

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Historiographia Linguistica* 47:2/3
© 2020. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/content/customers/rights>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Last Lectures. Collège de France 1968 and 1969. By Émile Benveniste. Edited by Jean-Claude Coquet & Irène Fenoglio. Translated by John E. Joseph. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2019. xii, 183 pp. ISBN 978 1 4744 3990 9 Hb, 978 1 4744 3991 6 Pb, 978 1 4744 3993 0 epub. Scottish £ 29.99

Reviewed by Pierre Swiggers (K.U. Leuven / F.W.O. Research Foundation – Flanders)

1. *Benveniste's "Dernières Leçons": A tragic Textgeschichte*

On Monday December 1, 1969 Émile¹ Benveniste (1902–1976) gave the opening lecture of his cycle of *leçons* at the Collège de France for the academic year 1969–1970. The first sentences of the lecture are worth quoting:

Nous continuons cette année l'étude commencée l'an dernier sur les problèmes du sens dans la langue, et, en particulier, parmi les systèmes sémiologiques, l'étude du système de l'écriture, qui nous a retenus longtemps.

Il devient d'autant plus nécessaire de poursuivre cette étude du sens qu'elle se place aujourd'hui dans des circonstances objectives plus favorables que par le passé. (*DL* p.139)²

Benveniste announced then an encompassing study of 'meaning' in language, starting from the notions of 'sign' and 'sign system', and crucially involving the distinction between *le sémiotique* ('the semiotic', i.e. the dimension of formal distinctiveness of signs, as a basic condition for their meaningful use), and *le*

1. In order to maintain uniformity in the use of the initial *É* (used in the French and English editions of Benveniste's last lectures), I will be using in this review the spelling *Émile*; Françoise Bader (2013) has pointed out that Benveniste himself wrote (and wanted to have printed) his first name as *Emile* without accent (this was the name he adopted when he became a French citizen in 1924; his original first name was *Ezra*).

2. Translation: "This year we shall continue the study begun last year on the problems of meaning in a language, and the study of the writing system, which, amongst semiological systems, has long particularly occupied us. It becomes all the more necessary to pursue the study of meaning as this study is now in more favourable objective circumstances than in the past" (*LL* p.121). I will use the abbreviations *DL* for *Dernières leçons* (= Benveniste 2012) and *LL* for *Last Lectures* (= the book under review).

sémantique ('the semantic', i.e. the socio-cultural content of signs-in-use).³ This crucial distinction — which Benveniste had then recently arrived at (he presented it in his 1968 address at the first meeting of the International Symposium of Semiotics at Warsaw [August 25 – September 1, 1968]; see Benveniste 1969) — opened new perspectives for linguistics; what is even more intriguing in the lines quoted above is the inclusion of writing within the scope of lectures on general linguistics.

Five days later, on Saturday December 6, Benveniste suffered a severe stroke. He was hospitalised and diagnosed with partial paralysis, hemiplegia and aphasia. Although at times emerging from his comatose state and regaining conscience, he was condemned to a bedridden existence and never recovered speech. During the subsequent six years and a half, he was moved from one hospital to another; finally, in May 1976 he was placed in a care home in Versailles. There he died on October 3, 1976, struck by an embolism. General linguistics had lost one of its most brilliant representatives.⁴

As the two volumes of his *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (Benveniste 1966, 1974)⁵ forcefully demonstrate, Benveniste was an outstanding representative of a ('truly') general linguistics' (cf. Fenoglio 2019:18–24),⁶ i.e. an all-

3. The (crucial) distinction between *le* and *la sémiotique* and *le* and *la sémantique* was not understood by the organisers of the 1968 semiotics conference, nor by Redard (in *DL* p.162). This is set straight by Irène Fenoglio and Jean-Claude Coquet (*DL* p.44 = *LL* p.64; see also two notes by John Joseph in *LL* p.28 n.11 and p.154 n.43), and cf. Fenoglio (2019:32–35).

