"Babeş-Bolyai" University

Faculty of Letters

The Integralist Perspective on the Relationship between Language and Poetry.

A Hermeneutical Approach to the Literary Text

– doctoral dissertation –

Scientific Coordinator:

Prof. univ. dr. Mircea Borcilă

Ph.D. Candidate:

Anton Horvath

Cluj-Napoca

- 2012 -

Contents

ABSTRACT

Key-words: *identity, culture, language, creativity, to name, logos semantikós, creation of signifieds, to say, speech, norm, system, universals, poeticity, the mother tongue of humanity, "relative" language, semanticity and intersubjectivity, the metaphoric creation within language, sign relations, "relative" poetry, the autonomy of linguistic levels, sense, the second semiotic ratio, evocation, functional plenitude, perspectival encapsulation, "absolute" language, relative-absolute tension, identification, vanishing point.*

The idea of the paper herewith is rooted in the view on the "identity" of language and poetry maintained by Eugeniu Coşeriu on the background of the "perspective overturn" which the Coserian integralism brought about with regard to the philosophy and theory of language as well as to the scientific field of linguistics itself. The challenge his 1971 article *Thesen zum Thema „Sprachen und Dichtung"* presents is, as far as we are concerned, that of attempting, as much as we can, to understand the underlying grounds for, as it has been put, his „dialectic" rationale: "*Thesis:* Poetry is identical to the language-as-such in that it represents the actuation of all language possibilities, the space of the latter's integral unfolding or functional plenitude; *Antithesis:* The identity of language and poetry is not acceptable on account of the fact that language is not absolute (it means understanding and structuring the «world», but neiter interpreting it, nor creating «possible» worlds as is the case of poetry) and, furthermore, it entails the dimension of «alterity» (which poetry does not assume); *Synthesis:* Poetry is «absolutization» of language, but only at the *sense* (or textual meaning) level, where it institutes a higher mode of the linguistic fact (signifier-signified-designation) by means of which language-as-such becomes an expression for superior level contents."[*]

The path we deem appropriate to pursue in tackling this "formidable «conundrum»", as professor Mircea Borcilă coins it, is, however, a rather analytical one. Following the guidelines of the three *ways* Eugeniu Coşeriu reveals in his *Thesen* to rightly site the "problem" – i.e. (a) that of determining the functions of the factual linguistic sign; (b) that of the stylistic analysis and literary theory and (c) that of philosophy or determining the essence of language –, our essay builds on the primary assumption of the creativity of language as a foundation for all culture forms.

---

[*] Dorel Fînaru, *Argument* in Eugeniu Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*, Iaşi, Ed. Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2009; pp. 15-16.

On this background (and taking, for methodological reasons, the liberty of reordering the succession of the Coserian "ways"), the poetic character of the language emerges as self-evident, especially as long as, in keeping with the integralist philosophy, such a fact is intuited, conceptualized and philosophically corroborated by thinkers such as Vico, Hegel, Heidegger or Croce, whose endeavours seem to reach the same conclusion according to which language and poetry are, in their "essence", one and the same.

These contributions are, in our opinion, decisive, since they basically legitimize both language as a creative activity in its cognitive project and art (particularly literature) as an *inherent* spiritual activity once it is founded on a language whose limits it tends to transgress, but to which it belongs, notwithstanding, as a defining act specific to the human culture (it is our contention that the poetic logos is not a subsequent determination of the semantic logos).

Finally, if the creative nature of language also implies, in principle, its intrinsic "poeticity", the phenomenal reality is, nevertheless, subject to a set of organic *universals*, among which, inseparably from semanticity, one should consider intersubjectivity (as "reason" for existence itself, so to say). Such an ascertainment leads to an implicit "relativization" of the debate on the "absolute" identity of language and poetry, reorienting it towards the *otherness* or what we call a *literary* way meant to retrieve, given the "mystery horizon" Lucian Blaga postulated, the originary energy at the ultimate core of any cultural (i.e. human) manifestation.

This median way is the *topos* of a permanent tension or dispute between the "absolute" and the "relative" along which textual meanings are continually recreated and metaphorically surpassed in an inexhaustible dynamic of "suspending" the principles of thought and the knowledge of things with a view to structuring new "worlds" (or retracing an "originary" one) – a universe to which one is granted access by hermeneutical means only. To be consistent with the idea of our essay, we could, as such, talk about the metaphor of the "vanishing point" as we could as well wonder: to what extent is, ultimately, the perspectival intersection of these two parallel lines – Language and Poetry – real?

I. Our remarks with regard to the linguistic creativity are preceded, in the first section of the paper, *Aspects of the integralist perspective on creativity* [**1.**], by several notes aimed at drawing attention to the fact that whenever we refer to notions

such as ***culture, language, creativity*** [**1.1.**], the common usage operates with a series of *reductions* that need *actuation*.

Culture [**1.1.1.**], therefore, precisely because we understand it as "humanistic", cannot be just an "epiphenomenon" of the human existence but rather the essential prerequisite of its fulfilment. Reducing it to one of the many particular fields of the human activitiy presumes, according to Lucian Blaga, a serious error of judgement.

Likewise, ***language*** [**1.1.2.**] is not just an expressive mode among others, as it is not, on the other hand, synonym to the thesaurus of an idiomatic community. Functionally speaking, some also maintain that language would be the expression of logical thinking or, more often than not, a (pragmatic) system subservient to communication and social coordination. Eugeniu Coşeriu sets the record straight, however, and draws on Aristotle, W. von Humboldt and Croce stating that, as *Tätigkeit*, language emerges before the apophantic or the pragmatic. In its capacity of creative activity with an internal purpose, language acts as the first occurrence by means of which the existent is conceptualized since it delineates the world's possibilities of being.

 Prior to anything, though, the actuation (*enérgeia*) which undergoes latency or competence (*dynamis*) can be synthesized, beyond any common reductions, in the idea of ***creativity*** [**1.1.3.**] specific to the cultural way of man and, preeminently, to language as a foundation for all cultural forms.

Having, hence, understood that the primordial manifestation of creativity lies within language and that the latter's fundamental dimensions reside in the acts of *naming* and *saying*, respectively, the chapter ***To name (onomázein)*** [**1.2.**] delves into the sphere of semanticity.

Logos semantikós [**1.2.1.**] does not have, first of all, instrumental value in designating the outer reality, but it actually marks off the pragmatic domain by means of a spiritual operation (apprehension of the essence – *noésis ton adiaireton*), appropriating it to certain "consciousness contents". One deals, therefore, with the construction of a *mundus intelligibilis* made up of existence possibilities which sets the world configuration process through language as a primary one. In other words, language does not emerge to operate with a world of previously classified things, but to delimit the possibilities of being (the spiritual world people create for themselves). The significant function and the creation of signifieds *per se* as cognitive act do not

depend on the existence of "things", which enables us to say that language is instituted as "previous to the distinction itself between existence and nonexistence."

