

The differences between the editions of the Saussure's third course of lectures

Coelho, Micaela Pafume

PIBIC/FAPEMIG

micaelapafume@yahoo.com.br

1 Introduction

The three courses of lectures delivered by Ferdinand de Saussure between 1907 and 1911 at the University of Genevaⁱ was very important to the establishment of Linguistics as a science. The books arising from them were pioneers in introducing the first theories that defined the “*langue*” as Linguistics’ study object, at the same time that delinked it from the other sciences. The “Course in General Linguisticsⁱⁱ” and “Third Course in General Linguistics – from the notebooks of Emile Constantinⁱⁱⁱ” are two of these books, whose authorship is given to Saussure, even though they were published after his death.

The CLG was edited by Bally and Sechehaye, two of the Saussure’s pupils, and is a book whose entire text is based on notes that refer to the courses of lectures delivered by the linguist, both belonging to the listeners and those that had been written by Saussure himself, to base his theories and prepare his classes.

The first publication of CLG occurred in 1916 and in that time it was extremely important to the establishment of the Linguistics as a branch of sciences, by delimiting its object and its own characteristics. Such publication consisted in an edition which aimed to synthesize every available *corpora* concerning to the linguistics theories developed by Saussure during his three courses of lectures. Nevertheless, although the CLG presents the theories that appeared in the materials referent to all the three courses, Bally and Sechehaye assert that the main sources used at preparing the book were the notes concerned to the studies approached in Saussure’s third course of lectures. These studies were made available by the listeners Ms. Sechehaye, F. Joseph and G. Dégallier.

In the same way, the TCLG was made by using notes. However, this edition was established mainly by using the notebooks belonging to Emile Constantin, and the theories presented concern only to the third and last course of lectures, delivered between 1910 and 1911. Such *corpus* was made available by Constantin to the Library of Geneva only in 1958 and, therefore, its first publication occurred only in 1993.

The publishers Eisuke Komatsu and Roy Harris assert that, in order to publish the book, it was necessary to correct orthographic errors and add to the body of text parallel and marginal notes. It was also necessary to signalize the insertion that the listener added to his notebooks after comparing them to the notes of G. Dégallier, another listener. Moreover, since Constantin did not date his notebooks, the publishers used the notes of Ms. Sechehaye to find out the dates in which each content was taught, and also to add the headlines of each part of the notebook. They achieved that by comparing the theories presented in both sources.

Thus, knowing that the TCLG content was the subject of Saussure's third course of lectures, and also considering Bally and Sechehaye assertion that the CLG was an edition based mainly on the third course of lectures, the present work proposes to perform a comparative analysis between this book and the TCLG. However, prior to accomplish this comparison, it is necessary to isolate from the CLG the parts referring only to the contents of Saussure's third course of lectures. Doing so will provide a content that is compatible with the TCLG, that is to say, useful to perform a coherent comparison.

With a view to find out such contents in the CLG, it is aimed to identify which of the three Saussure's courses of lectures gave rise to each part of the book. To get there, it will be isolated the parts found that are exactly related to the content pertinent to the third course of lectures. After defining the elementary parts of CLG to perform a comparison, the present article will concentrate on the analysis of that book, by contrasting it to the TCLG. Such analysis is to focus on both the books' structure and their content and terminology.

This analysis is intend to provide to the points of agreements and disagreements between both books, to clarify them, and also to specifically find out whatever is presented by one and overlooked by the other. Nevertheless, the ultimate aim of this research is to propose that the differences found between the books may lead to a reflection based on the theory of parapraxes. Such a theory was developed by Freud (1901) in the book "The Psychopathology of Everyday Life^{iv}", in which the author demonstrates, by means of many examples and a consistent reflection, that individual actions might suffer interference from psychological, then very individual, aspects. Such kind of interference can also be extended to the singularity of the listening.

In order to perform this reflexive proposal, it was decided to use Constantin's notebook in comparison with the notes of only one listener amid all three that provided Bally and Sechehaye with the notes referring to the third course of lectures. Since Ms. Sechehaye and Dégallier's notes were used as a supplementary material^v in the making of the TCLG, it has been made the choice of taking Joseph's notes as a reference, in assuming them as the ones that would differ most from the content of Constantin's notebooks.

