shape it within a remarkable and unique system. Through their editorial work, the 'Courses in General Linguistics' text aimed to stitch together the sections within a system intended to meet the lecturer's objectives, even if these objectives were not clear; they were shaped based on the editors' speculations as stated in the book's introduction.

The organization of the book reflects these editorial challenges, starting with a general introduction that doesn't align closely with Saussure's lectures, followed by sections on general principles like the sign, and moving into detailed discussions on synchronic, diachronic, and geographical linguistics, culminating with evolutionary linguistics. This structure shows the editors' struggle between maintaining the chronological flow of the lectures and presenting the concepts logically.

The compilation process, therefore, involved critical decisions on content arrangement, contextualization, and synthesis, which carried inherent risks of misrepresentation and speculation, making the reconstruction of Saussure's theories particularly complex.

It is evident in many places the terminological substitutions of what appeared in the students' notes in a successive and disruptive manner, which can be summarized in the following table:

Table No. 1

Substance acoustique	Substance phonique
Sonorité linguistique	Chaîne phonique
Suite acoustique	Tranche phonique
Unités irréductibles	Éléments phoniques/phonème

An illustrative table of the differences recorded in the writing of terms among students.

11. Rudolf Engler's Edition and the Differences in Saussure's Manuscripts

Rudolf Engler's edition (1968), which continued to deepen the work presented by Robert Godel (1957), one of the first to examine Saussure's manuscripts, noted many differences between these manuscripts and the book 'Courses in General Linguistics'. These differences can be summarized as follows (Godel, 1957, p.515):

1. Changes made by the editors to the conclusion.
2. All examples were added by the editors.
3. All comments are editor additions.
4. Addition of key concepts for clarification, such as the concept of 'social laws' which has no trace in the manuscripts.
5. The concept of 'the natural and actual object of linguistics is the study of the language in itself and for itself' was seen as crucial, added to the final sections of the book.'

Tullio De Mauro regarding the latter points out that we are faced with a situation of speculation and conjecture about Saussure's intentions (De Saussure, 1972, p.520). It reflects a clear concern by the editors to convey these ideas to the reader of the 'Courses in General Linguistics'.

The text became a series of additions, changes, transformations, substitutions, slippages, and even oppositions, as Jean-Claude Milner sees it (Milner, 2002, p.16). Ultimately, these processes that formed the lecture text make us move from a series of oral lectures to notes taken by listening students, leading to the interpretation of the oral and heard through the pens of editors who were not originally present.

We have blindly trusted that what is essential in Saussure's thought on general linguistics is summarized in the lectures book, which paralyzes our thinking with a sanctity that has prevented us from returning to its reality. Strangely, even with the emergence of Saussure's manuscripts, we

refrained from delving deeper into these questions.

The 20th century in the field of humanities has been marked as the century where researchers were preoccupied with interpreting Saussurean thought from lectures not written by their author. Hence, it was necessary for the editors of these lecture texts to be cautious in forming a picture of this thought based on the available evidence. Therefore, the critical apparatus must clearly distinguish between the teacher and the interpreters of his words. Thus, we are more deserving of bearing the painful blows of criticism, as it is not right to receive such for a valuable thought like this". This clear declaration puts us before the problem clearly; there is a difference between the teacher and the interpreters of his ideas.

But what about those manuscripts and notes taken by the students, which formed the basis of the lectures book? (Estanislao, 2010, p.3.) contributes preliminary remarks on digital publication, emphasizing the importance of understanding Saussure's drafts, which unlike complete manuscripts, are initial versions not fully prepared for publication.

Instead, we are faced with secondary drafts, incomplete and uncorrected handwritten research notes, which often take the form of personal work notes that may mislead the reader into thinking they are prepared for publication, but they are merely research projects. There are many examples in this regard, such as preparatory notes for an article on 'Whitney,' notes on the dual nature of language, or notes for a book on general linguistics (De Saussure, 1970, pp.539-541).

All these do not represent a text in the documentary sense but are merely preliminary writing processes, requiring all the precautions for their faithful transfer. This can only be achieved by considering the characteristics of the written material, involving complex transfer processes that require attention to correction indicators, additions, substitutions, transformations, and changes, without neglecting the marginal notes between lines and in the margins.

12.Key Notes from Saussure's Drafts

In reality, we may not find it difficult to clearly identify those notes from Saussure's drafts. Still, the process may be lengthy in inventorying those ideas that were subject to transfer and comment in the lectures book. We can point out the most important ones, such as:

- 1) The sign is arbitrary only in relation to what it refers to.
- 2) Language is form; it is pure form as an independent system.
- 3) Thought corresponds to language.
- 4) The signifier matches the concept.
- 5) The social dimension of language has remained neglected.
- 6) Language operates among people; it is social, etc.