4. See the well-informed necrological essays by Seiler (1977), Bolelli (1978) and Malkiel (1980). Moïnfar (1975) is a comprehensive bibliography of Benveniste's writings; see the supplement in Brunet & Mahrer (eds. 2011:7–13) and in Laplantine (2012). Since the publication of the volume *Émile Benveniste aujourd'hui* (Serbat ed. 1984), there has been a tremendously increasing interest in the work of Benveniste, as testified to by paperback reeditions of the *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, by the edition of selected texts (Benveniste 2015), and by the publication of collective volumes (cf. Brunet & Mahrer eds. 2011; D'Ottavi & Fenoglio eds. 2019; Fenoglio et al. 2016).

5. Of these two volumes (the second of which appeared during Benveniste's hospitalisation; the editors responsible for the papers included in this second volume decided to adopt the overall division into six sections which Benveniste had decided upon for the first volume) only the first was fully translated into English (see Benveniste 1971). The six sections are: "Transformations de la linguistique" (which in the first volume of the *Problèmes* includes the thought-stimulating overview of general linguistics, originally published as Benveniste 1954); "La communication", "Structures et analyses", "Fonctions syntaxiques"; "L'homme dans la langue"; "Lexique et culture".

6. From the outset of his last lectures, Benveniste defines his stand: "Nous allons donc continuer à parler de problèmes de 'linguistique générale'. C'est une notion qu'on entend en sens divers. On peut donner au terme 'général' une valeur dimensionnelle: l'ensemble des langues, les lois de leur évolution. Telle que je la comprends, la linguistique générale est la linguistique

encompassing reflection, nourished by the intimate knowledge of a wide variety of languages, on the nature, function, evolution, and variety of human language, in all its richness and complexity.

Thanks to the efforts of Irène Fenoglio and Jean-Claude Coquet, Benveniste's last lectures have been made accessible to a large audience. The edition is based on the transcription made by Arlette Attali and Valentina Chepiga of Benveniste's handwritten notes,⁷ which — together with other manuscripts — were donated to the Bibliothèque nationale de France by Georges Redard (1922–2005),⁸ as well as on the course notes taken by Jean-Claude Coquet (b. 1928), completed with those of Jacqueline Authier-Revuz (b. 1940) and Claudine Normand (1934–2011).

2. *The French connection: The original publication*

In the French original edition,⁹ published under the title *Dernières leçons – Collège de France 1968 et 1969*, the text of the lectures occupies pp.57–146. Benveniste's text is preceded by a brief biography ("Chronologie biographique d'Émile Benveniste", *DL* pp.9–12), and two introductory essays, one by Julia Kristeva ("Émile Benveniste, un linguiste qui ne dit ni ne cache, mais signifie", *DL* pp.13–40), and one by Jean-Claude Coquet and Irène Fenoglio ("Introduction", *DL* pp.41–56).¹⁰ The text of Benveniste's lectures is followed by three annexes: a bio-bibliographical sketch¹¹ by Georges Redard ("Émile Benveniste (1902–1976)",

qui s'interroge sur elle-même, sur sa définition, sur son objet, sur son statut et sur ses démarches" (*DL* p.60). [English translation: "We shall, then, continue talking about problems in 'general linguistics'. This notion is understood in various senses. The term 'general' can be given a dimensional value: the set of languages, the laws of their evolution. General linguistics as I understand it is the linguistics which questions itself about itself, its definition, its object, its status and its approaches" (*LL* p.74)]. Benveniste's handwritten text (Bibl. nationale de France, PAP, OR, boîte 40, enveloppe 80, f° 4) reads: "Nous allons donc continuer à parler de linguistique générale, de problèmes de linguistique générale".

7. The French edition reproduces a number of manuscript sheets of Benveniste's notes (see *DL* pp.52, 53, 58, 59, 64, 72, 74, 78, 80, 86, 88, 90, 99, 103, 105, 111, 116, 118, 123, 130, 133, 134, 141, 146, 147).

8. Benveniste's field notes on American Indian languages (Haida, Tlingit, Inuit) were donated by Redard to the University of Fairbanks.

9. See the reviews by Bader (2013), Chevalier (2012) and Maggiori (2012).

10. In my view it would have been better to have opened the volume with this introduction, especially since it offers an overview of the organisation of the book.

