

Hess-Lüttich, Ernest W. B.

**The schools of Structuralism – an overview : the impact of Prague
School Structuralism on other centres of textual analysis**

Theatralia. 2012, vol. 15, iss. 2, pp. 50-73

ISBN 978-80-210-5571-1

ISSN 1803-845X (print); ISSN 2336-4548 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/124412>

Access Date: 05. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.



Ernest W. B. Hess-Lüttich

The Schools of Structuralism – An Overview: The Impact of Prague School Structuralism on other Centres of Textual Analysis¹

I. Geneva

From the beginning, rhetorical, linguistical and literary approaches have been included in Structuralism. In the sense of the term coined by Jakobson, Structuralism can be derived from Ferdinand de Saussure's (1857–1913) synchronical language theory on the one hand, and from the literary sciences of *Russian formalism* (see below) on the other. Saussure (in taking up classical traditions and by delimiting himself from contemporary language historicism) perceives of linguistics as part of a general semiotics (*semiologie*). The drawing on his relational semiotic model and the idea of the arbitrariness of the sign (the conventional relation of *signifiant* and *signifié*) anchored within (and derived from Aristotle) allows for not understanding its meaning from the relation to the extralingual reality (from reference), but solely from its position in relational structure. Language (*langue*) is a semiotic system, by the rules of which utterances (*parole*) can be produced. As opposed to extra-systemic conditions (such as contexts of text production) or historical developments (synchronicity before diachronicity), the focus is thus on structure (of a text, for instance). The fourth of Saussure's famous dichotomies concerns the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations of linearity and equivalence in the structure of language. The differentiation of these relations of the horizontal and verti-

1 This paper is based on parts of an entry entitled “Strukturalismus”, published in German in: Gert Ueding (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 9. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer 2009, 194–221. Translation by Kevin McLoughlin.

cal dimension is later sustainably revisited by Jakobson as “axis of combination” and “axis of selection”.

Saussure's students Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye besides contrastive works mainly concentrate on the systematical reconstruction of the approach and compile the *Cours de linguistique générale* (CLG 1916) from lecture notes. The *Cours de linguistique générale* sustainably coins the Saussure reception and triggers a debate that is still ongoing today. The other members of the school, such as R. Godel, E. Engler or B. J. Frei, largely also orient themselves along the principles and dichotomies of the CLG, the base line of which is drawn upon by every introduction to the subject. However, it also still provides for scientific debate and is constantly complemented by new findings in Saussure's legacy (cf. e.g. STETTER 1997; JÄGER 2003; FEHR 2003).

II. Moscow – Petersburg – Tartu

The literary scientists and linguists cooperating in the Moscow Linguistic Circle (1914–1924), or in the Petrograde society for the study of poetic language (Opojaz, as of 1916) respectively, strive to work out structural characteristics of aesthetic usage (Jakobson, Jakubinskij, Reformatskij, Vinokur) and the structural roots of aesthetic effects of (literary and cinematic) works of art (Éjchenbaum, Šklovskij, Tomaševskij, Tynjanov) by means of the application of linguistic description methods. Under the influence of futurism in literature, as well as constructivism and cubism in painting, general interest is pointed towards literaricity generating “processes” (Šklovskij: *priēm*) for the alienation (*ostranenie*) of forms of practical or discursive speech. The thereby evoked “complication” of the semiotic form aims for the intensification, densification, de-automatisation of its perception. Likewise, usage is said to gain its strength for expressive innovation from the dynamics of standard setting typecast and standard violating individuality (cf. Veselovskij's evolution model of language change).

Using the example of Chlebnikov, linguist Lev Jakubinskij describes the breaking up of usual contiguity associations of sound and meaning by association following the principle of similarity. From this, Roman Jakobson later gains the formulation of his thesis of the projection of the principle of equivalence from the axis of paradigmatic on the axis of syntagmatic projected in poetic language: “In the poetic function, the relation of equivalence is projected from the axis of selection to the axis of combination” (JAKOBSON 1960: 27). Sergej Bernštejn, Boris M. Éjchenbaum, Jurij N. Tynjanov, Viktor Žirmunskij, Andrej Fedorov, Boris Tomaševskij, Vladimir Propp, Michail M. Bachtin and Petr G. Bogatyrev, among others, lay the foundation for later

theoretical concepts in textual, cinematic and theatre semantics, narratology and intertextuality (GRÜBEL 1998) with their paradigmatic and syntagmatic structure analyses of aesthetic texts. That is, before the Marxist-Leninist doctrine suffocates those intellectual impulses.

Only in the 1960s do linguistics, textual and cultural sciences in Moscow and Tartu tie in with this tradition. With the first *Symposium on the Structural Study of Sign Systems* in Moscow 1962, a new phase of Structuralist research commences. In his introduction to the documents of the convention, Vjačeslav V. Ivanov, with the programme oriented along Saussure (semiotic model) and Hjelmslev (level model), ties in with the tradition of Russian Formalism of the 1920s (cf. IVANOV 1962). At the same time in Tartu, Jurij M. Lotman (1922–1993) begins with his *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* [A Survey of Semiotics] and, as of 1964, with the summer schools on secondary modelling systems, which are explored by means of structural linguistics (cf. LOTMAN 1972, 1973). In the 1970s the interest of some representatives of the Moscow and Tartu school (e.g. V. A. and B. A. Uspenskij, O. G. Revzina and I. I. Revzin) broadens programmatically to include texts regardless of their semiotic structure and modality, and focuses on the conceptualisation of a general culture semiotic for the analysis of historically and dialogically conditioned structures of societal generation of sense in human semiospheres (cf. LOTMAN 1990). With the ambitious attempt at a non-reductionist object constitution the concept admittedly also forfeits a certain degree of conceptual selectivity (cf. EIMERMACHER 1986; FLEISCHER 1989, 1998; GRZYBEK 1989; SPECK 1997).

III. Prague

In 1911, even before the advent of the *Cours de linguistique générale*, the Czech anglicist Vilém Mathesius demanded the inclusion of synchronic and functional aspects in the study of language in an essay. Following the example of the Moscow Linguist Circle (and as a critical reaction towards its poetology of oeuvre immanence or *Werkimmanenz* or *L'immanence de l'oeuvre*) he encouraged the formation of a Prague Linguistic Circle. *The Cercle Linguistique de Prague* (CLP) was subsequently founded in 1926 and presented its theses to the public in the course of the *1st International Congress of Slavists* 1929 in Prague. They contained the essential concepts of functionalism, critical Saussure-reception, structural phonology, functional dialectology, textual theme-/rheme-structures and linguistic poetics. Especially the Russian members Nicolai S. Trubetzkoy (1890–1938) and Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) are considered to be the actual godfathers of the Prague School of linguis-

tics. However, it is not long before it attracts other linguists, such as Bohumil Trnka, Jozef Vachek and Bohuslav Havránek as well as literary and cultural scientists, such as Jiří Veltruský, Felix Vodička and first and foremost Jan Mukařovský. Their *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* are published up to 1939 and are later continued as *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* as of 1966. They unite vital papers on a broad thematic spectrum, encompassing issues from phonology, language typology (V. Skalička), text-, socio- and technolinguistics, up to stylistics and literary theory.