Therefore, pointing out the existing differences between the notes of these two listeners of Saussure's third course of lectures, it is possible to propose the following reflection: those differences were possibly caused by the same factors motivating parapraxes, which were discussed by Freud (1901) in the book ZPA.

2 Methodology

In order to develop both the analysis of the sources used in the making of the CLG and the analysis of the similarities and the differences between such book in comparison to the TCLG, it was selected the bibliographical analysis as a methodology. Such procedure is mutually satisfactory to support the isolating of the parts of the CLG which refers to the third course of lectures and to point out which contents of this book correspond to the contents of the TCLG, what makes possible the comparison between both. First of all it has been selected an auxiliary bibliography as a guide to our research, and it were also used both books themselves (CLG^{vi} and TCLG) as elementary readings in the process of identification of such parts.

The auxiliary works that were used consisted in two critical editions of the CLG, one made by Tulio de Mauro (1967), and other by Rudolf Engler (1967). Tulio de Mauro's edition presents a general panorama

of the making of the CLG, and, therefore, it was used as support in the identification of the sources which gave rise to the book. On the other hand, Engler's edition presents a delimitation of the sources used in each part of the CLG, and it was useful to delimitate exactly which parts of the book was developed from the *corpus* referent to the third course of lectures. Yet, Engler's edition indicates which notes from Constantin's notebooks were related to each of the fragments of the CLG, what precisely indicate the object of the comparison proposed here.

This way, from these readings and procedures, it was specified the sources used in the making of the CLG, aiming to isolate the content related to the third course of lectures from the body of the book. Afterwards, having recognized which parts of the CLG are worthwhile to be compared to the TCLG, an investigation began by starting from the analysis of macro-textual structures of the books; by macro-textual structures, one means the general features that differ in each one of them, such as the order of the contents and the theories used in the establishment of each chapter of each book. Next, it was started a more specific analysis of the contents, with the goal to find out the disagreements in the micro-textual features of the books, such as type of sentences used and lexicon and terminology chosen in each edition.

After comparing the books, it was realized that the differences found are related to the macro and micro-textual characteristics of both of them, as well as to the respective elements that take part in these structures, such as the order of presentation of content, and the type of sentences and lexicon used. Thus, it was possible to determine specifically which contents take part in the CLG that do not take part in the TCLG, and vice-versa.

3 The CLG and the sources of its making

In order to perform the first analysis that has been proposed, it is necessary to approach the context in which the CLG was made. After Saussure's death, Bally and Sechehaye expected to find, among the manuscripts he had left, a theoretical base complete enough to develop a book about the theories Saussure had delivered during his three courses of lectures. They intended to make a rearrangement of these manuscripts along with the notes they had from the listeners.

However, the publishers did not find any manuscript whose content were directly related to the theories presented in the notes of the listeners. According to them, Saussure threw off the provisional documents which contained the outlines of the planning of his courses of lectures. Therefore, in the "Preface to the First Edition", Bally and Sechehaye assert that all that was found were only notes, which was not pertinent to what had been taught during the classes.

Thus, Bally and Sechehaye decided to make the CLG using the notebooks of some listeners of Saussure's classes, mainly of those who took part of the third course of lectures, and also the few Saussure's own notes which were pertinent to the content of the book. In the "Preface to the first edition" of the book, the publishers assert that they decided to "attempt a reconstruction, a synthesis, (...) based upon the third course of lectures, but make use of all the material (they had), including Saussure's own notes". (Saussure, 1988: 2)

Accordingly, in what concerns to the first and second course of lectures, it was used the notes of Louis Caille, Léopold Gautier, Paul Regard and Albert Riedlinger; and concerned to the third one, it was used the notes of George Dégallier, Francis Joseph and Ms. Albert Sechehaye. With these materials at hand, and also with the collaboration of A. Riedlinger, who took part in the two first courses of lectures, the

publishers considered themselves prepared to make the arrangement of the corpora and to add the necessary connecting elements between the notes they had.