11. Redard's text was edited by Jean-Claude Coquet and Irène Fenoglio on the basis of a typewritten document (apparently dating back to 1977), which was conceived, but never finished, as a comprehensive bio-bibliography of Benveniste. A substantial part of this document

DL pp.151–174), a note by Émilie Brunet on the Benveniste papers conserved in France and in the United States (“Les papiers d’Émile Benveniste”, *DL* pp.175–180), and a “postface” by Tzvetan Todorov (1939–2017) (“Émile Benveniste, le destin d’un savant”, *DL* pp.181–195). The French volume is rounded off with an Index of personal names (*DL* pp.199–200), an Index of concepts (*DL* pp.201–203), a list of the illustrations with the credits to the owners (*DL* pp.205–207), and the table of contents (*DL* pp.209–210).

3. *John Joseph’s translation*

The book under review is the English translation, by John Joseph, of the French volume of 2012. It does not include illustrations and ends with the Name Index (*LL* pp.179–181) and the Subject Index (*LL* pp.182–183); a substantial addition is the “Translator’s Introduction” (*LL* pp.31–60).¹² Also, John Joseph has compiled a much more extensive Index of Names (including some 190 items), in comparison with the selective one in the French original (some 35 items); he has also reorganised and slightly extended the index of concepts:¹³

is included in the volume: “Nous [= J.-C.C. and I.F.] proposons un long fragment de ce texte qui se présente sous la forme d’un document de travail dactylographié et corrigé à la main, par Redard lui-même – nous le supposons” (*DL* p.149).

12. The book opens with “Biographical Information” on the contributors (*LL* pp.vi–vii), the “Editors’ Acknowledgements” (*LL* p.vii), and a “Biographical Timeline” (*LL* pp.ix–xii); Kristeva’s Preface is on pp.1–30, and the Introduction by Coquet and Fenoglio on pp.61–73. The translation of Benveniste’s lectures is on pp.74–127. The three appendices are on pp.128–156 (G. Redard), pp.157–162 (É. Brunet) and pp.163–178 (T. Todorov).

13. One item of the French index, viz. “*Il*” (*DL* p.202, unfortunately not italicised) is absent from the English index of subjects. This is probably due to the fact that John Joseph adopted a divergent translation strategy for the two relevant key passages in the French text. The passage in *DL* p.51 (text of Coquet and Fenoglio): “Le « nous » interpersonnel est tenu pour un « point fixe » bientôt dépassé; il s’oppose à la classe des humains dont l’indice linguistique est le « il » notant l’« absence de personne »” is translated, in *LL* p.68, as “The interpersonal ‘us’ is taken as a ‘fixed point’, quickly surpassed: it is in opposition to the class of humans of which the linguistic index is the ‘it’ marking the ‘absence of anyone’”; the passage in *DL* p.79 (text of Benveniste): “La base est fournie par la langue: en exemple, le système des pronoms, *je/tu* versus *il*” is translated, in *LL* p.85, as: “The basis is provided by the language: for example, the pronoun system, *I/you* versus *he/she/it*”. Personally, I would have generalised the option *he/she/it*, especially since in the translation of Julia Kristeva’s text, the opposition between first, second and third person is rendered with *I* vs. *you* vs. *he/she*: “This activity activates the language in the *discourse* situation addressed by the ‘first person’ (*I*) to the ‘second person’ (*you*), the third (*he/she*) being situated outside discourse” (*LL* p.7).

*DL*Chapitre 1 *Sémiologie*

- 2 décembre 1968

Première leçon

58–62

- 9 décembre 1968

Leçon 2

63–65 (p.66 blank)

- 16 décembre 1968

Leçon 3

67–69 (p.70 blank)

- 6 janvier 1969

Leçon 4

71–75 (p.76 blank)

- 13 janvier 1969

Leçon 5

77–80

- 20 janvier 1969

Leçon 6

81–83 (p.84 blank)

- 27 janvier 1969

Leçon 7

85–88

Chapitre 2 *La langue et l'écriture*

- 3 février 1969

Leçon 8

90–95 (p.96 blank)

- 10 février 1969

Leçon 9

97–100

- 17 février 1969

Leçon 10

101–106

- 24 février 1969

Leçon 11

107–111 (p.112 blank)