The structural-functional approach of the Prague School is empirically oriented, its observations focused on language as a means of communication in its socio-historic context and in its aesthetic context of utilisation (cf. HELBIG 1973: 48f.; LEPSCHY 1981: 73–84). In this respect, the school bridges the poles of the orthodox Structuralism coined by Geneva on the one hand, and the Moscow Formalism with its normative approach to literary language (*literaturnyj yazik*) on the other. Next to Trubetzkoy's structural phonology, the concept and methods of which also are fertile for historical linguistic issues, first and foremost the functional stylistics (Havránek, Hausenblas, Doležel, Jelínek) have developed an imperative impact.

Above all due to Roman Jakobson's numerous papers (particularly after his transmigration to the USA in 1941), which treat a broad spectre of linguistic and literary scientific issues (cf. HOLENSTEIN 1975, 1976; RUDY and WAUGH 1998), the approach also enjoys international propagation in the Western Hemisphere. His programmatic essays on “Linguistics and Poetics” (1960), including an extension of Bühler's Organon-model, on “Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry” (1961) or the joint effort with renowned anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss analysing Baudelaire's “Les Chats” (1962), generate a strong response and are considered to be classical pilot studies for that fertile nexus of linguistics and literary science, which also characterises the approaches of Havránek, Horálek, Doležel, Skalička, Jelínek or Červenka. Thus the Prague School of linguistics is frequently described as a genuinely linguistic-literary school that furthermore widened the horizon to textual and cultural sciences: “The implications of the work of the Prague School on aesthetics and literary structure go beyond the bounds of their chosen subject matter in the direction of a theoretical and operational application of Structuralism to cultural research in general” (GARVIN 1964: 10; cf. HESS-LÜTTICH 1985: 151–166).

With his systematic Peirce-reception, Jakobson's approach furthermore gains a more complex semiotic foundation for the non-reductionist expansion of the object range to further aesthetic expressions such as film, visual arts, music, architecture, theatre, as it has been demanded since the 1930s mainly

by Jan Mukařovský, who defines “Kunst als semiologisches Faktum” [Art as a semiological fact] (1934/1977). He describes it in the course of his approach to examining the structure of de-automatising focalisations of a message (*aktualizace*) in aesthetic texts regardless of semiotic modality, the constitution of meaning of which is based on societal attribution. Both have paved the way for the semiotic foundation of scientific examination of aesthetic texts:

Both Mukařovský and Jakobson contributed eminently to the view of the different arts as interrelated structures, laying the basis for modern semiotic studies which relate the different arts to each other and to other cultural sets, as for instance the Moscow–Tartu School in the Soviet Union. Mukařovský’s suggestion that the relation of structures of different arts is analogous to the link between the literatures of different languages and cultures [MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1941: 3; HESS-LÜTTICH], heralded the notable semiotic investigations in interart and intraart links since the 1960s.

(WINNER 1998: 2253; cf. HESS-LÜTTICH and RELLSTAB 2005)

IV. Copenhagen

A mere two years after the Prague *Cercle* publicised its theses, Louis Trolle Hjelmslev (1899–1965) and E. Viggo Brøndal (1887–1942) together with further young colleagues found the *Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* in 1931, which publishes an own bulletin as of 1934, from which the *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* emerge by 1944. Influenced by Saussure and inspired by his cooperation with phoneticist Hans Jørgen Uldall (1907–1957), Hjelmslev strives to describe the structure of language as a system of internal relations. Together with Uldall he sketches principals of a strictly structural phonology, which (as a means of distinction to Trubetzkoy) is called *Phonematics*. Mutually, they plan a two-volume book in order to found a radical Structuralistic language theory in the sense of a general semiotics entitled *Glossemantics*. Uldall only publishes his volume (entitled *Outline of Glossematics I: General Theory*) in 1957 as volume 10 of the *Travaux*, the second volume is never published.

Meanwhile, Hjelmslev is working on his edition of a glossematic language theory, which is entitled *Omkring sprogtteoriens grundlæggelse* and is published in 1943. In it he postulates that language be described empirically as structure *sui generis* and not viewed as a conglomerate of extralingual factors (cf. LEPSCHY 1969: 52f.). Apart from Saussure, the approach is mainly obliged to the principles of Logic Positivism of the Vienna Circle around Rudolf Carnap and strives to formulate an immanent algebra of language (cf.

JOHANSEN 1998: 2272). Furthermore, the system of language as a rational structure is continuously divided into classes, which, in turn, are classes of classes, until signs as elements of classes are attained, whose smallest unit is the *glossemē* as a non-reducible invariant (cf. MOTSCH 1974: 82f.).

The principles claim universal validity for language in general, whereby Hjelmslev differs between formal universals, which are necessarily distinct for all languages, and substantial universals, from which single languages select differentially (cf. BIERWISCH 1966: 93f.). Applied to the four semiotic dimensions form and substance of expression, and form and substance of content respectively, the phonetic material, for instance, is substance of expression and belongs to the level of formal universals. The phonological material of a language is form of expression and thus substantial. The reflection of issues of the environment, on the other hand, is substance of expression and hence corresponding to the formal universals. The form of content is the order of the material by a language and thus substantial. Only the form is subject of linguistics, i.e. phonology and morphology, respectively grammar and their interrelation. The substance belongs to physics as phonetics, respectively to psychology as semantics. The aim is an establishment of an algebraic calculus, which permits for a prediction of all combination possibilities of a given language (cf. HEESCHEN 1972: 69f.; HELBIG 1973: 60f.).

Despite its elevated formal demand and its resistance to application attempts in fields such as literary analysis (cf. TRABANT 1970), the glossematic scheme has not remained without influence, particularly in studies on “form of content” in the so-called *Pleremik* by Jens Holt in Sidney Lambs *Stratificational Grammar* and in the *Sémantique structurale* by Algirdas J. Greimas (cf. JOHANSEN 1998; NÖTH 2000: 78–87).

V. Paris

As with the other schools mentioned here, due to the multitude of approaches in a widespread field of disciplines in various places in France and the continuing reception and development of the paradigm in the romanophone countries of Europe and Latin America especially, the rhetorical function of the term Paris School of Semiotics as *pars pro toto* needs to remain present at all times. It traces back to the complete overview of Jean-Claude Coquet (1982), in which the *Groupe de recherches sémiolinguistiques*, founded by Algirdas L. Greimas (1917–1992), figures as *L'école de Paris*. Its medium of publication are the *Actes sémiotiques* and as of 1989 the *Nouveaux Actes Sémiotiques* respectively.

The Russian born Frenchman of Lithuanian descent develops his influential *Structural Semantics* (GREIMAS 1966, Eng. 1983) under the influence of Phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty, Lévi-Strauss' structural anthropology and Propp's narratology. Its linguistic foundations are mainly based on Saussure's concept of differential quality and the oppositional value of structure, as well as on Lucien Tesnière's dependency grammar model and Hjelmslev's glossematics (cf. NÖTH 2000: 112). In the trial of transferring structural processes to the textual level (*discours*) he, *inter alia*, is concerned with the determination of minimal components of meaning (*semes* as units of content substance in the sense of Hjelmslev) and their relations. To simplify, these fundamental units can be arranged into logic squares of binary oppositional structures, which underlie the meaning (*signification*) of texts as a semantic deep structure. Thus, the meaning is revealed by the relations between the units (*differences*) and not by its total. They form structures of recurrent seme constellations, which constitute the semantic coherence of a given text: isotopes as text segments linked by common contextual semes. Additionally, several isotope levels may overlap in polyvalent texts (cf. HESS-LÜTTICH 1985: 239–251).