It is important to highlight that the specification of which listeners provided the notes related to the third course of lectures, to the establishment of the CLG, was fundamentally important in developing our analysis. Once it was known the authors of the notes available, it was used the critical edition made by Engler, as well as the remarks made by Tulio de Mauro in his edition, in order to identify in the CLG which theories came from the notebooks of Ms. Sechehaye, G. Dégallier and F. Joseph.

These critical editions consist in analyzing both the texts of the CLG and its development context, made by their respective authors. The edition made by Engler is structured in six columns, among which the first always corresponds to the original CLG's text. The three next columns refer to the notes of each listener who contributed to the making of the book. The fifth column presents the notes of Emile Constantin that correspond to each part of the CLG, and the last one is a transcription of Saussure's own manuscripts. Tulio de Mauro's edition, on the other hand, presents the entire text of the CLG, increased by remarks related to each part of the book, that are explained in the end of the book.

Accordingly, using De Mauro's edition, it was tried to find those remarks that expose specifically which sources gave rise to each chapter of the CLG. Altogether, it were found 71^{viii} remarks in De Mauro's edition that refer to the origin of each theory presented in the CLG, and that adduce explanations about these sources.

With that, it was identified in the CLG each part mentioned in De Mauro's remarks, and, thus, it was used Engler's edition, which presents not only the remark about the sources that Bally and Sechehaye used to make the CLG, but also the full transcription of these sources in addition to the entire text of the book itself. This way, it could be recognized the notes of all the students that helped in the establishment of the book, as well as Saussure's own manuscripts that were used by Bally and Sechehaye. Also, it was known which parts of the TCLG correspond to the chapters of the CLG, since the notes of E. Constantin are presented in Engler's edition, as well.

These two critical editions together contributed to perform an analysis of the CLG, dividing it according to the course of lectures that gave rise to each of its parts. This way, following the sources mentioned in the critical editions, it was found out which of the three courses each part of the CLG was based on.

According to what was found, the book was classified between parts that was exposed only in the first, second or third Saussure's course of lectures, besides those which were exposed in two of the three courses, as well as those that were repeated in all three courses. Yet, it was found out parts that were developed only by the usage of Saussure's own manuscripts, and also parts that were created by Bally and Sechehaye to make a coherent and cohesive text with the sources available.

Sechehaye to make a coherent and cohesive text from the sources available.

Nevertheless, in order to specify only the parts of the CLG which are related to the content of Saussure's third course of lectures, it is first necessary to elucidate the chapters of the book that present contents that were either specially taught in this course of lectures or that compose the curriculum of both the third and the previous courses of lectures.

According to Engler (1967), among all the eight chapters composing the first part of the CLG (the “introduction”), only the fifth chapter “Éléments internes et éléments externes de la langue” was not made by using the notes from the third courses. These chapters present whether contents that were approached in more than one course of lectures (in the first and in the third, in the second and in the third or during the three courses, for example) or contents that were uniquely exposed in the 1910-1911’s course of lectures.

From the “Appendice” of the book, only the chapter “*Les espèces phonologiques*” discusses theories that were taught in the third course of lectures. Such theories, though, had already been approached by Saussure during the first course of lectures, and thus were not innovative ideas in the last course.

The three chapters of CLG’s “*Première Partie*” were made by using the sources referring to the third course of lectures. Although there are contents that were uniquely exposed during the third course, some parts had already been taught during the second course. The chapter “*Nature du Signe Linguistique*”, for instance, is composed by theories that came from both the second and the third courses. Nevertheless, the theories that refer to the second course of lectures were, according to Engler (1967), not repeated in the third course of lectures. On the other hand, the chapters II and III, there are contents that were repeatedly exposed in the two last courses of lectures.

From the “*Deuxième Partie*”, which is constituted by eight chapters, only chapters III (“*Identités, Réalités, Valeurs*”) and VII (“*La grammaire et ses subdivisions*”) do not present theories that were uniquely exposed in the third course of lectures. Chapter III contains, nonetheless, theories that were taught in both the second and the third course of lectures. Hence, chapter VII is the only one in the “*Deuxième Partie*” that is not straightly related to the sources of Saussure’s third course of lectures. In this same part, it is possible to realize that the content of chapter V presents ideas that were repeatedly exposed in the three courses.