*LL*1 *Semiology*

- 2 December 1968

First Lecture

74–76

- 9 December 1968

Second Lecture

76–78

- 16 December 1968

Third Lecture

79–80

- 6 January 1969

Fourth Lecture

80–83

- 13 January 1969

Fifth Lecture

83–85

- 20 January 1969

Sixth Lecture

85–87

- 27 January 1969

Seventh Lecture

87–89

[Notes for Part 1: 89–90]

2 *Languages and Writing*

- 3 February 1969

Eighth Lecture

91–95

- 10 February 1969

Ninth Lecture

95–99

- 17 February 1969

Tenth Lecture

99–102

- 24 February 1969

Eleventh Lecture

102–106

▪ 3 mars 1969	▪ 3 March 1969
Leçon 12	Twelfth Lecture
113–116	106–108
▪ 10 mars 1969	▪ 10 March 1969
Leçon 13	Thirteenth Lecture
117–120	109–111
▪ 17 mars 1969	▪ 17 March 1969
Leçon 14	Fourteenth Lecture
121–125 (p. 126 blank)	111–114
▪ 24 mars 1969	▪ 24 March 1969
Leçon 15	Fifteenth Lecture
127–135	114–119
	[Notes for Part 2: 119–120]
Chapitre 3 <i>Dernière leçon, dernières notes</i>	3 <i>Final Lecture, Final Notes</i>
▪ 1 ^{er} décembre 1969	▪ 1 December 1969
Première leçon	First Lecture
139–146	121–127

As to the additional texts presented in the “Annexes” and in the afterword, these correspond as follows in the original and in the English translation:

<i>DL</i>	<i>LL</i>
▪ Annexe 1: <i>Bio-bibliographie d’Émile Benveniste</i>	▪ Annex 1: <i>Bio-bibliography of Émile Benveniste</i>
Georges Redard (+ introduction)	Georges Redard
149–174	128–156
▪ Annexe 2: <i>Les papiers d’Émile Benveniste</i>	▪ Annex 2: <i>The Émile Benveniste Papers</i>
Émilie Brunet	Émilie Brunet
175–180	157–162
Postface	Afterword
▪ <i>Émile Benveniste, le destin d’un savant</i>	▪ <i>Émile Benveniste, a Scholar’s Fate</i>
Tzvetan Todorov	Tzvetan Todorov
181–195	163–178

John Joseph has provided a substantial introduction, which readers will do well to consult first, since it is more relevant than Julia Kristeva’s “Preface” to the

issues dealt with by Benveniste in his Collège de France (Monday)¹⁴ lectures of 1968–1969. Joseph counts the genesis of this posthumous publication, then offers an overview of the fifteen lectures of 1968–1969, and of the (truly) final lecture of December 1, 1969. Subsequently, he traces Benveniste's path from (Saussurean-based) structuralist general linguistics to his idiosyncratic version of poststructuralist 'semiolinguistics',¹⁵ deriving inspiration from phenomenology, Peirce¹⁶ and British analytical philosophy, and inspiring in turn the work of Barthes, Derrida, Kristeva and many other figures on the French scene of poststructuralism. Benveniste's extension and deepening of general linguistics crucially involved the distinction between *le sémiotique* and *le sémantique*, the notion of (inter)subjectivity in language, the concept of *énonciation*, and the idea that language "auto-semiotises" itself. What Benveniste understands by "auto-semiotisation" becomes clear in lesson 12 (see also Joseph's discussion in his introduction, *LL* 45–48), where he points out that it is precisely through writing, i.e. the conversion of spoken language into written notation, that language (structures) become an object (or objectivised body) of observation and analysis. Writing thus functions as a semiotic mediation for reflecting upon language as a symbolic system. In Benveniste's wording:

The writing system has always and everywhere been the instrument that has permitted a language to semiotise itself.

This means that speakers stop on the language instead of stopping on the things enunciated; they take the language into consideration and discover it signifying; they notice recurrences, identities, partial differences, and these observations get fixed in graphic representations which objectivise the language and summon as images the language's very materiality. (*LL* p. 106)¹⁷

14. Benveniste's chair at the Collège de France was one of "Grammaire comparée"; Benveniste lectured on Monday and Tuesday, the Monday lectures being devoted to "problèmes de linguistique générale".