The early approaches of the Paris School are later expanded to a narrative discourse grammar, which also systematically accounts for aspects of modality, emotionality and perspectivity and (as opposed to glossematics) has found widespread utilisation in many fields of linguistics, literary and social studies, jurisprudence, psychology, ethnology and mythology, research as well as art, musical and architectural semiotics (cf. BAK 1994; PARRET 1998; NÖTH 2000: 112–119; KIM 2002).

Applied semiotics is also the comprehensive sphere of textual scientist Roland Barthes (1915–1980) in his “median” Structuralist phase in the 1960s, during which, following early attempts at a structural reconstruction of classic rhetorics, his essays on the semiotics of film, photography, advertisement and fashion are published in swift succession. In them, he applies the instruments of rhetorics and later particularly methods of structural linguistics (distribution analysis, commutation tests, etc.) to nonlingual or polycoded texts with the goal of forming a taxonomy of elements of their genre specific codes (of movies, of fashion, etc.). He distinguishes these codes (in analogy to Saussure's *langue/parole* dichotomy) from their actualisation in concrete instances of text, which not only transport denotative contents of the code, but also the connotatives of the implicitly entailed *Mythologies* (BARTHES 1957, Eng. 1972), by which the semiotic systems of the (movie, fashion, etc.) codes become rhetorical systems. As Barthes faced the efforts of his “scientific phase” with increasing scepticism, as of *S/Z: An Essay* (BARTHES 1970a, Eng. 1975) the very latest, he shall be revisited under the post-Structuralist aspect.

The approaches in the Parisian literary science of that time, which have also been received in the German-speaking world, notably those of Claude Bremond, Tzvetan Todorov and Gérard Genette, are no less substantial to textual science; particularly in view of questions regarding the narrativity, genre theory, figure classification and intertextuality. Bremond's narrative text analysis (*Erzähltextanalyse*) initially emerged (among others) from the debate on approaches of Russian Formalism, particularly with Vladimir Propp's structural analysis of fairy tales (cf. chapter 4.2). Equal to him, Bremond strives to expose the basic plot units of a given text (*fonctions* and *processus narratifs* respectively). However, he enhances Propp's scheme with semantic tests of alternates, by a triad of functions and the priority of plot roles. With this, he strives to determine structure of the plot substratum underlying the text (BREMOND 1973; cf. GÜLICH and RAIBLE 1977: 202–218).

Tzvetan Todorov's narratological model is methodologically even more linguistically oriented. By means of structural processes, he strives to develop, from the exposure of the plot *substratum*, the inventory of categories of a universal grammar of narratology. He does not leave it at theoretical deliberations. In applying it to *Decamerone*'s novels he paraphrases the plot structure in summaries, condenses the thusly-gained paraphrases to primary and secondary propositions (verb, name, adjective; comparative, modus, transformation), which are then described by means of syntactic and semantic aspects. Hence, the narrative (*récit*) appears as structure of constituting sequences (*séquences*), which in turn emerge by the nexus of *propositions* (composed of *sujet* and *prédicat*) (TODOROV 1969, 1973; cf. GÜLICH and RAIBLE 1977: 219–250).

With the translation of his programmatic essay on *Structuralisme et critique littéraire*, Gérard Genette swiftly becomes a protagonist of the debate on the relationship of Structuralism and literary sciences in Germany, which sets in in the early 1970s mainly due to Heinz Blumensath's eponymous anthology and Jens Ihwe's collection of texts on the link between literary sciences and linguistics (GENETTE 1966–2002, 1972; BLUMENSATH 1972; IHWE 1971, 1972/1973). Subsequently, he composes numerous studies on questions of structural text analysis, on the classification of the rhetorical doctrine of figures, on the role of the author and on narratological theory (with the commonly received coinage of the term *diegesis* as a means to define the criteria for the definition of narrative mode or the focalisation in narratives as well as the fundamental differentiation of *discours* and *histoire*, which approximately corresponds with the distinction of *fabula* and *sujet* coined by the Russian Formalists, which, however, he then expands to the triad of *histoire*, *récit* and *narration*).

*ratiōn), as well as several further essays, which he collects in the thus far five volumes of his magnum opus *Figures* (GENETTE 1966–2002).*

Over the years, however, in lieu of his taxonomisation efforts in the field of the structural doctrine of figures with its six main groups (*tropes, figures de diction, figures de construction, figures de style, figures de pensée, figures d'élocution*), which he further differentiated in innumerable subcategories with the goal of creating a “*classement d'ordre logique*”, his genre typological deliberations on text types and classes has been more widely received. The distinction between these text types and classes is not always coherently successful, which is why he rather understands them as aspects of a generally conceived textuality, which he in turn (e.g. in the introduction to *Palimpsestes*) grasps as field of the *transtextualité* and multifariously parcels in such of the *architextualité* (e.g. *types de discours, modes d'énonciation, genres littéraires, intertextualité* (e.g. *citation, plagiat, allusion*), *metatextualité* (e.g. *commentaire, critique*), *paratextualité* (e.g. *titre, préface, notes, illustration, brouillon*), *hypertextualité* (e.g. *parodie, travestissement, pastiche*, thus not to be confused with the concept of hyper textuality in the English-speaking text and media sciences) (GENETTE 1976, 1979, 1982, 1991; cf. ADAMZIK 2004: 98f.; HESS-LÜTTICH 1997, 1999).

VI. London

The phoneticist (and student of Daniel Jones) John Rupert Firth (1890–1960) is considered to be the founder of the London School of Linguistics (LANGENDOEN 1968; MONAGHAN 1979; LUX 1981). On the road paved by Philipp Wegener, Bronislaw Malinowski and Alan Gardiner he drafts the programme of a “sociological linguistics”, which mainly ought to have two problems to solve: “First the very difficult problem of describing and classifying typical contexts of situation within the context of culture, and secondly of describing and classifying types of linguistic function in such contexts of situation” (FIRTH [1935] 1957: 27). The primacy of the text embedded in a hierarchy of context as a realisation of social action and interactionally negotiated *meaning* also earned the approach the label “contextualism”. *Meaning* is thereby grasped as a relational construct, the content of which emerges from its function in a matrix of occurrence, which is to be determined by means of a structural analysis of its elements on all linguistic levels.

Therefore, a text is *realised* by filtering *meaning* from a potential of social *action*, which by means of lexico-grammatical encoding receives a linguistic *form*, which in turn obtains its material *substance* of the utterance (in sound or type) by its attachment to physical sign vehicles. Conversely, a text is *con-*

stituted by significant combinations from the *system* of sound or type sign joining together to form larger functional units, which in turn shape lexicogrammatical or morpho-syntactical *structures*. This network of syntagmatic relations between *structure* elements and paradigmatic relations between *system* elements represent the semantic potential as linguistic complement of social behaviour of dialogical action in situationally, historically and socio-culturally graded contexts. The references to the programme of glossematics, on the one hand, and of the Prague School on the other, admittedly remain implicit, but are clearly decipherable nonetheless.