In the same train of thought, language does not make up for a logical object or a product of the logical thinking. The logicist confusion turns up between the purpose of the linguistic activity as such (independent from any subsequent determinations), i.e. the significant one, and a certain circumstantial purpose, the intention of the linguistic subject, which can be, among others, of a logical nature. According to Coşeriu, we are herein confronted with a "level confusion" since language is not logical, but previous to any logical distinctions. As first specific manifestation of the humankind, language and its internal categories are not therefore primarily linked to the thought faculty, but rather to the *knowledge* one.

The creativity inherent, therefore, to turning what exists into a representational object by reason of a primordial intuition becomes, through **grasping the unitary [1.2.2.]**, the archetype of any creativity form and identifies with the originary spiritual operation known as *apprehensio indivisibilium*.

Consequently, as a "determining term" in trying to understand man, language is distinguished, first of all, by having or, more rigorously put, by *being **signified and intentionality [1.2.3.]***. From this standpoint, language, in its "expressive" nature, does not presume a simple response, "naturally" necessary, but an *objective signified*. Likewise, it cannot be maintained that the expression is the one which "has a signified" as long as the expression itself comes through solely by means of the signified as "purpose or function of the language." Practical communication, then, does not define the linguistic realm in the absence of the latter, but is rather defined as a determination subsequent to the *creation of signifieds*. We shall say, as such, that, firstly, the signified is basic *structuration of the human experience* due to the fact that, far from acknowledging something that already exists, it actually delimits the human experience. Secondly, one should consider the fact that the signified *structures* objects of the experience as "human consciousness contents" *by virtue of an internal purpose*. As such, the signified does not refer to "entities", but to the *very being of things*, to what is there universal in the infinite possibility of the individual experience.

Motivated by purpose and less conditioned by nature, language is an "intentional" activity not as much as *use* of expressions and signifieds, but, above all, as *creation* of these signifieds and their correspondent expressions. The "originary"

character of language is not to be understood temporally, but as *primary*, *essential*, *defining*, which presupposes that language should be essentially perceived as *enérgeia* in all its forms.

Henceforth, the linguistic activity must be considered in the integrality of its levels, viewpoints, contents and accomplishment norms in all contexts where, as culture founder, the primary linguistic creativity develops its particular instances.

The chapter ***To say (légein)*** **[1.3.]** draws upon the notes on semanticity mentioned above to set them in the perspective of intersubjectivity and the speech activity. Fundamentally significant, language comes to the fore as speech activity in order to become reality. Beyond the traditional distinction *langue / parole*, Coşeriu advances his own theory building on a coherent and unitary vision with respect to language as creative activity. Assigning the notion of "*langue*" to the field of the historical linguistics, he maintains that, as opposed to the approach of the theoretical linguistics in what concerns that which is *normal* and *functional* within a language act, *langue*, as a system of isoglosses, is found at a descriptive and synthetic level, regardless of the fact whether certain linguistic acts may serve as models for others – i.e., without involving the (re)creative processes of abstraction and actualisation specific to the ***speech-norm-system*** **[1.3.1.]** relationship.

Once the abstraction degrees of the particular linguistic act established (*speech* contains *the individual norm*, *the individual norm* contains *the social norm*, *the social norm* contains *the system*), the converse process, i.e. the actualisation, emerges as especially relevant to the idea of creativity at the *speech* level (as long as we methodologically choose to see things from the end of the *system* itself). Given the fact that both the norm and the system are actually instituted by means of the speech act as *langue states* (no less diachronically, according to Coşeriu, if we take into account the phenomenon of passing from one system and one norm to others), they also provide the framework within which the linguistic (re)creation through the speech act becomes expressively possible *owing to* and *by means of* the abstracted linguistic "thesaurus". The system, therefore, as a "network of functions", can be actualised in determined social forms, which, in their turn, are actualised in individual norms so as that they should ultimately make up the "infinite variety and multiplicity of the actual linguistic activity." While the system is a complex of functional oppositions, the norm is its "collective" actualisation; speech, then,

becomes the individual actualisation of the norm, which also entails the *expressive originality of the speaking individuals*.

Along the abstraction and actualisation processes of language as a creative knowledge (acquisition) activity, Coşeriu distinguishes, to circumscribe this constitutive form of culture in its integrality, three specific, but no less complemental, **levels and viewpoints [1.3.2.]**. At a *universal* level, one notes the speaking activity in general since human beings always speak even when they temporarily suspend speech. *Historically*, on the other hand, language occurs as speaking activity in a *langue*, according to the norm and the system of a distinct community and on the background of a historical tradition. Finally, we have an *individual* level, which actualises the concrete speech units, from elementary formulae to the most ellaborated texts, i.e. the speech act or the series of speech acts that have established an actual connection to each other. These levels are, in fact, theoretical stratifications of the same unitary reality, interdependent aspects of the same phenomenon: language as *enérgeia*, to which, given the specificity of each level, three types of *dynamis* are associated.

There are, consequently, three essential levels of the linguistic competence. The *elocutional* one implies, irrespective of the linguistic structurations, the intuitive relation to the principles of thought and to knowing things as they are. The *idiomatic* one refers, then, to the rules of the given *langues* as long as the creative freedom of language is necessarily geminated with the dimension of historicity or solidarity with other speakers, be it sinchronically or diachronically. Lastly, at the individual level, there is an *expressive* competence or, in other words, the possibility of knowledge according to the norms inherent to the construction of a discourse. This fact implies, on the one hand, a series of norms on which one builds "traditional texts", from certain basic formulae used within a given community to the so-called "textual macrostructures" as well as, on the other hand, a higher synthesis of the linguistic competences once *sense* or textual meaning is instituted.

The levels and viewpoints which make up the "synopsis" which articulates the integralist perspective are ultimately legitimized through a set of **contents and epistemological outsets [1.3.3.]**. The *designation* actualizes, therefore, the determined relationship between a linguistic expression and a "state-of-fact", i.e. between the sign and the denoted "thing". It can correspond to a signified (to its own possibility as conceptually delimited experience) or, equally, to a "metaphorical

transfer" process. Next, the *signified* represents the very possibility of the designation as the content of a given sign in a *langue* and exclusively by means of the *langue*. Whereas the *sense* (the textual meaning) lies beyond the signified and the designation, encapsulating them and, thus, providing a content of a superior order. As a principle, the autonomy of the language levels and of their implicit correlative contents opens, on the other hand, the possibility of studying the same unitary phenomenon from three different perspectives so that we can ultimately reach, due to their complementary and interdependent nature, an overall vision which could undoubtedly prove useful in a systematic approach of other forms of culture. That is why, within the aggregation of linguistics as a general science, one should discern three (sub)linguistic disciplines, whose objects are defined by the above mentioned competences and their associated contents, i.e. a *speech* linguistics, a (traditional) *langue* linguistics, and a *text* linguistics. As for this last one, Coşeriu distinguishes between a "transfrastic grammar" and "the true text linguistics", as long as the latter tackles the texts which emerge at an autonomous level prior to any distinctions in a determined *langue*.