The “*Troisième Partie*” is made out of seven chapters and the appendix. Nevertheless, only the first chapter (“*Linguistique Diachronique*”) includes subjects that were exclusively approached in the third course of lectures. The remaining chapters, according to the sources found in Engler (1967), were not made by using the theories related to the last course. The appendix, however, approaches ideas that were taught in both the second and the third course of lectures.

All the four chapters of the “*Quatrième Partie*” present theories exclusive seen in the third course, and also contents that were taught in the first or in the second course, which were approached latter again in the last course of lectures.

The “*Cinquième Partie*” is the last part of the CLG, and comprises five chapters. The two last chapters (chapter IV “*Le Témoignage de la Langue*” and chapter V “*Familles de langues et types linguistiques*”) were made from the sources related to Saussure’s third course of lectures. Nevertheless, the chapter IV contains theories from the third course of lectures, and also contents that took part in the curriculum of both the first and third course of lectures.

Analyzing the presence of the theories from the third course of lectures in the CLG, one realizes that all parts of the book contain at least one chapter referring to one of those theories. Moreover, it can be

noticed that there are entire chapters that refer to these theories. In some chapters, though, the mention to those theories is minimal or even not present at all.

This identification has also shown that there are many theories in the CLG that were taught by Saussure in his third course of lectures, but which had already been taught in the first or in the second one. The incidence of these same contents in more than one course allows one to realize that the trajectory traced by Saussure in the development of his authentic linguistic theories was concomitant to the occurrence of the courses of lectures he delivered between 1907 and 1911.

Yet, by evaluating the analysis performed, it can be observed that all chapters of the CLG have sentences created by Bally and Sechehaye aiming to connect the sources used. Therefore, it is noticed that the notes used at doing the book were often disconnected, i.e., they did not present any coherence between them. This fact shows a certain degree of subjectivity, both in the manuscripts written by Saussure himself and in the way listeners understood his speech. This may have occurred because, in spite of the fact that the courses of lectures have been based on these notes of Saussure, the listeners' notebooks presented differences in their contents.

It is a fundamental information to justify the comparison proposed, because the particular understanding of the listeners, together with the changes to which the sources were subjected as a consequence of the edition process, may also provide the occurrence of differences between the two target books of our research: the CLG and the TCLG.

4 CLG and TCLG: the agreements and disagreements

The comparative analysis between the CLG and the TCLG shows that each one of them has exclusive characteristics because of the proposal to which each one were made. The goal of the publication of the CLG was to spread linguistics theories never though before. On the other hand, the TCLG aimed to make public the notebooks of only one of the listeners, who had taken part in Saussure's course of lectures, without being among those who had given their notes to the making of the CLG.

Among the exclusive characteristics of the CLG lies the fact that, since it is a combination of different corpora, the making of the book demanded that Bally and Sechehaye added parts of texts which were written by themselves, in order to provide coherence and cohesion to the book, as well as to establish a link between the sources available. Moreover, the CLG presents a macro-structure organized into parts and subdivided in chapters and paragraphs, which were created by the publishers and based on the division of the theories exposed during the courses of lectures.

The TCLG have also some insertion made by the publishers Komatsu e Harris; however, because this book did not aim to spread any theory, such insertions are signalized by markers in the body of the text. Yet, the publishers also choose to signalize the modifications Constantin himself made in his notes, both during the classes and afterwards, when he checked his notes with another listener: G. Dégallier. Moreover, the TCLG presents the dates in which each one of the theories presented in the notebooks was taught. These dates were taken from the notes of another listener, Ms Sechehaye, by comparing the contents of their notes with those of Constantin.

Nevertheless, the fact that each book has its own characteristics is not only a source of differences, but of many factors in common as well.

The first element of agreement between the CLG and the TCLG, in terms of the analyzed parts, is naturally the fact that both refer to the theories exposed in Saussure's courses of lectures. Also, both books present two sources of notes in common: those of Dégallier and those of Ms. Sechehaye.