15. Or a semiotically based anthropological linguistics (cf. Fenoglio 2019 and Flores 2019).

16. Peirce figures prominently in lessons 2 and 3 (*DL* pp. 63–65, 67–69 = *LL* pp. 76–78, 79–80), in which Benveniste contrasts Peirce's 'universalist' view with Saussure's 'individual-social' point of view. An interpretive issue on which I would disagree with Benveniste is his statement that Peirce only thinks of language in terms of words (*DL* p. 67 = *LL* p. 79).

17. French original: "L'écriture a toujours et partout été l'instrument qui a permis à la langue de se sémiotiser elle-même. Cela veut dire que le parlant s'arrête sur la langue au lieu de s'arrêter sur les choses énoncées: il prend en considération la langue et la découvre signifiante; il remarque des récurrences, des identités, des différences partielles et ces observations se fixent dans des représentations graphiques qui objectivent la langue et qui suscitent en tant qu'images la matérialité même de la langue" (*DL* p. 113).

4. *Benveniste transposed into English: Translation issues*

As John Joseph points out,

[t]ranslating a text like the *Last Lectures* requires a balance making readers aware of ambiguities and precisions, and not putting readers off with a translation in which these issues are omnipresent. Most readers, most good readers, want the main ideas without constant interruption over details. It is a utopian task, and simultaneously dystopian, since the end product is guaranteed to let every reader down in one way or another. (*LL* p.49)

Let me first dispel the translator's doubts: on the whole, he has produced an accurate, elegant and highly readable translation of a text which, despite its seemingly untechnical nature —the Collège de France conferences are, as a general rule, open to a broad audience, and are never the subject matter of a course examination —, presents a number of translational problems.

Apart from the general problem of translating a scientific, in this case a linguistic text, there are specific problems involved in translating Benveniste, an author who invested a number of terms with a very specific load (cf. Moïnfar 1997). One of the well-known general problems involved in translating a French text about language(s) into English is the imperfect match between French *langage/langue* and English 'language', a difficulty occasionally enhanced by the superimposition of the Saussurean distinction between *langue* and *parole* (a distinction endorsed by Benveniste).

Joseph discusses three translation problems and his translational choices (*LL* pp.50–55).

1. He first takes up the just mentioned problem of translating French *langage* and *langue*, to which only one English term (if one leaves aside the word 'tongue') corresponds. Joseph has chosen to use 'language' with a determiner ('a/ 'the') or in the plural form ('languages') in order to translate *langue* (*langues*), and he uses 'language' without the determiner in order to translate *langage*, while admitting that the solution does not always give a stylistically elegant outcome.
2. The second problem concerns Benveniste's use of *signifiante*, which he uses distinctly from *signification* and from *sens*. Joseph translates *sens* mostly with 'meaning', but also with 'sense' (e.g., "in another sense"), or even 'way'. Since he decided to translate *signification* as 'signification', he had to find another translational equivalent for *signifiante*. His solution has been to revive the old English word 'signifiante', of Anglo-Norman origin,¹⁸ and I think this is an excellent choice, given that the unusual French term also urges the French-speaking reader to pay attention to the specific semantics of the word.

3. The third term discussed by Joseph is *énonciation*, which Benveniste often used, in the 1960s, to render the term ‘utterance’ he found in the writings of Leonard Bloomfield (1887–1949), Zellig S. Harris (1909–1992) and Bronisław Malinowski (1884–1942). Of course, Benveniste endowed *énonciation* with a specific technical meaning,¹⁹ and this would make the (re-)translation of his term by ‘utterance’ a poor solution. Joseph has decided to use ‘*énonciation*’, a term of which he notes that it “has already been established in the (admittedly scant) English-language literature dealing with this aspect of Benveniste’s work” (*LL* p.55).²⁰

These three problems are of a different nature: the case of *langage/langue* is one of a (quantitatively) different lexical distribution in the source and target languages; the case of *signifiante* involves the technicalisation of an old word, and with *énonciation* we face a difference in the number of corresponding terms (since ‘utterance’ would correspond to both *énoncé* and *énonciation*) and a difference (viz. presence vs. absence) of semantic homology within a word family: in French, *énoncé*, *énoncer* and *énonciation* form a homogeneous series, but this is not exactly the case with ‘to utter’ and ‘utterance’ (one utters sounds and sentences, but not utterances). Another interesting problem, one not discussed by Joseph, concerns the rendering of French (*l’*)*écriture*. Joseph has chosen to translate this uniformly as ‘writing’ (without determiner), but in Benveniste’s last lectures the term *écriture* covers a fluctuating domain, ranging from writing system, script, way of writing, written style, written language to writing (as a general concept).²¹ Given the ubiquity of *écriture* in Benveniste’s lectures, it would have been worthwhile to discuss this translation problem, although one has to admit that Joseph’s uniform solution has the advantage of not complicating matters.