Besides the countless fine differentiations one ought to delve into once engaged in the study of such a complex field, we shall, nevertheless, focus, for the time being, on the content which the speech activity at the discourse level actuates within the domain of the expressive competence, i.e. the *sense*. Analogous to the primary linguistic signified, the sense starts, in its turn, from an intuition in order to elevate the existent of the "textual world" (which is mediated through the primary creativity of the language as such) to the rank of a "representational object", although not as much by an apprehension of the indistinct unitary, but by a *comprehension* of a poetic-hermeneutical nature.

II. The second section of our paper, ***Considerations on the philosophical thesis regarding the identity of language and poetry* [2.]**, takes the debate further, attempting to establish the fact that the reexamination of language from an integralist perspective considering the fundamental (syn)thesis according to which, in all its aspects, language is "preeminently" a *creative activity* and the foundation of all culture forms, not only facilitates, but even *requires* a reassessment of certain cultural formulations, relationships and approaches, especially in what concerns the literary art and, particularly, poetry.

As a defining dimension of the spiritual (and, hence, cultural) human existence, *poetry* itself becomes, if we may set forth an **argument [2.0.]**, one of the fields which, owing to the integralist "clearings", refuses any longer to be perceived as a mere either "optional", or "taken for granted" phenomenon. Coşeriu suggests and, ultimately, demonstrates, in the wake of an illustrious thought tradition, that poetry is a reality whose circumscription can be both rigorous and convincing (without losing, however, its "mysterious" character), a reality within which apparently disjunct element coexist and complement each other. This fact is furthermore emphasized by the assumption of the *identity* of poetry and language as *logos poetikos* in relation both to the primary semanticity and the permanent activity of semantic (re)creation.

To engage the "essential" identity of language and poetry, one should start, in our opinion, from certain **assumptions of the debate [2.1.]** in order to present a series of frameworks which are meant to validate the very setting forth of the problem itself.

This supposes retrospecting to a set of preliminary **connections [2.1.1.]** among which, with a view to researching the identity of language and poetry on the background of the hermeneutical perspective integralism and, particularly, the text linguistics have opened, an unavoidable stage would be to investigate the philosophical sources tapped on by the Coserian theory of language. The implicit outsets thereof should subsequently refer to another crucial domain in substantiating such a research, namely the integralist metaphorology, whose guidelines have been charted, in principle, by Mircea Borcilă on the grounds of "the metaphoric creation within language." Next, one has to mention the interdisciplinary character of the literary hermeneutics, since, as Lucia Cifor righly notes, it probes a widely encompassing epistemological horizon, whether we have in mind some fundamental disciplines such as philosophy, history, anthropology or the general areas of language and literature which are systematized by linguistics, the literary history and criticism, poetics, etc.

A second defining reference should be made to what is known as linguistic **universals [2.1.2.]**, i.e. those notions of utmost generality (types, properties or relations able to define what is invariable within a certain reference system) whose function is to operate as irreducible philosophical concepts as well as axiomatic realities of the field under scrutiny. Considering the *essential universals*, Coşeriu

states five such prime realities with regard to language: *creativity*, *semanticity*, *alterity*, *historicity*, and *materiality*. Assimilated to the universal of creativity, quintessentially, language subsequently claims two other constitutive and specific dimensions, i.e. objectivity and intersubjectivity, which correspond, in universal terms, to semanticity and alterity. Only when this primary triad has been noted, one can abstract or derive the secondary elements, that is historicity and materiality, in order to wholly circumscribe the reality of language.

Eventually, in dealing with the general idea of **poeticity [2.1.3.]**, the new investigational perspective on linguistics as "cultural science" and the redefinition of its object, i.e. the linguistic competence understood as virtuality of the linguistic cognitive-creative activity, invites to a reevaluation of poetry itself as a cultural form. All the more so as, in what the integralist studies are concerned, a decisive contribution to the disambiguation of the field will be made by the notion of "metaphoric competence" which Mircea Borcilă, drawing on Coşeriu and, then, Blaga, sites concentrically at a level exponential to the "intuitive" ability or knowledge that makes the achievement of the "linguistic act" possible. The apparently superfluous topic of poetry is to be, therefore, necessarily (re)actuated.

Given these assumptions on which the problem needed reinstating, a first natural step would be to retrace its philosophical sources over a chapter regarding **the "essential" identity [2.2.]** of language and poetry.

The idea of this identity finds a first philosophical and philological clarifying expression in Giambattista Vico's gnoseological theory and epistemology. On the background of what will later be called "sciences of the spirit", poetry, as **mother tongue of humanity [2.2.1.]**, to reiterate Croce's phrase, is language itself at the age of its "outflow", defining humanity (culture) within the infinite possibilities of the *poetic logos*, to which, on the background of its fundamental semanticity, it identifies. Where the creative activity (*enérgeia*) stays in the "absolute" dimension of a "sacred language" which should be "interpreted" for people (by heroes), we also have to do, naturally, with the ideal hypostasis of poetry as a world creating act or "the language of gods." In this essentially mythological universe, naming emerges equally as full actuation.

G.W.F. Hegel notes himself **the self-sufficient speech in its very content [2.2.2.]** as identical, in an epic age, to poetry. Tackling the poetic expression, Hegel operates several essential distinctions meant to point out the permanent tension

between identity and non-identity within the relationshiop of language and poetry. The true source of the poetic language does not inhere, according to the German philosopher, in selecting and assorting words, but in the representation *kind*. As far as poetic representation is concerned, therefore, one distinguishes an *originary* stage, when poetry is still not cleft into the extremes of the common consciousness. Prior to isolated data, which are exterior to the inner essence, to abstractions and to the relations thereupon, the representation guards its poetic character only as long as these extremes stay undivided somewhere between the usual intuition and thought. Sprung from the same genetical stem of to the linguistic representation, poetry seems to institute, here, its own representation at a pre-logical stage becoming, as such, identical to language. Hegel (much the same way Coşeriu would) obviously understands, however, that, ultimately, these two cultural forms derive exponentially from one another, setting forth a dialectic reasoning with respect to this relationship. According to this, to reattain *totality* (and, no less, its originary identity) the "relative" expression of the mundane intuition seeks fulfilment in an integrating and transgressive one on a higher plane.