In the TCLG's preface, Harris and Komatsu assert that when they analyzed Constantin's material, it was clearly perceptible that the listener consulted Dégallier's notes in order to complement his material, and checking some questions about the content. Some of these insertions that Constantin did in his own material after comparing it to that of Dégallier were highlighted with the letter "D." or "G.D.". Nevertheless, the publishers assert that some of these insertions were evidently borrowed from Dégallier, but were not notified by Constantin.

Therefore, it is possible to see that these two complementary *corpora* of the TCLG (Ms. Sechehaye's notes, that were used as a source to find the dates of the classes, as well as Dégallier's notes) were also used as corpora in the making of the CLG. The usage of these sources in common between the two books may give rise to the occurrence of similarities between their contents. This way, after analyzing the content presented in the two books, one can certificate that the evaluated topics indeed agree to each other. However, there are some disagreements on how they were developed, both in their macro-textual organization, and in micro-textual features.

Moreover, the comparative analysis showed that each book has some equivalent chapter made by different theories, and the chapters are also presented in different orders in each one of the books. This is caused by the fact that the TCLG prioritizes the presentation of the content in the same order as it was presented in Constantin's notebooks, and in contrast the CLG present its content in an order which best fitted the evolution of the exposed ideas.

The remaining differences may be found out by comparing the books in what concerns the type of text peculiar to each one of them. The TCL, as a publication of the notes taken during classes, presents traces of oral proceedings and sentences that contextualize and resume the content of the course of lectures. For instance, in the beginning of the class May 19, 1911, a note presents an explanatory sentence as a means of resume the evolution of the classes and also to contextualize the theoretical point they had reached with the classes: "*A un moment nous prendrons même un direction différente, mais sans que cela amène confusion. Ces commentaires nous ramèneront au même point?*" (Saussure, 1993 : 91).

This excerpt presents not a theoretical explanation, but rather an explanation of the progress of the course, characterized by the occurrence of elements that resume what had been presented until that moment, and also by features that inform what would be covered next. For this reason, the incidence of these meta-explanatory sentences in the TCLG may be considered as being a disagreement between the books, since this kind of sentence do not appear in the CLG, given that its aim is only to expose Saussure's linguistic theories.

Besides the occurrence of such sentences in the TCLG, there are also some sentences of this same book that are semantically equivalent in the CLG, although they are structured with negative adverbs as well as with antonyms. For instance, the equivalent sentences in the books:

TCLG : "Pour le cas d'une période de langue passé, le moyen de l'audition directe n'existe plus (...)."
(Saussure, 1993 : 50)

CLG: “*Quand il s’agit d’une langue appartenant au passé, nous en sommes réduits à des données indirectes (...)*.” (Saussure, 1986 [1916] : 58)

It is possible to notice that in the sentence from the CLG there is the statement that only the “*données indirectes*” exist. However, in the TCLG, there is the statement that “*l’audition directe n’existe plus*”. In this case, there is the use of the negative adverb “*ne plus*”, the use of the antonym “*directe*” and also the word “*audition*” as a synonym of “*données*” in the formation of the sentence in the TCLG. In spite of the fact that it is a micro-textual difference between the texts, this does not disturb the realization that these sentences are semantically equivalents.

Yet, despite this disagreement in the type of sentences and lexicon in each one of the books, the two texts present a common feature on the precision with which ideas are exposed. In both texts, the theoretical explanations are composed by features that betray an uncertainty regarding the accuracy of the content. Since these uncertain questions occur both in the CLG and in the TCLG, it is possible to notice that they may not come from the specific type of text used in each book, but from a theoretical question.

Each book presents both specific and common features that betray these theoretical uncertainties. In the TCLG, the main specific characteristics that show these questions are the oral proceedings traces and the meta-explanative sentences, like that it was mentioned before. Yet, the following sentence can also illustrate the uncertainty in the content of the TCLG: “*Mais il nous faudra reprendre le fait en lui-même pour la mettre en lumière*”(Saussure, 1993 : 87). The note presents a resume of the content, aiming to clarify what had not been clear enough, which reveals the existence of questions about the explanation, pointing uncertainty in the theories.