These are examples of notes written by Saussure. In all these topics, the true and decisive answer certainly lies in those phrases written by their author. The real discovery of these drafts (1998) has helped clarify these issues with live evidence. Although they have been available for a long time, attempts to utilize them in the logic of textual reconstruction have remained stumbling in their pursuit of an accurate construction of Saussurean thought.

In reality, we cannot, in any case, blame Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, despite many shocking facts, as they are credited with preserving Saussure's thought from oblivion, even if the reconstruction process was done."Saussurean thought, by editors who are attentive to the revolutionary nature of his ideas with a will that is not devoid of awareness of the difficulty of the task. However, questions will find their way to multiply within the texts they have edited.

13. The Fundamental Question: Who Wrote Courses in General Linguistics?

If Saussure was not the writer of the 'Courses in General Linguistics', then what would his true thought have been? This fundamental question puts the lectures book in a cloud of doubt, a necessary doubt to understand the content of a theory attributed to one of the most prominent intellectuals of the 20th century. Referring to Saussure has become imbued with suspicion. So, is the Saussure we refer to, and that theorists have referred to in their theories, the real 'Saussure'? Or do we only know his reconstructed intellectual remnants driven by the motives of proof? To exit this circle of doubt, we will need to review documents, dates, and even the method of follow-up and reading before writing anything on behalf of Saussure.

We must start with the texts published by their author and return to his manuscripts to classify their value, as well as his scientific correspondence, and then review the students' records and their most consistent notes. In light of these data, we cannot speak much, nor attribute to the teacher what he did not say.

Saussure's established works, like his university studies 'Mémor on the Primitive System of Vowels in Indo-European Languages' (1878) and 'Thesis on the Use of Absolute Genitive in Sanskrit' (1881), illustrate his development of key linguistic concepts. These studies laid the groundwork for his later revolutionary ideas of 'system' and 'value,' which were central to his linguistic theories. Alongside these two works, there are many notes and articles published by Saussure that revolve around his continuous research on Indo-European languages.

These publications include all the interventions he presented at the Linguistics Society in Paris between 1880-1892, which took the form of notes that multiplied until the end of 1892 and later witnessed distancing and interruptions. Among the most famous articles by Saussure at that time were those focused on the ancient Lithuanian language, which Saussure had studied and mastered for many years as part of his research journey.

Interestingly, nothing on general linguistics was addressed except for some simple references, such as the statement denying the existence of a 'true theory of language,' indicating some methodological errors and inconsistencies in the presentation. In this regard, Saussure's works published during his lifetime addressed issues of comparative grammar and matters related to the reconstruction of Indo-European language, showing little interest in general linguistics, even if they alluded to views related to general linguistics.

Gradually, Saussure's publications noticeably ceased, except for some brief interventions on etymology issues presented specifically at the History and Archaeology Society in Geneva. He seemed frustrated through those incomplete or abandoned articles. It is the same frustration that dominated him when he foresaw the effort of publishing a work on general linguistics. In an interview with Leopold Gautier, he said: 'It may be futile to embark on long research to publish a work on general linguistics, considering that I left a lot of unpublished research when I came here' (Godel, 1957, p.30).

Ultimately, this confirms that beyond these challenges in his writings on issues related to Indo-European languages, Saussure left only scattered fragments and notes requiring considerable effort for explanation, commentary, or even correction.

The scientific texts published by Saussure during his lifetime mostly focused on issues of comparative grammar of ancient languages, and references to general linguistics appeared only incidentally. This is not contradictory to the prevailing climate of that era, as everyone was keen on achieving the dream of reconstructing Indo-European languages.

The manuscripts confirm that Saussure was driven to think about the conditions related to

general linguistics due to his dissatisfaction with the methods and concepts established then in comparative grammatical studies of Indo-European languages. This research orientation clearly shows Saussure's actual path and some elements of his theory.

Therefore, we must take on the role of investigation and inquiry regarding those manuscripts that could clarify Saussurean thought on general linguistics. To accurately trace the evolution of Ferdinand de Saussure's ideas, it's crucial to consider the dating of each manuscript, regardless of the topic (Bouquet & Engler, 2002, pp.143-173).