On the background of the decisive conceptual actuations called forth along the debate with regard to the relationship between language and poetry, Martin Heidegger *exposes* and *proposes* a **poetic project of truth [2.2.3.].** In his meditations on the origin of the work of art, the Freiburg philosopher gathers up on the topic concerning the complementarity of being and being-in-the-world to root it in an ontologically projected aesthetic judgement. Since the essence of art is poetry, concludes Heidegger, the essence of poetry becomes "foundation of truth", an edification which proves to be impossible outside the linguistic structuration. Talking about "foundation" as *giving, establishment* and *beginning*, he invokes the "edifice" of language as setting in existence the *possibility* of truth which is to set-itself-into-work. As a creative act of synthesizing a significant form with its signifying matter, language becomes, in its turn, "matter". Exalted, rather than dimmed, within the work, this significant matter of a higher order (since it already contains a structured world) is granted, through the *sense*, the "form" of a new world it *blazes* with a leap (*Sprung*) by means of which truth bursts out. This leap is meant *to fetch* things into being from the very source of the essence, becoming, as such, an *originary leap* (*Ursprung*) of the art itself. The poetic activity, as foundation of being fulfilled by means of the word, synthesizes, *ex*posing and *pro*posing their essence, both language

and poetry as *ontologically preeminent* "knowledge" activities through creation. If language (*Sprache*) structures the world delimiting its possibilities and enriching, by all subsequent determinations, its cultural being-in-the-world, poetry (*Poesie*) fructifies it, on the background of its whole set of acquisitions, trying to approximate and to institute its potentiality up to the plenitude of its active originary principle in Poetry (*Dichtung*) as essence of art: truth-setting-itself-into-work. The debate on the identity of language and poetry loses, therefore, its bivalent validity, requiring to be reordered in the triadic processuality *language – poetry – art*. Within this framework, we are to talk not as much about identity, but rather about an *identification* between language and **P**oetry through poetry as an approximation of the tension between the "relative" and the "absolute" with the provisions of both their primal spheres.

On the principle ***homo nascitur poeta* [2.2.4.]**, Benedetto Croce approaches, given the ontological underlying bases of his own thought system, the decisive aspect concerning language, which he subsumes to the same defining concepts which establish poetry as a "preeminent" spiritual act. Croce takes on to clarify a series of terms inherent to the relationship between language and art, among which primordially relevant proves to be *intuition*. Intuition, according to the Italian philosopher, would be the preconceptual *knowledge* act by means of which *matter* is subjected to the immediate *sensation* so that, once elevated through an *image* to a *representational* status, it should acquire *form* along a significative process where a newly attained consciousness content is associated to a pre-logical *expression* necessary in operating any conceptual distinctions. The intuitive knowledge, in other words, becomes, as such, expressive knowledge. This would be another good way of saying that we, actually, have to do with an *act of acquiring knowledge through creation*. Subsequent to the "absolute" creative instance of the expression-intuition (where language and poetry are identical on account of the fact that the poetic expression ties what is particular to the universal the same way language delimits, by grasping the unitary, an infinite possibility), an inevitable relativization occurs due to intersubjectivity. That is, if language and poetry coincide at an ideal primary stage of the creative activity, we see, once the functional reductions of language take place, the emergence of literature as a discourse meant to actuate its inherently creative nature. Consequently, while Heidegger suggested reorienting the debate from language towards poetry, seeking to elucidate the nature of language through the essence of the poetic expression within a triadic relationship (i.e. *Sprache – Poesie –*

Dichtung), Croce gathers up to advance, in our opinion, somewhat of a similar project: preserving its essential unity, the expression may be analytically distinguished into three active components, i.e. *linguistic expression – literary expression – poetic expression*, configuring the real object of a well justified research endeavour on the "conundrum" we are confronted with when dealing with the identity of language and poetry.

Instead of a conclusion **[2.3.]**, we could say that the truly significant attainment of a debate on the so-called "identity" of language and poetry (given the decisive interdisciplinary assumptions of the integral text linguistics as *sense* hermeneutics) is that it eventually thematizes the dynamic of the relationship between language and art (on the background of an ongoing tension between the "relative" and the "absolute" creative subjects). One may rather circumscribe, therefore, a process of "identification" in the course of which language tends to update its evocative semiotic ties (and [re]institute, as *enérgeia*, its competences with a view to accomplishing its functional plenitude) so that it should ultimately acknowledge its very own poetic nature.

III. The third section of our thesis, ***On language and poetry with respect to their functional autonomy*** **[3.]**, draws, as we note in the ***introduction*** **[3.0.]**, on the Coserian assumptions in order to establish certain ways of *siting* the object in a series of perspectives meant to emphasize, on the one hand, its "metaphysical" legitimity (as long as the afore mentioned identity undoubtedly exists at the level of the creative activity as *enérgeia*) and, on the other, to circumscribe it within an inevitably relative processuality. Since some of the coordinates concerning the "essential" (originary) identity of language and poetry have already been approximated, it remains that we outline the *identification* process whose premisses we deem to have set and which actually entails, in our opinion, the real dynamic of this relationship.

The chapter ***[Relative] language ⇆ "relative" poetry*** **[3.1.]** starts by reaffirming the intersubjective dimension of language due to which language and poetry *are not identical*. The two fundamental forms of culture present their own function and purposes, the decisive argument in this respect being provided, according to Eugeniu Coşeriu, by the fact that, above all, "language is not absolute."

Revisiting the universals of ***semanticity and alterity*** **[3.1.1.]**, we shall comply with Coşeriu in saying that the philosophy of language has recorded two prevalent

lines of thought in accord with the interdependent facets under which language has been perceived: 1) the relation between language and the essence of things and 2) the intersubjectivity of language. Firstly, based on Heraclitus, Plato and Aristotle, one comes to the conclusion the any expression is semantic, although not all expressions bear the same subsequent determinations since language itself is prior to the very distinction between truth and false or existence and inexistence. Secondly, making use of the observations of such philosophers as St. Thomas Aquinas, Juan Luis Vives, M. Merleau-Ponty, Guido Callogero, John Dewey, Martin Heidegger and especially Wilhelm von Humboldt, Coşeriu points out that, as long as it definitely bestows being on things, language also emerges as an objective dimension of the empirical individual ending up by being subjected to a severe functional reduction. Alterity and the subsequent (reductive) determinations of the *semantic logos* render language on a totally different level from the idea of "absolute" (i.e. artistic) creativity.

As a founding cultural form, however, language shows a permanent creative propensity (acknowledging, at the same, its own nature of spiritual activity which it tries to reactuate) at the alterity level as well (or precisely because of its subsequent intersubjective character). ***The metaphoric creation within language* [3.1.2.]** derives from the *epistemological fundament* of the language science as it has been redefined by Coşeriu. On the background of the two defining conceptual coordinates traced by Mircea Borcilă, i.e. the *cognitive* and the *creative* ones, language activates its "poetic" resources in *metaphors*, where the poetician identifies a *knowledge* mode and, as such, a metaphoric *competence*. While poetry (i.e. the poetic principle) does not entail alterity, language creates its possibility of being-in-the-world as well through discourse, structuring, by *metasemy*, a "signified" whose reason is the *quiddity* of the human creativity in general. Poetry is – at the *sense* level – the way language draws attention upon the fact that humanity is fundamentally cultural and, in its cognitive essence, preeminently creative (i.e. infinitely spiritual).