Michael A. K. [Alexander Kirkwood, H-L] Halliday (1978), in consequent orientation to the perception of language as a form of organisation of social experience, further develops his “systemic grammar” to a “social semiotic”, which links Structuralism and Functionalism as well as language system and social system. Social reality (culture) is thereby regarded as a sign construct constituted, *inter alia*, by language, linguistic practise as text with ideational, interpersonal and structural functions. The coherence of these “intrinsic” sign functions and the “extrinsic” sign functions of the situational dimension of action is thereby created by the rhetoric of the *register*:

The environment, or social context, of language is structured as a *field* of significant social action, a *tenor* of role relationships, and a *mode* of symbolic organization. Taken together these constitute the situation, or ‘context of situation’, of a text.

(HALLIDAY 1977: 201; cf. HESS-LÜTTICH 1985: 166–186)

Field of discourse, *tenor* or *style of discourse*, and *mode of discourse* define the situationally appropriate (*aptum*) employed “register” of the communicate (cf. HESS-LÜTTICH 1974).

As opposed to the Czech and French Structuralism, the London School has primarily remained restricted to varied branches of linguistics, where, however, it has unfolded a sustainable fertility in Indo-European studies (W. S. Allen), linguistic typology (C. E. Bazell), language history and history of linguistics (R. H. Robins), phonetics (D. Abercrombie), language theory, grammar and semantics (A. A. Hill, F. R. Palmer, J. Lyons), lexicography and corpus linguistics (J. Sinclair, R. Quirk), sociolinguistics (M. Gregory), stylistics and rhetoric (G. Leech), translation theory (J. C. Catford), language didactics (A. McIntosh, P. Strevens), etc. and is still vivid, for instance in the application of the concept of “Social semiotics” to new fields (R. Hodge, G. Kress), in the conjunction of linguistics and literary sciences within the scope of the highly active Poetics and Linguistics Association (M. Short, K. Wales) or in the ap-

proaches of the *critical discourse analysis* (N. Fairclough, P. Chilton), which is devoted, *inter alia*, to the public linguistic usage in media and advertisement and the relation of language and power.

Hence, there have been renewed connections to the French approaches of critical discourse research (e.g. P. Bourdieu). However, due to its roots, which are rather influenced by ethnology (Malinowski) than philology, and its pragmatic-antimentalist premises, the London school continues to usually be regarded as a connecting link between the European and the American Structuralism.

VII. New York

Exiled by Fascism and National Socialism respectively, several European Structuralists (among them Roman Jakobson) meet in New York. The New York universities have thus literally been dubbed a “branch of Prague” (cf. HELBIG 1973: 72f.). Their preferential medium as of 1943 is the magazine *Word* by the Linguistic Circle of New York. Nevertheless, its influence remains restricted to leading North American colleagues such as Leonard Bloomfield, Edward Sapir, Charles F. Hockett, Zelig S. Harris, Archibald A. Hill or Charles C. Fries. The anti-positivist reaction of the European Structuralism is not understood in the USA. The coherence of linguistic system and usage, of social and individual aspect of language is initially disregarded. Only certain principals, such as classification, distributionalism or corpus basing are adopted from the Structuralist methodology. Bloomfield and his disciples (Bloomfield School) concentrate on determining *immediate constituents* and develop a method to analyse constituents from them, which examines the relationship of dependence between elements and becomes significant for the later to emerge dependency grammar (Tesanière) (cf. LEPSCHY 1969: 66f.).

One of the motives for the radicalisation of distributionalism on a behaviourist foundation was the disaccommodation of traditional grammars for the description of unknown Native American languages. Initially, they ought to be merely apprehended in their immediately observable material inventory, disregarding all mental, cognitive, psychic or semantic aspects. The mass of protocollled utterances of a language is thereby considered to be the corpus, the elements of which are identified and classified by their distributional relations. Noam Chomsky criticises this procedure, as, according to him, it only serves to create list grammars at best, which permit compiling inventory lists for corpora, alas not suitable to deliver material for the grammar of a language.

In his *Syntactic Structures* (1957), Chomsky thus further develops the IC-analysis to a phrase structure grammar, which describes the body of rules,

which allows for the generation of an infinite mass of possible phrases, and the assignment of surface structures of factual phrases to the abstract deep structures of the syntactic control system, which likewise reveals the selection restrictions of phrase elements in its structure description (in the form of tree diagrams), respectively. The approach, structuralist in its basics, has prompted an overwhelming response in Europe. Admittedly, though, no longer primarily with the Structuralists (despite several attempts at the development of rhetorics on a generative foundation: see below), who only gained little from its renunciation from the principle of monolingualism (*grammatica universalis*) and idealisation of the model of the competent speaker (cf. WEYDT 1976). This distance has rather grown with the development of later version of the *generative grammar* (*Government and Binding*) (ALBRECHT 2000: 103).

Nonetheless there were attempts (first and foremost in English studies and linguistics, barely in German studies) at developing rhetorics on generative foundations for some time. Already the early Chomsky assumed a hierarchy of deviations of the grammatically “well-formed” (*degree of grammaticalness*), in which the degree of the respective deviation conforms with the type of the respective violated rule. On this foundation catalogues of example phrases from literary texts were compiled, the aesthetic impact of which was attempted to be described in reference to their level of grammaticality. The generative rhetoric then applied this process to *elocutio*, the third *officium oratoris*, and strived to describe the body of rules, by which words acquiesce to the hierarchy of the phrase (rules of formation) and thought is conceived in words (rules of transformation). To be more precise:

Die Formationsregeln erzeugen eine Hierarchie syntaktischer Kategorien und Relationen wie Nomen, Verb, Subjekt, Prädikat, Objekt, welche die Tiefenstruktur eines Satzes bilden, die seine Bedeutung determiniert und als Strukturbau darstellbar ist. Die Transformationsregeln ordnen die Elemente der Tiefenstruktur entsprechend ihren Funktionen und in ihrem hierarchischen Verhältnis an, tilgen identische Elemente, fügen Flexionsmarkierungen hinzu und führen so die Konstituenten der abstrakten Tiefenstruktur über in einen wohlgeformten Satz und damit in die konkrete Oberflächenstruktur.

(OSTHEEREN 1996: 730f.)

[The rules of formation generate a hierarchy of syntactic categories and relations such as substantive, verb subject, predicate, object, which form the deep structure of a phrase, which in turn determines its meaning and is portrayable as a tree structure. The transformation rules arrange the elements of the deep structure according to their function and their hierarchical rela-

tion, obliterate identical elements, add markers of inflection and hence convey the constituents of the abstract deep structure to a well-formed phrase and thereby to the concrete surface structure.]

Likewise, the choice of words follows rules, which restrict the freedom of choice and determine, for instance, if a word or substantive is employed, as verb with or without an object, as personal or non-personal substantive – or, again, to be more precise:

Jedes Element unterliegt entsprechend seiner durch das Lexikon gegebenen klassifikatorischen Matrix strikten Kategorisierungs-, Subkategorisierungs- und Selektionsbeschränkungen, die seine Operabilität in Formations- und Transformationsprozessen determinieren.