On the other hand, the CLG presents these theoretical uncertainties in generalizations and conclusions in the text that do not provide concrete information, i.e. which are capable to substantiation. Silveira (2009) assert in a footnote that the CLG have a essayistic feature, which can be seen, according to her, by the characterization “*en quelque sorte mystérieux^{viii}*”, used to explain the division of the language in two amorphous masses. Classifying the way the language is formed as “*mystérieux*” reveals a gap in its functioning, which is related to the reasons why the language is divided in such way.

Also, a common characteristic in both books that contributed to the occurrence of the theoretical uncertainties consists in the lack of a terminological standard, that can be perceived by comparing the development of the content in each one of them. The correspondent sentences in each book are structured with a semantically similar lexicon, but which does not constitute a terminological standard. For instance, in the TCLG it is asserted that the phonetic writing is “*basées sur les éléments irréductibles du son* (p. 42)”, whereas in the CLG it is asserted that such writing is “*basées sur les éléments irréductibles de la parole* (p. 47)”. This disagreement may be caused by an uncertainty referent to the actual components of the phonetic system, the sound or the words, about which it was not found a solid specification.

Finally, it was realized that the comparison between the CLG and the TCLG highlighted the occurrence not only of differences between the books, but also of some similarities, mainly in the contents that compose them. The more relevant agreements between them consist in the insertions that the publishers made among the source texts of them. These changes show that even the TCLG does not present the notes of the third course of lectures as they were taken, but in a modified version.

Nevertheless, even this agreement is marked by a difference in how these changes made by the publishers are presented. In the CLG the insertions are merged in the text, whereas in the TCLG these changes are signalized by markers established by Komatsu and Harris in the Preface of the book.

5 Francis Joseph and Emile Constantin: two listening of the same speech

In order to accomplish the comparative analysis between Joseph's notes and Constantin's notebook, it was decided to evaluate only the microstructural differences that were found between the sources, since Joseph's notes were not published separately. Nevertheless, they can be found in Engler's critical edition (1967) of the CLG, but without a macrostructure defined *a priori*.

This way, it was used this critical edition, which entirely presents the sources used by Bally and Sechehaye in the making of the CLG. Therefore it was possible to have access to Joseph's notes and thus to achieve the comparison between them and Constantin's notebooks. When comparing them, the first difference that was found refers to the fact that most of Joseph's notes are significantly shorter than Constantin's ones, what can be observed in the following samples, that consists in segments of correspondent contents in the notes of the listeners:

Joseph: *“La carte linguistique de l'Empire romain serait encore plus étonnante.”* (ENGLER, 1967, p. 445)

Constantin: *“La carte linguistique de l'Empire romain, si nous l'avions, nous offrirait des exemples semblables de langues coexistantes et même nous y trouverions des choses plus étonnantes encore.”* (ENGLER, 1967, p. 445)

Joseph's note presents only the essential idea of what was exposed, and it is possible to realize that they were made with no more than the minimum number of words needed to communicate the desired content. On the other hand, the sentence wrote down by Constantin, presents marks of an oral speech, besides that, it is made out of more attributive and descriptive elements that contribute to highlight a more detailed and prolix writing.

Moreover, because of this difference in size in the notes of each listener, it was one perceives that the totality of notes that come from Joseph is do not surpass the amount of notebooks that belong to Constantin. This fact can be proved by an information found in Gambrara (2005) in which Constantin offered 11 notebooks to the *Bibliothèque de Genève*^{ix}, which summarize a total amount of 478 pages of notes, while Joseph gave to Bally and Sechehaye five uncompleted notebooks, from which the amount of pages is unknown, and that were not offered to the BGE.