This becomes semiotically possible by ***the actuation of the sign relations* [3.1.3.]**. Along the *sense* creation process as unfolding of the cognitive activity, a key role is played by the relations the linguistic sign establishes according to the predominant language functions. Starting from Karl Bühler's *instrumental model*, Coşeriu notes that there is a series of other sign relations which need actuating: with other signs (individual, categorial, systemic signs), with the textual signs (as in the

reiterated, idiomatic discourse or in paremiology), with the "things" (given the icastic function) and with the "knowledge of things" (where one can identify the *frames* stipulated, through certain *determination* operations, by the speech linguistics). Since Bühler does not clearly distinguish between the sign functions "within *langue*", i.e. in the virtual sign, and those "within text", i.e. of the accomplished sign, all these relations, which are not to be directly reduced to the representational function, have to be retrieved by means of what Coşeriu calls *evocation*. Evocation overwhelmingly contributes, by plurivocity, to the "enrichment" of language while *sense* derives precisely from combining the Bühlerian functions with evocation.

At this stage, we should take the time of an ***interlude: the linguistic "change"*** **[3.1.4.]**. Language, according to Coşeriu, should be understood as belonging to the world of culture and freedom (given the Kantian distinction between *nature* and *culture* or *necessity* and *freedom*). Intentional productive activities (art, science, philosophy) are not essentially as much "productive", but "creative". The linguistic "change" cannot actually be but *making* of a *langue* and, therefore, during the process along which a new language fact is given birth, the "substituted" phenomenon represents the very substance ("the material cause") of the new creation. Understanding language as *enérgeia*, we do not deal with a "change", but with an incessant "birth" of language meant to generate the historic construction of *langues*.

Our essay spots an ***intersection*** **[3.1.5.]** area at this point. On the background of the alterity inherent to language as structuration and medium by which we historically site ourselves at the "horizontal" level of the *relative* culture (due to the conditions implied by the constitutively relational status of any human activity), one should note an obvious and perpetual tendency towards retrieving an essential creativity by specific means and devices. The assumptions of a transition from the "relative" language to what we call "relative" poetry in what the latter represents, on the one hand, as a second stage of the semiotic way to identification and, on the other, as a first stage of the "literary" way, are perfectly synthesized by Coşeriu in the corollaries of the *evocation* idea. This synthesis is ultimately contained in the observation that, beyond any reductions, *language, as such, is, in its essence, of a poetic nature*. In other words, language presents all the prerequisites to enter a process of *absolutization*, i.e. to maintain a permanent state of tension between the "relative" and the "absolute".

On the foundation set by the linguistic creativity, the transition, within the process of identification between language and poetry, from the "relative" purpose to the "absolute" one implies a matter-of-course distinct function. The chapter *"Relative" poetry ⇆ "absolute" language* **[3.2.]** probes the idea according to which language discovers, actually, a level, a competence and a content specific to its own "absolutization" endeavour. By ushering in a "literary" way (poetic in what the literary art is concerned), language makes itself subject to a new semiotization meant to delimit the infinite possibility of intuiting "alternative" worlds focused around the absolute subject.

We delve, therefore, into a field of epistemological confluence, the one that Eugeniu Coşeriu has established as *text linguistics*, a discipline which, beyond the so-called "transfrastic grammar", the complexity of the textual phenomenon requires that the linguistic study should redefine its tenets with a view to a *sense hermeneutics* and, furthermore, that the poetic study should root itself in the preeminent ground of the linguistic creativity.

According to Coşeriu, a *sense* linguistics must admit that the text stands for an autonomous level of the linguistic sphere. ***The autonomy of the linguistic levels*** **[3.2.1.]** presumes, therefore, first of all, ***the speech level*** **[3.2.1.1.]**, where one encounters those phenomena common to the whole of the speech activity regardless of the historic *langue*. This universal level implies a particular competence, i.e. the *elocutional* one, whose degree of accomplishment lies in *congruency*, as well as a specific function with a general content value known as *designation*. ***The langue level*** **[3.2.1.2.]**, as an obvious phenomenon, does not necessarily require a particular legitimation. What is important, however, is that we should keep in mind it entails a traditionally assimilated *idiomatic* competence, whose accomplishment degree lies in *correctness* and whose content is the *signified* itself. As concerns ***the text level*** **[3.2.1.3.]**, Coşeriu advances a decisive series of reasons for which the text cannot be considered a mere phenomenon of the historic *langue*. Due to such considerations, we may already note that language seeks to take on a distinct creative function as compared to the designation made possible through the creation of signifieds. Given the justifications the Romanian linguist sets forth, the autonomous textual level entails, in its turn, a specific competence, namely the *expressive* one, which is accomplished in conformity to the degree of *adequacy* (appropriation). The text level is ultimately legitimized thanks to the content with which the expressive competence

operates within the discourse: the complex of contents given exclusively as textual contents, according to Coşeriu, is the *sense* (or textual meaning).

Considering ***the sense (textual meaning)* [3.2.2.]**, we must obviously note that these linguistic levels are not independent *per se*. Whether we have in mind the extralinguistic reality or the superidiolinguistic universes, one deals no less with phenomena that owe their existence to language itself. The autonomy of the levels derives precisely from legitimizing some content values founded on linguistic functions. To overcome the language dimension would actually require a new intuition and, after all, a new "world".

***The second semiotic ratio* [3.2.2.1.]** assumes that, beyond and by the idiolinguistic structuration, the interpretation process of any speech act at the discourse level (from the most elementary utterance to literary works) must first and foremost take into consideration the existence of a different ratio as compared to the primary significant one. Analogous to the Saussurean distinction between *signified* and *signifier*, one can operate, at the *textual sign* level, a similar dichotomy: the signified and the designation make up the (textual) *signifier* while the *sense* represents the (textual) *signified*. The linguistic signs have a signified by which they delimit the possibility of a designation referring to an extralinguistic instance. This state of fact stands, on a higher (exponential) semiotic plane, for the *expression* of a superior unit content, i.e. the *sense*.

The actualisation of language at the discourse level also involves a series of relations around the sign representation, which may contribute to the *sense* construction. Given the distinction between the sign functions within the "langue" and those within the "text", Coşeriu has noticed a whole complex of relations by means of which the sign becomes functional within the linguistic act, synthesizing them under the notion of ***evocation* [3.2.2.2.]**. Besides *situation*, *region* and *context*, the *discourse universe*, as a fourth frame or universal system of signifieds which entails a specific discourse meant to validate its sense, is aimed at completing the evocative actuation. Evocation has a significant contribution to the enrichment of language, manifesting, on the other hand, a plurivocity which, far from generating ambiguity, is apt to valorize an incommensurable linguistic potential. *Sense*, therefore, derives from combining the primary functions of language with the evocation. While the evocation pertains to the *significant function*, the text operates, nevertheless, with a *textual function*. That is why, when speaking about a text,

Coşeriu emphasizes the importance of what he calls *frames* and especially, with regard to the idea of our thesis, the *discourse universe*.

Despite the implications of the so-called "deviation stylistics", Coşeriu sees the textual function as ***deviating the "deviation" in the functional plenitude of language* [3.2.2.3.]**. Since (a) all sign relations belong to speech in general and (b) they emerge within the full actuation of the poetic language, (c) the poetic language cannot be a mode of the linguistic usage among others, but must be understood as *language par excellence* once this is where one would ultimately observe the utmost manifestation of all linguistic possibilities. This means that (d), to determine the poetic language, we cannot isolate a "poetic function" *among other language functions* due to the fact that (e) within the poetic language resides language itself in its comprehensive functionality. Poetry – literature as art – represents the manifestation of the *functional plenitude of language*.