(OSTHEEREN 1996 731; cf. id. 1997: 439–451)

[Every element according to classificatory matrix given by the lexicon is subject to strict restrictions of categorisation, subcategorisation and selection, which determine its operability in processes of formation and transformation.]

It was then assumed that the degree of the rhetoric-stylistic and aesthetic impact respectively could be concluded from the degree of deviation from the norm as defined by the body of rules.

Chomsky's deviation model is complemented in 1971 by anglicist Götz Wienold (who at that time taught English linguistics in Konstanz), who extends the “surrogate processes of formulation” by the “complimenting”, which gives a premonition of Jakobson's process of selection (on the paradigmatic axis) and combination (on the syntagmatic axis). Wienold, in the sense of Chomsky, at this time still believes to be able to describe usage by an algorithm, “der allen möglichen wohlgeformten Äußerungen eine semantische Interpretation über eine Strukturbeschreibung zuordnet” [which allocates any given well-formed utterance a semantic interpretation on a description of structure] (WIENOLD 1971: 54). Grammaticality and poeticity are recognised as reciprocally proportional: the more distant a text is to its “normal form”, the more “poetic” it appears. Contemporary stylistics were not satisfied by this: according to their stance, poeticity is no subcategory of grammar. Hence grammar as a category of stylistic theory construction is beyond debate (SANDERS 1973: 66f.).

In contrast and consequent dissociation from the “Reduktionsform des Strukturalismus” [reductionist form of Structuralism] (Jakobson), Kenneth L. Pike (1967) develops his text model of *tagmemics*, which is indebted to the

Firth School, unlike Chomsky's GTG (Generative Transformative Grammar), however, it is received rather cautiously. The model basically depends on six principles: (i) on the distinction of "emic" units for this system and "etic" units for the process (which was deduced by Hjelmslev); (ii) on the definition of the text (not the phrase) as supreme unit of analysis; (iii) on the notion of the "tag-mem", determined by form and function, and analogue structure units; (iv) on a grammatical hierarchy of elements (cf. Halliday's model of *strata*); (v) on the concept of the "matrix" (which extends the notion of the paradigm), and the "logical field" respectively; (vi) on the connection of the grammatical with a referential hierarchy (which overcomes the anti-semantic rigorism of the Bloomfield School). The level model, which is "open to the top", furthermore permits a crossing of the language border (*uttereme*) to the non-linguistic action (*behavioreme*), as long as subordinate units invariably assume communicatively relevant functions in superordinates, whereby "wir unausweichlich auf die Relevanz der Kultur [und] des nicht-verbalen Verhaltens als desjenigen Kontextes verwiesen [sind], in dem große linguistische Einheiten ihre Funktion haben" [we are inevitably referred to the relevance of culture and the non-verbal behaviour as the context in which large linguistic units have their function] (PIKE 1967: 288; cf. GÜLICH and RAIBLE 1977: 97–115).

VIII. Liège

Perhaps the most closely connected school to the classic rhetoric beside the structural doctrine of figures (e.g. Genette) is the Liège School, which figures as *Groupe μ* (the initial stands for *μεταφορά* [metaphorá]), around Jacques Dubois (and Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, Francois Pire, Hadelin Trinon), at the interdisciplinary *Centre d'Études Poétiques* of the university of Liège. In its *Rhétorique générale* (DUBOIS 1970, Eng. 1981) it builds on the *quadripartita ratio* of the Quintilianian style classes and strives to render their (in the original: its) basic operations of *adiection*, *detractio*, *transmutatio* and *immutatio* utilisable for a linguistic systematisation of the inventory of rhetorical figures and tropes. Quintilian's *mutatio* (or what is, loosely speaking, called *ostranenie* or *priěm* respectively in Moscow, *aktualizace* in Prague, *foregrounding* in London, *écart* in Paris) is approximately matched by what in Liège is called *métabole*: a specific selection from the sign repertoire, which signifies an alteration of the expected, an alienation, emphasis, a renewal, distinction from the usual and hence directs the recipient's attention towards the code. Generally, this has been simplistically described as "deviation from the norm" (PLETT 1975), as a linguistic devi-

ant (*écart linguistique*) from a stylistic “idle state” or zero degree (*degré zero*), which albeit falls somewhat short (HESS-LÜTTICH 1985: 187ff.).

In a similar perspective as in the London School’s systemic functional grammar, the *metaboles* are sorted by levels (*niveaux*), which they *realise* (not constitute) semiotically. The figures of the *adiection*, *detractio*, *transmutatio* and the tropes of the *immutatio* return in the substantial operations of the *adjonction* and *suppression* (and their combination) on the one hand, and in the relational operations of the *permutation* on the other hand. They are arranged (in vague orientation to the Hjelmslevian sign model) in the form oriented *metaplasm*s and the sense oriented *metasememes* of the word level as well as the form oriented *metataxes* and the sense oriented *metalogisms* of the phrase level. The area of metaplasm thereby contains morphological figures (metamorphes) as well as grapho- and phonostylistic alterations (metagraphs and metaphones), which are evoked on all levels by the operations of addition, detraction, immutation and transmutation. The same takes effect for the metataxes, which (in the sense of the London terminology) are to be interpreted as syntactic processes of colligative combination alterations, and for metasemes, which concern the decisions of selection. The metalogisms transform the logic structure of certain sequences and correspond soonest with the tradition of rhetoric figures of thought.