5. *Remarks and corrections*

Benveniste’s last lectures are geared towards a more general, if not composite audience: predominantly philosophers, semioticians, literary scholars, historians

18. For the meanings of the Old French (including Anglo-Norman) *senefiance*, *senifiance*, *signifiance* (and other variants), see Wartburg (1964: 603).

19. For a comprehensive study of Benveniste’s notion of *énonciation* and its reception, see Ono (2007); cf. also Flores (2019).

20. I have also come across the term ‘*enunciation*’ in the English translation of Hagège’s inaugural lecture at the Collège de France (Hagège 1989). I have to add, however, that this English translation is in more than one respect too servile and of doubtful quality.

21. On Benveniste’s theorisation of *écriture*, see D’Ottavi (2019) and various contributions in Fenoglio et al. (2016).

of culture, perhaps rather than linguists. The lectures lack the degree of linguistic technicality (as well as the wide coverage of languages) that makes the *Problèmes de linguistique générale* so fascinating and thought-provoking. Nevertheless, the *DL/LL* provide ample food for linguistic reflection on writing and writing systems, on the function of language, on units of language analysis. The fact that the text published here reflects a provisional stage — as preparatory notes for a cycle of oral *leçons* — explains the scarcity of references, and the absence of critical discussion of views held by other linguists. And in view of Benveniste's erudition and eagerness to elucidate complex problems, this can only be regretted. To give two examples: (a) In discussing the characteristics of human language, Benveniste nowhere refers to Hockett's classic articles (1959, 1960),²² and I would also have liked to see a discussion of Greenberg's (1963: 1–17, 56–65) views on this issue; (b) On the global issue of writing Benveniste does not go into a discussion of works on the history of writing (such as Février [1948] or Diringer [1948, 1962]), and one would at least have expected some comments on Gelb (1952/1963², French transl. 1973), a thought-stimulating (and also controversial) work²³ on 'grammatology'.

There can be no doubt that Benveniste held interesting views on the history of writing, on the typology of writing systems, on the type of language analysis performed in writing; only, these are not to be found in his last lectures. Nonetheless, the prematurely silenced voice of Benveniste and his written word require careful reading: in reading these lectures, we sense the effort of a linguist trying to understand the complexity of language and that of man's relationship to language and speech. Also, Benveniste's theory-oriented undertaking is backed by encyclopedic, accurate historical information.

I have found only one (minor) inaccuracy. On p. 112 of *LL* (= p. 122 of *DL*), Benveniste speaks of the Sumerian term *dup* for '(writing) tablet'. However, the term is *dub*, and the compound term for 'scribe' is *dub-sar* (not *dup-sar*); also, the Akkadian word for 'tablet' should have been transcribed as *tuppu* (not *tuppu*).²⁴

As to Joseph's highly readable translation, I have found very few errors. On p. 133, in Annex 1 containing the translation of Georges Redard's bio-bibliography of Benveniste, one reads:

22. For a critical look, see Wacewicz & Zywczyński (2015).

23. Gelb's book contains interesting views on writing from a structural-functional point of view (cf. Swiggers 1984 and Daniels 1990), but the author's evolutionary assumptions are subject to criticism (cf. Cardona 1991: 34–35; Moreno Cabrera 2000: 289–300).

24. These errors are in *DL* on p. 122, in *LL* on p. 112. On Akkadian *tuppu*, see Tavernier (2007).

At the same time [viz. in the years 1919–1920] he was attending Antoine Meillet's lectures in the Collège de France and at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, where he also attended lectures on comparative grammar and Indo-Aryan languages by Jules Bloch, Louis Finot, Sylvain Lévi and, for Latin palaeography in 1919–20, Émile Chatelain. Starting in 1920 he worked under Louis Renot preparing for the *agrégation* in grammar, which he received in 1922, placing ninth. (LL p.133)

As can be seen in the original, the latter part of the text is about Louis *Renou*, a study companion and life-long friend (not a supervisor!) of Benveniste's, with whom he prepared the exams for the *agrégation*: “Dès 1920, il prépare avec Louis Renou l'agrégation de grammaire où il est reçu neuvième en 1922” (DL p.156).