Key manuscripts that predate his three notable lectures at the University of Geneva include those from November 1891, where he explored historical and comparative aspects of Indo-European languages. These lectures are pivotal, illustrating early thoughts on 'general laws' derived from linguistic studies, the dynamics of language change, and the temporal positioning of language.

The manuscript of notes on accentuation in Lithuanian from 1894 shows a fundamental shift in Saussure's thought from comparative grammar to reflections on issues of general linguistics. For instance, he wrote an intriguing statement: 'The central subject of accentuation issues is not the accent itself, but the relations of opposition and difference within language, of which accent is only a simple component.' This context is where he first used the chess analogy, which would become central to his theories.

14. Saussure's Notes on Whitney and the Emergence of Key Concepts

Additional manuscripts include his notes from November 1894, through which he prepared an article on William Dwight Whitney, the renowned American scholar of Sanskrit. Whitney was credited with deriving some general principles about language despite the incomplete results achieved by comparative grammar, thus representing an exceptional case in Saussure's view due to his philosophical outlook (Bouquet & Engler, 2002, pp.204 -206).

These notes contain significant cognitive breaks, such as considering language as a 'human institution,' referencing 'sign theory,' distinguishing between 'evolution' and 'language states,' addressing the quantitative property of oppositions, and mentioning 'arbitrariness' explicitly for the first time. There are numerous valuable notes whose dates and correlations with the development of Saussurean thought in linguistics methodology need careful scrutiny.

Although the notes reflect instances of hesitation, doubt, repetition, additions, fragmentation, and cancellation, they are it is clear from Saussure's general interest in issues related to the project of reconstructing Indo-European languages that a genuine theory of general linguistics was in the process of forming. We cannot overlook the scientific value of the personal correspondences preserved in the manuscripts, as they clarify, beyond any doubt, the true course of his research, which can be seen as a reflection of the psychological climate driving his desires and setbacks in research. These correspondences provide evidence of the plans, consultations, and inquiries about hidden questions, states of frustration, misunderstandings, and even pathological fears of writing or responding to letters. These aspects cannot be neglected in understanding the characteristics of Saussure's thought.

What preoccupied Saussure in these correspondences were issues related to Indo-European languages, yet they also reflected a clear interest in deriving principles of general linguistics. In a letter dated January 4, 1894, to his friend Antoine Meillet, Saussure openly acknowledged the difficulty of this task, stating: 'I have been unable to define a precise meaning for at least one term in the field of linguistics' (Benveniste, 1994, p.95). ' These correspondences also reveal Saussure's preoccupation with a significant literary issue known as the problem of anagrams in ancient Latin and Greek poetry. Here, he appeared to be exploring the implications of his linguistic theories towards the horizons of literary text analysis (Roman Jakobson, 1980, p.268).

Conclusion

It may be difficult to determine explicit results from this investigation and follow-up, which has recently been demonstrated through the efforts of a number of researchers regarding the significant flaws that accompanied the process of editing the text of the book 'Courses in General Linguistics,' especially considering the value of knowledge that was built according to what came in this text. This reflects the necessity of being aware of the importance of the text that builds knowledge. Nevertheless, many investigators' efforts have sought to reduce the gap and the impact of the shock, describing them as merely natural errors in the complex editing process that the book underwent.

Bibliography List:

1. Engler Rudolf (1968), Ferdinand de Saussure, Cours de linguistique générale, Otto Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden;
 2. Godel Robert (1957), Les sources manuscrites du Cours de linguistique générale de F. de Saussure, éd. E.Droz, Genève;
 3. Ferdinand de Saussure (1972), Cours de linguistique générale, Tullio de Mauro, col. Bibliothèque scientifique, éd. Payot, Paris;
 4. paradigme, éd. Seuil, Paris;
 5. Bouquet Simon et Engler Rudolf (2002), Saussure Ferdinand, Ecrits de linguistique générale, éd. Gallimard, Paris;
 6. Emiles Benveniste (1964), Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure, n0 21, éd. Droz, Genève;
 7. Roman Jakobson (1980), La charpente phonique du langage, éd. De Minuit, Paris;
 8. Louis-Jean Calvet (1975), Pour et contre saussure vers une linguistique sociale, éd. Payot, Paris;
 9. Starobinski Jean (1970), Les Mots sous les mots, les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure, NRF, Gallimard, Paris;
- Internet websites:
- 1- Estanislao Sofia (2010), Qu'est qu'un brouillon en sciences du langage ? notes préalables à une édition numérique des manuscrites de F. De Saussure, Cahiers Ferdinand De Saussure, Droz, 211, 63, p.3. In <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00668556> (12/31/2024)