With all criticism of its deviation aesthetic premises and syntactic reductionisms (HESS-LÜTTICH 1985: 186–196) the structural model of the *Groupe μ* still allows for the systematic assignment of rhetorical figures and tropes to linguistically defined classes, due to its elaborated and categorical net of notions, along with revealing breaches in the system, which can figure as search categories for the definition and positioning of new rhetorical phenomena and such that are not yet covered in classic compilations (e.g. Lausberg). Furthermore, the model does not only aim for a systematic reformulation of the *elocution*, but due to its consequent orientation towards the structural methodology also for an application of the *rhetoriké téchnē* in the analysis of non-linguistic and polycoded texts as a contribution to a *rhetorique de l’image* (GROUPE μ 1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMZIK, Kirsten. 2004. *Textlinguistik. Eine einführende Darstellung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004.
- ALBRECHT, Jörn. 2000. *Europäischer Strukturalismus*. Tübingen/Basel: Francke, 2000.
- ARNOLD, Heinz Ludwig, and Heinrich DETERING (eds.). 1996. *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft*. München: dtv, 1996.
- BAK, Hyun-Mi. 1994. *Grundprobleme der strukturalen Textsemantik*. Berlin: Köster, 1994.
- BARTHES, Roland. 1957. *Mythologies*. Paris: Seuil, 1957.
- BARTHES, Roland. 1970a. *S/Z*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
- BARTHES, Roland. 1970b. L'ancienne rhétorique: aide-mémoire. In *Communications 16: Recherches rhétoriques* (1970): 172–237.
- BARTHES, Roland. 1973. *Le plaisir du texte*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.
- BARTHES, Roland. 1988. *Das semiologische Abenteuer*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- BIERWISCH, Manfred. 1966. *Strukturalismus. Kursbuch 5* (1966): 77–152.
- BIRUS, Hendrik, Sebastian DONAT, and Burkhard MEYER-SICKENDIEK (eds.). 2003. *Roman Jakobsons Gedichtanalysen. Eine Herausforderung an die Philologien*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003.
- BLUMENSATH, Heinz (ed.). 1972. *Strukturalismus in der Literaturwissenschaft*. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1972.
- BOUDON, Raymond. 1973. *Strukturalismus. Methode und Kritik*. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1973.
- BREMOND, Claude. 1973. *Logique du récit*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.
- BROEKMAN, Jan M. 1971. *Strukturalismus. Moskau – Prag – Paris*. Freiburg/München: Alber, 1971.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.
- CHVATÍK, Květoslav. 1981. *Tschechoslowakischer Strukturalismus*. Munich: Fink, 1981.
- CICERO, Marcus Tullius. [1970] 1977. *Brutus*. Ed. by Bernhard Kytzler. Munich: Heimeran, 1977.
- COQUET, Jean-Claude. 1982. *Sémiose: L'école de Paris*. Paris: Klingsieck, 1982.
- COSERIU, Eugenio. 1969. *Einführung in die strukturelle Linguistik*. Tübingen: Narr, 1969.
- COSERIU, Eugenio. 1977. *Tradición y novedad en la ciencia del lenguaje*. Madrid: Gredos, 1977.
- CULLER, Jonathan. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics*. London: Routledge, 1975.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. 1992. *Woran erkennt man den Strukturalismus?* Berlin: Merve, 1992.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. 2004. Der ununterbrochene Dialog: zwischen zwei Unendlichkeiten, das Gedicht. In id. and Hans-Georg Gadamer. *Der ununterbrochene Dialog*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2004: 7–50.
- DOSSE, François. 1999. *Geschichte des Strukturalismus*. 2 Vols. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1999.
- DUBOIS, Jacques et al. (eds.). 1970. *Rhétorique générale*. Paris: Larousse, 1970.

- DYCK, Joachim, and Gert UEDING (eds.). 1990. *Rhetorik und Strukturalismus* (= Jahrbuch der Rhetorik 9). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1990.
- ECO, Umberto. 1973. *La struttura assente* [The Absent Structure]. Milan: Bompiani, 1973.
- ECO, Umberto. 1985. *Semiotik und Philosophie der Sprache*. Munich: Fink, 1985.
- EIMERMACHER, Karl (ed.). 1986. *Semiotica Sovietica. Sowjetische Arbeiten der Moskauer und Tartuer Schule*. 2 Vols. Aachen: Rader, 1986.
- FAGES, Jean-Baptiste. 1974. *Den Strukturalismus verstehen*. Gießen: Achenbach 1974.
- FEHR, Johannes (ed.). 2003. *Ferdinand de Saussure. Linguistik und Semiology*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2003.
- FIETZ, Lothar. 1998. *Strukturalismus*. Tübingen: Narr, 1998.
- FIRTH, John Rupert. [1935] 1957. The technique of semantics. In *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957: 7–33.
- FLEISCHER, Michael. 1989. *Die sowjetische Semiotik. Theoretische Grundlagen der Moskauer und Tartuer Schule*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1989.
- FLEISCHER, Michael. 1998. Die Schule von Moskau und Tartu. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998: 2289–2300.
- FOHRMANN, Jürgen & Harro MÜLLER (eds.). 1988. *Diskurstheorien und Literaturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- FORTUNATIANUS. 1979. *Ars rhetorica*. Ed. by Lucia Calboli Montefusco. Bologna: Pàtron, 1979.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1969.
- FRANK, Manfred. [1983] 2001. *Was ist Neostrukturalismus?* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001.
- FÜSSEL, Kuno. 1983. *Zeichen und Strukturen*. Münster: Edition liberación, 1983.
- FUHRMANN, Manfred. 1984. *Die antike Rhetorik*. Munich/Zürich: Artemis, 1984.
- FUHRMANN, Manfred. 1997. *Redekunst am Beispiel Ciceros*. Stuttgart/Düsseldorf/Leipzig: Klett, 1997.
- GABELENTZ, Georg von der. 1984. *Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. Tübingen: Narr, 1984.
- GARVIN, Paul L. (ed.). 1964. *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Academic Press, 1964.
- GARZ, Detlef (ed.). 1994. *Die Welt als Text*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1994.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1966–2002. *Figures I–V*. Paris: Seuil, 1966–2002.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1972. Strukturalismus und Literaturwissenschaft. In Blumen-sath (ed.). *Strukturalismus in der Literaturwissenschaft*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1972: 73–88.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1976. *Mimologiques*. Paris: Seuil, 1976.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1979. *Introduction à l'architexte*. Paris: Seuil, 1979.

- GENETTE, Gérard. 1982. *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1991. *Fiction et dictum*. Paris: Points, Seuil, 1991.
- GENSKE, Dieter, and Ernest W. B. HESS-LÜTTICH. 1998. Zeit-Zeichen in der Geologie. Über die Vorgesichte der Geo-Semiotik. In Hess-Lüttich, and Schlieben-Lange (eds.). *Signs & Time Zeit und Zeichen*. Tübingen: Narr, 1998: 133–151.
- GREIMAS, Algirdas Julien. 1966. *Sémantique structurale*. Paris: Larousse, 1966.
- GROUPE M. 1992. *Traité du signe visuel – Pour une rhétorique de l'image*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.
- GRÜBEL, Rainer. 1998. Der Russische Formalismus. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998: 2233–2248.
- GRZYBEK, Peter. 1989. *Studien zum Zeichenbegriff der sowjetischen Semiotik*. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1989.
- GÜLICH, Elisabeth, and Wolfgang RABBLE. 1977. *Linguistische Textmodelle*. Munich: Fink, 1977.
- HALLIDAY, Michael A. K. 1977. Text as Semantic Choice in Social Contexts. In Dijk, Teun A. van, and János S. Petöfi (eds.). *Grammars and Descriptions*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1977: 176–225.
- HALLIDAY, Michael A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Arnold, 1978.
- HEESCHEN, Claus. 1972. *Grundfragen der Linguistik*. Stuttgart etc.: Kohlhammer, 1972.
- HELBIG, Gerhard. 1973. *Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*. Leipzig: VEB Bibliograph. Inst.; Munich: Hueber, 1973.
- HEMPFER, Klaus W. 1976. *Poststrukturelle Theorie und narrative Praxis*. Munich: Fink, 1976.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. 1974. Das sprachliche Register. In *Deutsche Sprache* 4 (1974): 269–286.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. 1985. *Zeichen und Schichten in Drama und Theater* (= Soziale Interaktion und literarischer Dialog II). Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1985.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. 1997. Text, Intertext, Hypertext. Zur Texttheorie der Hypertextualität. In Josef Klein, and Ulla Fix (eds.). *Textbeziehungen. Linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997: 125–148.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B., and Gesine L. SCHIEWER. 1998. Lamberts Semiotik. Gedächtnis, Erkenntnis, Kommunikation. In Hess-Lüttich, and Schlieben-Lange (eds.). *Signs & Time Zeit und Zeichen*. Tübingen: Narr, 1998: 208–227.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B., and Brigitte SCHLIEBEN-LANGE (eds.). 1998. *Signs & Time Zeit und Zeichen*. Tübingen: Narr, 1998.
- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. 1999. Towards a Narratology of Holistic Texts: the Textual Theory of Hypertext. In Sam Inkkinen (ed.). *Mediapolis. Aspects of Texts, Hypertexts and Multimedial Communication*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1999: 3–20.

- HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B., and Daniel RELLSTAB. 2005. Zeichen/Semiotik der Künste. In Karlheinz Barck et al. (eds.). *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe*. Vol. 7. Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 2005: 247–282.
- HOCKETT, Charles F. 1976. Eine Bemerkung über Struktur. In Elisabeth Bense, Peter Eisenberg, and Harmut Haberland (eds.). *Beschreibungsmethoden des amerikanischen Strukturalismus*, Munich: Hueber, 1976: 299–302.
- HODGE, Robert, and Gunther KRESS. 1988. *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
- HOLENSTEIN, Elmar. 1975. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- HOLENSTEIN, Elmar. 1976. *Linguistik, Semiotik, Hermeneutik*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976.
- HWR cf. UEDING, ed. 1992–2005.
- IHWE, Jens (ed.). 1971. *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*. 3 Vols. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1971.
- IHWE, Jens (ed.). 1972/73. *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*. 2 Vols. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1972/73.
- IVANOV, Vjačeslav V. (ed.). 1962. *Simpozium po strukturnomu izučenij znakovych sistem*. Moscow: Akademii Naus SSSR, 1962.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. 1960. Linguistics and Poetics. In Stephen Rudy (ed.). *Select-
ed Writings*. Vol. 3. *Poetry of Grammar
and Grammar of Poetry*. The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton, 1981: 18–51.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. 1961. Poèzija grammatiki i grammatika poëzii [Poetry of grammar and grammar of poetry]. In K. Pomorska, and Stephen Rudy (eds.). *Language in Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987: 121–144.
- JAKOBSON, Roman, and Claude LÉVI-STRAUSS. 1962. Les Chats'de Charles Baudelaire. In *L'Homme. Revue française d'anthropologie* 2 (1962): 2: 5–21.
- JÄGER, Ludwig 1976. Der saussuresche Begriff des Aposème als Grundlagenbegriff einer hermeneutischen Semiotologie. In Ludwig Jäger, and Christian Stetter (eds.). *Zeichen und Verstehen*. Aachen: Rader, 1986: 7–34.
- JÄGER, Ludwig (ed.). 2003. *Ferdinand de Saussure. Wissenschaft von der Sprache*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2003.
- JOHANSEN, Jørgen Dines. 1998. Hjelmslev and Glossematics. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.) *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998: 2272–2289.
- KIM, Taehwan. 2002. *Vom Aktantenmodell zur Semiotik der Leidenschaften. Eine Studie zur narrativen Semiotik von Algirdas J. Greimas*. Tübingen: Narr, 2002.
- KNAPE, Joachim. 1996. Figurenlehre [Rhetorical Figures]. In Gert Ueding (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 3. Darmstadt: M. Niemeyer, 1996: 289–342.
- KOERNER, Ernst F. Konrad. 1974. Animadversions on some recent claims regarding the relationship between Georg von der Gabelentz and Ferdinand de Saussure. In *Studi saussuriani par Robert Godel*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1974: 165–180.

- KOERNER, Ernst F. Konrad. 1990. Ferdinand de Saussure and the question of the sources of his linguistic theory. In Ricarda Liver, Iwar Werlen, and Peter Wunderli (eds.). *Sprachtheorie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft* (= Fs. Engler). Tübingen: Narr, 1990: 153–166.
- KRISTEVA, Julia. 1969. *Semeiotikè. Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
- LACAN, Jacques. 1964. *Le Séminaire de Jacques Lacan XI: Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychoanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1964.
- LACHMANN, Renate (ed.). 1982. *Dialogizität*. Munich: Fink, 1982.
- LANGENDOEN, Terence D. 1968. *The London School of Linguistics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1968.
- LAUSBERG, Heinrich 1990. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*. Munich: Hueber, 1990.
- LEECH, Geoffrey N. 1966. *Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric*. London: Routledge, 1966.
- LEPSCHY, Giulio C. 1969. *Die strukturelle Sprachwissenschaft*. Munich: Nymphenburger, 1969.
- LEPSCHY, Giulio C. 1981. *Mutamenti di prospettiva nella linguistica*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1981.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. 1958. *Anthropologie structurale*. Paris: Plon, 1958.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. 1960. *Traurige Tropen*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1960.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. 1962. *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon, 1962.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. 1981. *Die elementaren Strukturen der Verwandtschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1981.
- LIEBERG, Godo. 1956. Der Begriff ‘structura’ in der lateinischen Literatur. *Hermes* 84 (1956): 4: 455–477.
- LOTMAN, Jurij M. 1972. *Die Struktur literarischer Texte*. Munich: Fink, 1972.
- LOTMAN, Jurij M. 1973. *Die Struktur des künstlerischen Textes*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1973.
- LOTMAN, Jurij M. 1990. *Universe of Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- LUX, Friedemann. 1981. *Text, Situation, Textsorte*. Tübingen: Narr, 1981.
- MAN, Paul de. 1983. *Blindness and Insight. Essays on the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Minneapolis: Minneapolis University Press, 1983.
- MAN, Paul de. 1979. *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- MCQUILLAN, Martin. 2001. *Paul de Man*. London/New York: Routledge, 2001.
- MEYER, Urs. 2005. Strukturale Literaturwissenschaft und rhe-torische Textanalyse. In Gert Ueding (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 7. Darmstadt: M. Niemeyer, 1996: 1472–1494.
- MONAGHAN, James. 1979. *The Neo-Firthian Tradition and its Contribution to General Linguistics*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1979.
- MOTSCH, Wolfgang. 1974. *Zur Kritik des sprachwissenschaftlichen Strukturalismus*. Berlin: Akademie, 1974.