Minor (typographical) errors,²⁵ some of which go back to the French original, are: p.vi, l. 21 and p.vii, l. 2: Centre National; p.xi, l. 14: lives clandestinely; p.22 l. 5: *sphoṭa*;²⁶ p.22 l. 18–19 and p.30 l. 10: *Foundations of Language*; p.24 l. 36 (and p.180, in the index): Mohammad Djafar Moïnfar; p.57 note 6: Hermann [not: Karl] Osthoff; p.57 note 9: “Structure [not “Structures”] des relations de personne” (also to be corrected in the English translation as “Structure of personal relationships”); p.58 l. 26: *en français*; p.60 line 8: L'hospitalité; p.123 l. 30: sémiologie; p.158 l. 32: Carmelia; p.178 note 9: catégories de langue [not plural, *langues*] (and “categories of language” in the English translation in the following line).

The fifth International Congress of Linguists, mentioned on p.136, was scheduled for September 1939, but did not take place. In the index, p.181, “Scaliger” (mentioned by J. Kristeva) should be identified as “Jules-César Scaliger”, and not (his son) “Scaliger, Joseph-Juste”.

REFERENCES

- Bader, Françoise. 2013. Review of Benveniste 2012. *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 66.207–215.
 Benveniste, Émile. 1954. “Tendances récentes en linguistique générale”. *Journal de Psychologie* 1954.47–51. [Repr. in Benveniste 1966.3–17.]
 Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale* [I]. Paris: Gallimard.
 Benveniste, Émile. 1969. “Sémiologie de la langue”. *Semiotica* 1.1–12; 2.127–135. [Repr. in Benveniste 1974.43–66.] <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1969.1.1.1>
 Benveniste, Émile. 1971. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Transl. by Mary Elizabeth Meek. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