These features referring to the amount of notes from each listener may be related to the assertion made by Komatsu and Harris (1993) that Constantin was an “assiduous note-taker”, and also in the description given by the publishers to Dégallier and Joseph's notes as “sketchy” (p. XV). The great majority of Constantin's notes is followed by more detailed explanations of the content, whereas Joseph's notes are, mostly, topics related to the theme. The following examples illustrate these features of the notes of each listener:

Joseph: *“La langue de certains pays est double par un autre genre de phénomène, c'est-à-dire par superposition d'une langue littéraire de même souche. Toutes deux vivent.”* (ENGLER, 1967, p. 446)

Constantin: “*La langue de beaucoup de pays est double dans une autre sens et en vertu d’un autre genre de phénomènes. C’est la superposition d’une langue littéraire à la langue naturelle de même source, toutes deux vivant l’une vis-à-vis de l’autre.*” (ENGLER, 1967, p. 446)

Additionally, Constantin’s notes present sentences with a bigger amount of lexical items than Joseph’s notes, i.e., one can perceive that Joseph reduced the sum of words in his sentences, in aiming to write his notes as topics. This conduct of the listener provided the occurrence of same differences in their notes, when compared to the content written by Constantin, as can be seen in the examples taken from Engler’s critical edition (1967):

Joseph: “*La différence des mots entre eux se déroule suivant deux sphères.*” (p. 276)

Constantin: “*Le rapport <et la différence> des mots entre eux se déroule suivant deux ordres, dans deux sphères tout à fait distinctes ;*” (p. 276).

It is possible to perceive that Constantin’s note refers to “**le rapport et la différence des mots entre eux**”, while Joseph’s one refers only to “**la différence des mots entre eux**”. Moreover, Constantin registered that they (the relation and the difference) are established in two orders, two spheres quite distinct, whereas Joseph’s note simply reveals that the difference is established in two spheres.

Furthermore, it is possible to perceive that Constantin’s notes show a more synonyms and adjectives, what can be seen in the same example given above. In order to explain the content in a more detailed way, Constantin used the word “order” as a synonym to “sphere”, which makes possible the interpretation that he wanted to better delimitate the meaning of the word in that context. Besides, the listener used the adjective phrase “tout à fait distinctes” in order to emphasize that the two spheres do not present similarities between them. Hence, It was observed that the usage of adjectives, as well as the usage of synonyms and other lexical items, appears mainly in Constantin’s notebooks. This fact motivates the prolix and detailed character of his notes, when compared to Joseph’s ones.

Also in this fragment, it is important to realize that, in Constantin’s note, the word “difference” is put between the sign “<””, which designates, according to the publishers, words that were added in the margin or in the interlines of the notebooks. This fact might mean that both Constantin added the term after comparing his notes with Dégallier’s ones, and also the occurrence of a writing slip or a slip of the understanding of what was listened in that moment, and was filled soon afterwards. In anyway, it is possible to realize that the word “difference” either was forgotten in the exact moment at which the note was taken, or was not significantly listened while Constantin was taking his notes, and had been added latter.

On the other hand, it is possible to realize that Joseph did not formulate nor reformulated his notes by using the word “relation”. It is possible that if the listener had forgotten to write down the word at taking the note, then he would be able to realize that he had forgotten an element in the beginning of a sentence and, as well as Constantin made with the word difference, he would add the missing word to his notes. It seems that the lack of the word “relation” in Joseph’s notes can be merely understood as a **listening slip**, and not as a writing slip, since the listener did not add the word to his note afterwards.

Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that although Joseph’s note is a source used in the making of the CLG, the equivalent part of the book to this fragment is formulated by using both the words “relation” and “difference”:

CLG: *“Les rapports e les différences entre termes linguistiques se déroulent dans deux sphères distinctes dont chacune est génératrice d’un certaine ordre de valeurs ;” (SAUSSURE, 1995[1916], p. 170)*

It is believed that the occurrence of these two terms in the content of the CLG may stem from the fact that the notebooks from the other two listeners of the third course of lectures also present these words registered in their notes, as it is possible to see in the following fragments taken from Engler’s critical edition (1967):

Ms. Sechehaye: *“(…) le rapport et la différence des mots entre eux se déroule selon deux ordres, en deux sphères distinctes.” (p. 276)*

Dégallier: *Toutefois, des ici, Il faut constater que le rapport et la différence des mots entre eux se déroule selon deux sephères touta à fait distinctes. (p. 276)*

This way, knowing that three, among four listeners of the same course of lectures, made their notes using as subject of this sentence the words “relation” and “difference”, it is possible to make the reflexion that the fact of Joseph elaborated his notes with only one of the words was motivated by the occurrence of a listening slip. In this case, however, one can also realize the possibility of forgetfulness of the word, because although the notes were made during the classes, the time required for the listener to forget a term he had just listened is unknown. Nevertheless, since Freud does not mention slips of listening in the book ZPA, and merely cite them in the book *“Einleitenden Vorträge auf Psychoanalyse”* (1915), the author probably related the forgetfulness to something that was listening with the slips come from of the non effectuation of the listening, covering them at the same level, as equivalent parapraxes.