Hence, we need to identify a "transgressive function", which language actuates within ***the discourse universe of the literary way* [3.2.3.]** or of "fantasy". On the one hand, language creates the possibilities of conceptually delimiting the world as such, while, on the other, given the assumptions of a permanent significative metaphoric transfer as a speech activity at the discourse level (through the *sense*), it inaugurates a new "universe" (of "possible worlds"). In our essay's terms, we shall state that, functionally speaking, language cannot be identical to poetry on account of the following facts: (1) at a first level, the latter is a *text*, implying the autonomy of the *sense* with respect to the signified and the designation and (2) at a second level, it is an *artistic text*, which implies the autonomy of the *poetic sense* with respect to what we understand by *linguistic sense*. So that language, in its functional plenitude or *par excellence*, should become truly poetic (and forfeit its relativity), it requires an additional function, whose content therewith emerges as a so-called "absolute" *sense*, a function of an admittedly *translinguistic* nature (but *inter*mediated by the autonomous language leves and, especially, by the textual on, where the *sense* ushers in the hermeneutical possibility) by its very *metaphoric* (or *metasemic*) definition.

Drawing on the Lucian Blaga's philosophical notion of "perspectival doublets", Mircea Borcilă reinforces the idea according to which, although pertaining to an autonomous level, language seeks identification (by retrieving its originary "energy") to poetry along a process of ***perspectival encapsulation* [3.2.3.1.]**. On the stem of the two functions Blaga distinguished, i.e. the "plastic" and "revelatory", a

first engraftment of the Coserian theory occurs when defining the 1st metaphoric function. The explanation of the metaphoric phenomenon lies, therefore, neither in certain psychological or sociological factors, nor in some particular linguistic uses (such as the rhetorical-stylistic one) which these factors generate. A critical step in founding a genuine cultural poetics, Borcilă notes, is to subsequently define the 2nd metaphoric function in a translinguistic perspective, i.e. that of the *cultural-poetic* creativity. The theory of such a "revelatory" function is, once more, tighly correlated to the Coserian integralism, particularly in what concerns the functional dissociation between language and poetry as activity of the "relative" subject, on the one hand, and as the activity of the "absolute" subject creating "possible" worlds, on the other.

If poetry must interpreted as ***"absolutization" of language*** **[3.2.3.2.]** at the textual *sense* level, according to Coşeriu, we should keep in mind that a concept such as "absolutization" has to be understood rather *verbally* (the act of "making for the absolute" and its consequences) as, ultimately, a similar process to the idea of *identification* between language and poetry or, in other words, between the relative and the absolute subjects. Inasmuch as language creates the "instrument" for the "interpretation" of this world, outlining an autonomous instance at the expression level, to "absolutize", however, it has to become autonomous *with respect to itself* and to redefine its entire "discourse universe". It is important to discern, therefore, that this transition takes place from the standpoint of a second meaning or level of the *sense*. The second semiotic ratio involves, in our opinion, a double *possibility*: a 1st "horizontal" sense or meaning, as a potentiality of the sign (signified + designation given the representational function and the evocative complex) and only then a 2nd "vertical" sense as a possibility of the whole set of linguistic factors (and, implicitly, of the 1st sense) *provided that* this entails a transgression, i.e. a suspension of the "facts" in the perspective of an "alternative" world. Such a world would come forth with its own autonomy level specific to the (infinite) *freedom* of an "absolute" subject, i.e. independent from any relations and, therefore, from any relative circumscription (a sense 2*b*, that is, as opposed to the sense 2*a* of the semantic creation within language).

The adjacent realm in which the "dispute" between the relative and absolute unfolds (where language is elevated to an exponentially higher status up to adopting a presumtive new "norm" that is divergent from the one acknowleged by the idiomatic aspect of speech engendered by the intersubjective use) sites the ***relative*** ⇆

***absolute tension within the discourse universe of fantasy* [3.2.3.3.]**. The discourse universes are, according to Coşeriu, *knowledge universes* corresponding to certain fundamental cognitive modes along the cultural activity: (a) of *common experience*; (b) of *science*; (c) of *fantasy* (or imagination) and (d) of *faith*. These knowledge modes imply, in their turn, three domains or "worlds": (1) *a world of necessity and causality*; (2) *a world of freedom and purpose* and (3) *a world of faith*. The "fantasy" or poetic creation discourse universe (specified, in our case, to literature) appropriates the language content to the preeminent autonomous level of *sense*. We must, nonetheless, state that the sense of any creative discourse presents two autonomous levels itself according, firstly, to a "plastic" function and, secondly, to a "revelatory" one, connecting, by means of an encapsulation process, the text linguistics to a *transexpressive* poetics of culture. On the background of these radically different (and almost incompatible) "worlds", where the "sense derived from signifieds" seeks, within the poetic act, to be exponentially elevated, in the dynamic of the metaphoric transfer, to a sense "transcendent beyond significations" or "making for the absolute", we deal with the awakening of a tension which cannot be pacified other than by proceeding to a "leap". It is a no less "originary" leap, if we wish, but which ultimately stands for the very reason of the entire dialectics entailing language and poetry.

One actually deals, in principle, with what Mircea Borcilă calls *sense articulation* in configuring the "discoursive poesis", a mainly intratextual process meant to illustrate the "conflicting" relationship between these "worlds" or "knowledge domains". The "dispute" sets off in a *diaphoric* moment, once we note an apparently irreconcilable disjunction between two "things" of the "real" world and when two referential fields are caught in an *irreducible tension* (in the circumstances of a stressed disanalogy) as to the background of the (given) world. This is followed by a strategic *endophoric* moment which probes the possibilities of mediating the tension by highlighting the analogies in view of suspending it. So that, eventually, one should access an *epiphoric* moment, when the "collision" between the referential fields (I and II) gives birth to the *projection* of a field III, i.e. that of a "possible-impossible" world, where the *sense* construction reaches a maximal peak specific only to the actuation in poetic texts.

The *relative language – relative poetry – absolute language* triad is to be ultimately defined, in our opinion, by an ***intersection in vanishing points* [3.2.4.].**

Whereas language and poetry are without a doubt two autonomous dimensions of the cultural creation, with distinct functions and contents (*significative*, on the one hand, and *transsignificative*, on the other) and, therefore, non-identical, one cannot by any means overlook their relationship of in-depth *inter*dependence or *inter*section: first that language is the one which creates the *possibility* of any *sense* (both the 1st and, particularly, the 2nd) and, then, that poetry itself is the one which determines, as *enérgeia*, the creative potential of the language as knowledge activity, projecting a cultural horizon meant to bring about a transgressive propensity of the relative subject towards the ideal image of an absolute subject. The reference point is reduced (or actuated) in this case to an elusive but no less real *vanishing point*.