25. It would also have been better to uniformise the spelling of ‘Tocharian’ (LL p.2 and p.62, but ‘Tokharian’, p.147).

26. The erroneous spelling *spotha* is found already in the original French text of Julia Kristeva.

- Benveniste, Émile. 1974. *Problèmes de linguistique générale* [II]. Paris: Gallimard.
- Benveniste, Émile. 2012. *Dernières leçons. Collège de France 1968 et 1969*. Édition établie par Jean-Claude Coquet et Irène Fenoglio. Préface de Julia Kristeva. Postface de Tzvetan Todorov. (Collection 'Hautes Études') Paris: Éditions du Seuil & Gallimard.
- Benveniste, Émile. 2015. *Langues, cultures, religions*. Choix d'articles réunis par Chloé Laplantine et Georges-Jean Pinault. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.
- Bolelli, Tristano. 1978. "Émile Benveniste (1902–1976)". *Studi e saggi linguistici* 18.1–24.
- Brunet, Émilie & Rudolf Mahrer (eds.). 2011. *Relire Benveniste: réceptions actuelles des Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia.
- Cardona, Giorgio Raimundo. 1991. *Antropología de la escritura*. Barcelona: Gedisa. [Italian orig. *Antropologia della scrittura*. Torino: Loescher, 1981.]
- Chevalier, Jean-Claude. 2012. "Benveniste, fascinant et multiple". *La Quinzaine Littéraire* nr. 1059 (16–30 avril 2012).22.
- Daniels, Peter T. 1990. "Fundamentals of Grammatology". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110.727–731. <https://doi.org/10.2307/602899>
- Diringer, David. 1948. *The Alphabet. A key to the history of mankind*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Diringer, David. 1962. *Writing*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- D'Ottavi, Giuseppe. 2019. "Pour une théorie benvenistienne de l'écriture. Petite enquête philologico-historique". In: D'Ottavi & Fenoglio (eds.) 2019.123–140.
- D'Ottavi, Giuseppe & Irène Fenoglio (eds.). 2019. *Émile Benveniste, 50 ans après les Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm.
- Fenoglio, Irène. 2019. "La linguistique générale d'Émile Benveniste. Une épistémologie méthodique et continue". In: D'Ottavi & Fenoglio (eds.) 2019.17–51.
- Fenoglio, Irène, Jean-Claude Coquet, Julia Kristeva, Charles Malamoud, & Pascal Quignard. 2016. *Autour d'Émile Benveniste. Sur l'écriture*. Paris: Seuil.
- Février, James G. 1948. *Histoire de l'écriture*. Paris: Payot.
- Flores, Valdir do Nascimento. 2019. "De la réception à l'actualité d'Émile Benveniste au Brésil. Aspects anthropologiques d'une théorie de l'énonciation". In: D'Ottavi & Fenoglio (eds.) 2019.195–217.
- Gelb, Ignace Jay. 1952. *A Study of Writing. The Foundations of Grammatology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. [Second rev. edition, 1963 (without the original subtitle).]
- Gelb, Ignace Jay. 1973. *Pour une théorie de l'écriture*. Paris: Flammarion. [French transl. of Gelb 1952/1963².]
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. *Essays in Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Originally published in a paper-bound edition as *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology* n. 24, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1957.]
- Hagège, Claude. 1989. "Linguistic Theory. A contribution to an anthropological project". *Diogenes* 145.17–35. [Translation, by Jeanne Ferguson, of "Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire de Théorie linguistique du Collège de France, 26 avril 1988".] <https://doi.org/10.1177/039219218903714502>
- Hockett, Charles F. 1959. "Animal 'Languages' and Human Language". *Human Biology* 31.32–39.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1960. "The Origin of Speech". *Scientific American* 203.88–111. [Repr. in: *Human Communication. Language and its Psychobiological Bases*, ed. by William S.-Y. Wang, 1–12. San Francisco: Freeman & Company.] <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0960-88>

- Laplantine, Chloé. 2012. "Dossier bibliographique et chronologie documentée. L'actualité récente d'É. Benveniste". *Semen* 33.165–184. <https://doi.org/10.4000/semen.9528>
- Maggiori, Robert. 2012. "Délir la langue. Les derniers cours du linguiste et polyglotte Émile Benveniste". *Libération*, supplément, 26 avril 2012.6–7.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1980. "Lexis and Grammar – Necrological Essay on Émile Benveniste (1902–76)". *Romance Philology* 34.160–194.
- Moïnfar, Mohammad Djafar. 1975. *Bibliographie des travaux d'Émile Benveniste*. Paris: Société de Linguistique de Paris; Louvain: Peeters. [Separate publication of the contribution published in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*, IX–LIII.]
- Moïnfar, Mohammad Djafar. 1997. "Sur la terminologie de Benveniste". *LINX* 9.365–374. <https://doi.org/10.4000/linx.1085>
- Moreno Cabrera, Juan Carlos. 2000. *La dignidad e igualdad de las lenguas. Crítica de la discriminación lingüística*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Ono, Aya. 2007. *La notion d'énonciation chez Émile Benveniste*. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1977. "Nachruf auf Émile Benveniste". *Kratylos* 22.208–211.
- Serbat, Guy (ed.). 1984. *Émile Benveniste aujourd'hui*. Paris & Louvain: Société pour l'Information grammaticale & Peeters.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 1984. "On the Nature of West-Semitic Writing Systems". *Aula Orientalis* 2.149–151.
- Tavernier, Jan. 2007. "The Case of Elamite *tep-/tip-* and Akkadian *ṭuppu*". *Iran* 45.57–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/05786967.2007.11864718>
- Waciewicz, Sławomir & Zywczyński, Przemysław. 2015. "Language Evolution: Why Hockett's Design Features are a Non-Starter". *Biosemiotics* 8.29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12304-014-9203-2>
- Wartburg, Walther von. 1964. *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band XI, Lieferung 96 (*si-situs*). Basel: Zbinden.

Address for correspondence

Pierre Swiggers
 Research Group CoHistAL
 K.U. Leuven
 Blijde Inkomststraat 21 *pb* 3308
 B-3000 LEUVEN
 Belgium
pierre.swiggers@kuleuven.be