- MÜHLHÖLZER, Felix, and Gerhard PLUMPE. 1998. Strukturalismus. *Wörterbuch der Philosophie* 10 (1998): 342–350.
- MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1934/1976. L'art comme fait sémiologique [Art as Semiotic Fact]. In *Actes du 8^e Congrès international de philosophie*. Prague (1936): 1065–1072.
- MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1941. Mezi poezíí a výtvarnictvím [Between Poetry and Arts]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 7: 1–16.
- MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1977. *The Word and Verbal Art*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1977.
- NÖTH, Winfried. 2000. *Handbuch der Semiotik*. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 2000.
- OPPITZ, Michael. 1975. *Notwendige Beziehungen. Abriß einer strukturalen Anthropologie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- OSTHEEREN, Klaus. 1996. Generative Rhetorik. In Gert Ueding (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 3. Darmstadt: M. Niemeyer, 1996: 730–737.
- OSTHEEREN, Klaus. 1997. Theorie und Praxis einer Generativen Rhetorik: Zu Götz Wienolds Formulierungstheorie. *Anglia* 97 (1997): 439–451.
- OVIDIUS NASO, Publius. 1963. *Tristia. Epistulas ex Ponto*. Ed. by Georg Luck. Zürich and Stuttgart: Artemis, 1963.
- PARRET, Herman. 1998. Greimas and his School. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998: 2300–2311.
- PIAGET, Jean. 1980. *Der Strukturalismus*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980.
- PIKE, Kenneth L. 1967. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1967.
- PLETT, Heinrich F. 1975. *Textwissenschaft und Textanalyse. Semiotik, Linguistik, Rhetorik*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1975.
- PLETT, Heinrich F. 2000. *Systematische Rhetorik*. Munich: Fink, 2000.
- POSNER, Roland, Klaus ROBERING, and Thomas A. SEBEOK (eds.). 1998. *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998.
- PROSS, Caroline, and Gerald WILDGRUBER. 1996. Dekonstruktion. In Heinz Ludwig Arnold, and Heinrich Detering (eds.). *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft*. München: dtv, 1996: 408–429.
- PÜSCHEL, Ulrich. 1985. Das Stilmuster 'Abweichen'. Sprachpragmatische Überlegungen zur Abweichungsstilistik. *Sprache und Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 55 (1985): 9–24.
- QUINTILIANUS, Marcus Fabius. 1988. *M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri XII*. Ed. Helmut Rahn. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges, 1988.
- RITTER, Joachim, Karlfried GRÜNDER, and Gottfried GABRIEL (eds.). 1971–2005. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* (= HWdPH). 13 Vols. Basel: Schwabe; Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges, 1971–2005.
- RUDY, Stephen, and Linda WAUGH. 1998. Jakobson and Structuralism. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics*

- (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998: 2256–2271.
- RUSTERHOLZ, Peter. 1996. Zum Verhältnis von Hermeneutik und neueren anti-hermeneutischen Strömungen. In Heinz Ludwig Arnold, and Heinrich Detering (eds.). *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich: dtv, 1996: 157–177.
- RUSTERHOLZ, Peter. 1998. Poststrukturalistische Semiotik. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1998: 2329–2339.
- SANDERS, Willy. 1973. *Linguistische Stiltheorie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- SCHAFF, Adam. 1974. *Strukturalismus und Marxismus*. Munich: Europaverlag, 1974.
- SCHIEWER, Gesine L. 1996. *Cognition symbolica – Lamberts semiotische Wissenschaft und ihre Diskussion bei Herder, Jean Paul und Novalis*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996.
- SCHIWY, Günther. 1969. *Der französische Strukturalismus*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1969.
- SOLBACH, Andreas. 1994. *Evidentia und Erzähltheorie. Die Rhetorik anschaulichen Erzählens in der Frühmoderne und ihre antiken Quellen*. Munich: Fink, 1994.
- SPECK, Stefan. 1997. *Von Šklovskij zu de Man: Zur Aktualität formalistischer Literaturtheorie*. Munich: Fink, 1997.
- STETTER, Christian. 1997. *Schrift und Sprache*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1997.
- STIX, Bettina. 1997. *Rhetorische Aufmerksamkeit. Formalistische und strukturalistische Vorgaben in Paul de Mans*
- Methode der Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich: Fink, 1997.
- THIBAULT, Paul J. 1998. Structuralism. In Paul Bouissac (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Semiotics*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1998: 598–601.
- THOM, René. 1975. *Structural Stability and Morphogenesis*. London: Longman, 1975.
- THOM, René. 1980. *Modèles mathématiques de la morphogenèse*. Paris: Bourgois, 1980.
- TITZMANN, Michael. 1977. *Strukturale Textanalyse*. Munich: Fink, 1977.
- TITZMANN, Michael. 2003a. Struktur, Strukturalismus. In Jan-Dirk Müller et al. (eds.). *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*. Vol. 3. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2003: 532–539.
- TITZMANN, Michael. 2003b. Semiotische Aspekte der Literaturwissenschaft: Literatursemiotik. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics* (= HSK vol. 13.3). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2003: 3028–3103.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan. 1967. Essai de classification [Essay on Clasification]. In *Littérature et signification*. Paris: Larousse, 1967: 107–114.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan. 1969. *Grammaire du Décaméron*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1969.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan. 1973. *Poétique* (= *Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme?* vol. 2). Paris: Points, Seuil, 1973.
- TRABANT, Jürgen. 1970. *Zur Semiolegie des literarischen Kunstwerks*. Munich: Fink, 1970.
- TRABANT, Jürgen. 1990. *Traditionen Humboldts*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1990.

- UEDING, Gert, and Bernd STEINBRINK. 1994. *Grundriß der Rhetorik*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994.
- UEDING, Gert (ed.). 1992–2012. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Vols. 1–10. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992–2012.
- UEDING, Gert. 2000a. *Klassische Rhetorik*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000.
- UEDING, Gert. 2000b. *Moderne Rhetorik. Von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000.
- ULDALL, Hans Jørgen. 1957. *Outline of Glossematics I: General Theory* (= Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague 10). Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag, 1957.
- VATER, Heinz. 1982. *Strukturalismus und Transformationsgrammatik*. Trier: Wiss. Verlag Trier, 1982.
- VITRUVIUS, 1964. *De architectura libri decem* [Ten Books on Architecture]. Ed. by Curt Fensterbusch. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges, 1964.
- WAHL, François (ed.). 1981. *Einführung in den Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1981.
- WESTERMANN, Rainer. 1987. *Strukturalistische Theorienkonzeption und empirische Forschung in der Psychologie*. Heidelberg etc.: Springer, 1987.
- WEYDT, Harald. 1976. *Noam Chomskys Werk*. Tübingen: Narr, 1976.
- WIENOLD, Götz. 1971. *Formulierungstheorie, Poetik, Strukturelle Literaturgeschichte am Beispiel der altenglischen Dichtung*. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1971.
- WINNER, Thomas G. 1998. Prague Functionalism. In Roland Posner et al. (eds.). *Semiotik Semiotics*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1998: 2248–2255.

Prof. Dr. Dr. Dr. h.c. Ernest W. B. Hess-Lüttich is Full Professor of German (Language and Literature) at the University of Bern (Switzerland) and Hon. Professor Extraordinary at the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa). His main fields of research are dialogue studies and discourse analysis as well as intercultural pragmatics and media studies. To date, he has written and edited some 40 books and published more than 320 articles in scholarly journals, handbooks, and editions. He was president of the German Association for Semiotic Studies and is president of the international Association for intercultural German Studies. He is also a member of numerous editorial and advisory boards as well as honorary member of the Hungarian Association of German Studies. He has received an honorary doctorate (from Budapest) and lectured as visiting professor at major universities on all five continents.

Summary

Ernest W. B. Hess-Lüttich: The Schools of Structuralism – An Overview

The Impact of Prague School Structuralism on other Centres of Textual Analysis

The paper is devoted to an important aspect of the history of science in the field of linguistics and literary studies. It presents a brief survey of some of the Structuralist approaches to textual analysis in the main linguistic schools influenced by the Prague School in the 20th century. The ‘city tour’ starts in Geneva, Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Tartu and Prague, and goes on to Copenhagen, Paris, London, New York, ending in Lüttich (or Liège or Luik).



Ernest W. B. Hess-Lüttich

Photograph © KDS FF MU