Our essay concludes, actually, with another outset. ***Instead of a conclusion: Quijote's visions or how many possible Spains are there?*** **[3.3.]** tries to succintly approximate some necessary applicative developments in the fields of literary hermeneutics, theory and criticism given the acquisitions of the Coserian integralism and of the integralist poetics founded by Mircea Borcilă as a metaphorically oriented cultural anthropology. Considering Don Quixote both as the "lyric ego" around which Lucian Blaga articulates one of his poetic worlds and as a suggestive plastic embodiment of the "optical illusions" contrived by Octavio Ocampo, we shall maintain that the figure is sited from the very beginning in *parallel* worlds. In other words, Alonso Quixano's Spain is not Quixote's Spain (yet). It becomes clear, in our opinion, that the overall image of the *character* is, in all of its reality, a *projection*, the "articulation" of another realm, where, once the "usual facts" are suspended, the "norm" becomes freedom itself. In this *sense* shall we have Don Quixote's close-up. And this is also the *sense* in which we are, thus, offered the *intersection* inherent to the aspiration of reuniting these two levels (logically and pragmatically incompatible). The two Spains, the "stone" one, of monotony, and the "blue" one, of freedom, mentioned in Blaga's poem, seem to meet nowhere whatsoever. Yet, *we find ourselves in the same picture*. Ultimately, they are but the *vanishing points* of the ingenious (creative, spiritual), but no less ingenuous hidalgo Quixano, *this so necessary creature for Quixote's freedom*.

Bibliography

- *** – *Un lingvist pentru secolul XXI*, Chişinău, Ed. Ştiinţa, 2002; Materiale ale Colocviului Internaţional „Filologia secolului XXI“;
- *** – *Meridian. Lucian Blaga în lumină 9*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Cărţii de Ştiinţă, 2009; Ediţie îngrijită de Mircea Borcilă, Irina Petraş şi Horia Bădescu;
- Aristotel – *Metafizica*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2001; Traducere, comentariu şi note de Andrei Cornea. Id., Editura Academiei, 1965; Traducere de St. Bezdechi; Studiu introductiv şi note de Dan Bădărău;
- Aristotel – *Despre interpretare*, Bucureşti, Ed. Ştiinţifică, 1957; Traducere de M. Florian;
- Blaga, Lucian – *Poezii*, Bucureşti, E.P.L., 1967; ediţie îngrijită şi adăugită de George Ivaşcu;
- Blaga, Lucian – *Geneza metaforei şi sensul culturii*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 1994;
- Blaga, Lucian – *Artă şi valoare*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 1996;
- Blaga, Lucian – *Zări şi etape. Aforisme, studii, însemnări*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2003;
- Boc, Oana – *Textualitatea literară şi lingvistica integrală. O abordare funcţional-tipologică a textelor lirice ale lui Arghezi şi Apollinaire*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Clusium, 2007;
- Borchert, Donald (ed.) – *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2nd edition), MacMillan Reference USA, 2005;
- Borcilă, Mircea – *Lingvistica integrală şi fundamentele metaforologiei*, extras din „Dacoromania“, Editura Academiei Române, Institutul de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară „Sextil Puşcariu“, serie nouă, VII-VIII, 2002-2003;
- Borcilă, Mircea – *Între Blaga şi Coşeriu. De la metaforica limbajului la o poetică a culturii*, extras din „Revista de filosofie“, Ed. Academiei Române, Tomul XLIV, Nr. 1-2, ianuarie-aprilie, 1997;
- Bühler, Karl – *Theory of Language. The Representational Function of Language (Foundations of Semiotics)*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, J. Benjamin's Pub. Co, 1990; translated by Donald Fraser Goodwin in collaboration with Achim Eschbach;
- Carr, H. Wildon – *The Philosophy of Benedetto Croce*, London, Macmillan and Col, ltd, 1917.
- Cassirer, Ernst – *Symbol, Myth, and Culture. Essays and Lectures of Ernst Cassirer 1935-1945*, New Haven-London, Yale University Press, 1979; edited by Donald Phillip Verene;
- Cassirer, Ernst – *Eseu despre om. O introducere în filozofia culturii umane*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 1994; traducere de Constantin Coşman;
- Cassirer, Ernst – *Filosofia formelor simbolice*, Volumul I: *Limbajul*; Piteşti, Editura Paralela 45, 2008; Traducere din limba germană de Adriana Cînţa;
- Castillo, Jesús Martínez del – *Las relaciones lenguaje-pensamiento o el problema del logos*, Madrid, Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, S.L., 2010;
- Călinescu, G. – *Principii de estetică*, Craiova, Ed. Scrisul Românesc, 1974; ediţie îngrijită şi prefaţată de Al. Piru;
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de – *Iscusitul hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Bucureşti, Ed. Minerva, 1987; traducere de Ion Frunzetti şi Edgar Papu; traducerea versurilor şi note de Ion Frunzetti; prefaţă de G. Călinescu; tabel cronologic de Edgar Papu;
- Cifor, Lucia – *Principii de hermeneutică literară*, Iaşi, Ed. Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza“, 2006;
- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Sistem, normă şi vorbire*, 1952/2004; cap. VI *Schiţă a unei teorii coerente a vorbirii şi a formalizării sale*, în *Teoria limbajului şi lingvistică generală.*

Cinci studii, Bucureşti, Ed. Enciclopedică, 2004; Ediţie în limba română de Nicolae Saramandu;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Determinare şi cadru. Două probleme ale unei lingvistici a vorbirii*, 1955/2009; Traducere din limba spaniolă de Constantin Dominte, revizuită de Nicolae Saramandu; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, *Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*; Antologie, argument şi note de Dorel Fînaru; Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2009;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Creaţia metaforică în limbaj*, 1956/2009; Traducere din limba spaniolă de Eugenia Bojoga; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Logicism şi antilogicism în gramatică*, 1956/2009; Versiune comparativ-cumulativă de Nicolae Saramandu et al; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Limbajul şi înţelegerea existenţială a omului actual*, 1967/2009; Traducere de Mihaela Pohoaţă, Ramona Pohoaţă şi Dorel Fînaru; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Omul şi limbajul său*, 1968/2009; Versiune comparativ-cumulativă de Dorel Fînaru; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Teze despre tema „limbaj şi poezie"*, 1971/2009; Traducere de Dorel Fînaru cu colaborarea autorului; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Universaliile limbajului şi universaliile lingvisticii*, 1974/2009; Versiune comparativ-cumulativă de Lavinia Seiciuc; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Nu există schimbare lingvistică*, 1983/2009; Versiune comparativ-cumulativă realizată de Dorel Fînaru; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Competenţa lingvistică. Ce este ea în realitate?*, 1985/2009; Traducere din limba engleză de Georgeta Raţă; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Limbajul între φύσει şi θέσει*, 1988/2009; Traducere din germană de Ana-Maria Prisăcaru şi Eugen Munteanu; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Semn, simbol, cuvânt*, 1992/2009; Traducere din limba germană de Eugen Munteanu; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit.

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Limbajul: diacriticon tes ousias. Zece teze despre esenţa limbajului şi a semnificaţiei*, 2001/2009; Traducere de Dorel Fînaru şi Nicoleta Moroşan; *Argument*; în *Omul şi limbajul său*, ed. cit;.

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Filozofia limbajului*, în *Prelegeri şi conferinţe*, supliment al publicaţiei *Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară*, T. XXXIII, 1992-1993, Seria A, Lingvistică; Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide" Iaşi;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Competenţa lingvistică*; în *Prelegeri şi conferinţe*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Limbajul poetic*; în *Prelegeri şi conferinţe*, ed. cit.;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Creativitate şi tehnică lingvistică. Cele trei niveluri ale limbajului*, în *Lecţii de lingvistică generală*, Ed. Arc, 2000; Cuvânt înainte de Mircea Borcilă; Traducere de Eugenia Bojoga;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Limba funcţională*; în *Lecţii de lingvistică generală*, ed. cit.;

- Coseriu, Eugenio – *Linguistica del testo. Introduzione a una ermeneutica del senso*; Edizione italiana a cura din Donatella Di Cesare; Roma, Carocci Editore, 2001 (1997); ap. *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*, J. Albrecht, Tübingen, 1980;

- Coseriu, Eugenio – *Prolusione. Orationis fundamenta: La preghiera come testo*. Atti del Congresso Internazionale „Orationis Millennium", L'Aquila, 24-30 giugno, 2000. A cura din Giuseppe de Gennaro S.I., Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Cittá del Vaticano;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Filozofia limbajului*, în *In memoriam Eugeniu Coşeriu*, Extras din „Fonetică şi Dialectologie", XX-XXI, 2001-2002; Ed. Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2004;

- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Epistemologia lingvisticii*, în *In memoriam Eugeniu Coşeriu*, ed. cit.;

- Coseriu, Eugenio – *Dieci tesi a proposito dell'essenza del linguaggio e del significato*, în *Il linguaggio e l'uomo attuale. Saggi di filosofia del linguaggio*, Verona, Edizioni Centro Studi Campostrini, 2007;
- Coşeriu, Eugeniu – *Istoria filozofiei limbajului de la începuturi până la Rousseau*; Ediţie nouă, augmentată de Jörn Albrecht, cu o remarcă preliminară de Jürgen Trabant; Versiune românească şi indice de Eugen Munteanu şi Mădălina Ungureanu; Cu o prefaţă la ediţia românească de Eugen Munteanu; Bucureşti, Ed. Humanitas, 2011;
- Croce, Benedetto – *Estetica privită ca ştiinţă a expresiei şi lingvistică generală. Teorie şi istorie*, Bucureşti, Ed. Univers, 1971; studiu introductiv de Nina Façon; traducere de Dumitru Trancă;
- Croce, Benedetto – *Poezia. Introducere în critica şi istoria poeziei şi literaturii*, Bucureşti, Ed. Univers, 1972; traducere şi prefaţă de Şerban Stati;
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich – *Prelegeri de estetică*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1966; traducere de D.D. Roşca; vol. II;
- Heidegger, Martin – *Fiinţă şi timp*, Bucureşti, Ed. Humanitas, 2003; Traducere din germană de Gabriel Liiceanu şi Cătălin Cioabă;
- Heidegger, Martin – *Originea operei de artă*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 1995; trad. şi note de Thomas Kleininger şi Gabriel Liiceanu; studiu introductiv de Constantin Noica;
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von – *Despre diversitatea structurală a limbilor şi influenţa ei asupra dezvoltării spirituale a umanităţii*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2008; Versiune românească, introducere, notă asupra traducerii, tabel cronologic, bibliografie şi indici de Eugen Munteanu;
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von – *Essais esthétiques sur Hermann et Dorothée de Goethe*, Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord): Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1999; traduits et préfacés par Christophe Losfeld; suivis d'un article adressé a Madame de Staël;
- Marian, Rodica – *Identitate şi alteritate în lirica lui Lucian Blaga*, în *Revista română de studii culturale*, nr. 1, 2006;
- Marian, Rodica – *Alteritate nealienantă şi risipire de sine la poetul Blaga*, în *Meridian. Lucian Blaga în lumină 9*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, 2009;
- Munteanu, Eugen – *Introducere în lingvistică*, Iaşi, Polirom, 2005;
- Munteanu, Eugen – *Componenta aristotelică a gândirii lingvistice coşeriene*, în „Analele ştiinţifice ale Universităţii «Al. I. Cuza», Iaşi, Lingvistică, 1991-1992;
- Murguía, Adolfo – *Sprache und Welt. Festgabe für Eugenio Coseriu zum 80. Geburstag*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 2002;
- Noica, Constantin – *Cuvânt împreună despre rostirea românească*, Bucureşti, Ed. Eminescu, 1987;
- Peters, Francis E. – *Termenii filozofiei greceşti*, Bucureşti, Ed. Humanitas, 1993; Traducere de Dragan Stoianovici;
- Ricoeur, Paul – *Eseuri de hermeneutică*, Bucureşti, Ed. Humanitas, 1995;
- Spanos, William V. (ed.) – *Martin Heidegger and the Question of Literature. Toward a Postmodern Literary Hermeneutics*, Bloomington-London, Indiana University Press, 1979;
- Steiner, George – *Martin Heidegger*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1978/1989;
- Stoianovici, Dragan; Dima, Teodor; Marga, Andrei – *Logică generală*, Bucureşti, Ed. Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1990;
- Tămâianu, Emma – *Fundamentele tipologiei textuale. O abordare în lumina lingvisticii integrale*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Clusium, 2001;
- Trabant, Jürgen – *Semiología de la obra literaria. Glosemática y teoria de la literatura*; Madrid, Editorial Gredos, Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, 1975; Version espanola de José Rubio Sáez;

- Vilarnovo Caamaño, Antonio – *Lógica y lenguaje en Eugenio Coseriu*, Madrid, Editorial Gredos (Biblioteca Románica Hispánica) 1993;
- Vico, Giambattista - *Principiile unei ştiinţe noi cu privire la natura comună a naţiunilor*; Bucureşti, Ed. Univers, 1972; studiu introductiv, traducere şi indici de Nina Façon; note de Fausto Nicolini şi Nina Façon;
- Vîlcu, Dumitru Cornel – *Orizontul problematic al integralismului* (*Integralism şi fenomenologie* – vol. I), Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Argonaut & Scriptor, 2010.
- Vlad, Carmen – *Sensul, dimensiune esenţială a textului*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Dacia, 1994;
- Zagaevschi-Cornelius, Lolita – *Funcţii metaforice în* Luntrea lui Caron *de Lucian Blaga. Abordare în perspectivă integralistă*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Clusium, 2005.
- White, David A. – *Heidegger and the Language of Poetry*, Lincoln-London, University of Nebraska Press, 1978.