Thus, considering both the insertion of the word “difference” in Constantin’s notes, and the absence of the word “relation” in Joseph’s notes, one can think about the possibility of both situations be considered as **slips** that occurred during the act of taking notes.

Freud exemplifies the occurrence of a writing slip in the book ZPA, by mentioning a report of Dattner (1911 *apud* Freud 1901, p.86) about the omission of the word “effective” in the Hungarian translation for the financial agreement signed between Austria and Hungary in 1867. The author defends that the “unconscious tendency” of the Hungarians translators of giving less benefits as possible to Austria was the motivator factor of the omission.

In this case, it is possible to realize the existence of a tendency to the forgetfulness of the word “effective”, according to Freud, probably caused by the pretension of the Hungarian translators of giving the minimum of benefits to the Austrian nation. Just as in writing, as is the case of this example, listening slips can also come from an oriented action, which may lead the individual to listen or fail to understand words to suit his/her interest. However, defining the psychological factors that caused Constantin and Joseph’s slips is not scope of this work.

This way, either a slip of listening or a slip of writing, or even a forgetfulness, as Constantin momentarily disregarded the existence of the word “difference” in Saussure’s speech, and Joseph not even wrote down the word “relation”, one may realize that Freud’s theory about parapraxes (1901) allows the reflexion that the differences between the listeners notes may had been caused by psychological interference, that is particular to each subject.

The fragments taken from Joseph and Constantin's notes, as well as the analysis of the equivalent parts of these fragments in the CLG and also in the notes of other listeners, are probably consistent examples that allow the understanding that the words "difference" and "relation" certainly took part of Saussure's speech during his third course of lectures. Nevertheless, because of factors related to the singularity of the listening, they were removed from the notes of the listeners in the exact moment they wrote them down.

6 Conclusions

The purpose of this comparative analysis was to identify the features that are presented in Bally and Sechehaye publication that do not appear in Komatsu and Harris one, and vice-versa. At performing this comparison, it has been realized that there are many factors that can interfere in the making of a book. Thus, despite of the fact that both books refer to the same theoretical content, there is the possibility of occurrence of differences between them.

Despite the initial goal of this work was find the differences occurred in both books, it were ended up finding an important feature in common between them, parallel to the fact of referring to Saussure's theories. Both the TCLG and the CLG were developed, somewhat, by using Dégallier and Ms. Sechehaye's notes. This fact certainly influenced in the occurrence of the agreements found between both books.

In respect to the disagreement between them, the comparative analysis allowed to conclude that there are really some differences and that most of them were caused by the edition of the sources in the making of the book. From this perception, it is emphasized that the most important difference in comparing the two books is the fact that the TCLG presents markers of the changes in the text, and the TCLG presents the changes merged to the text homogenously, i.e. in a non-explicit way.

Nevertheless, it can yet be noticed that there are also terminological and lexical differences (like the antonyms and the choice of words that compose the sentences), which makes one contemplates the possibility that such disagreements may be caused by the peculiarity of listening to each individual.

The analysis of such differences showed that Joseph's notes disagree not only with Constantin's ones, but also with Dégallier and Ms. Sechehaye's notebooks, as well as with the CLG itself. Amid the four sources related to the third course of lectures, Joseph's note is the only one not containing the word "relation" as a component of the sentence used as example. This fact allowed one to confirm the hypothesis that his notes were those which would present the largest panorama of differences when compared to Constantin's notebooks.

Yet, it was noticed that the presence of disagreements between the sources used in the making of the CLG does not affect the content of the work, as far as the analyzed fragment is concerned. Joseph's note, which may be considered incomplete, for it does not present the two subjects of the sentence, looks as if it had not been used as a reference by Bally and Sechehaye in the making of the book. The publishers used the words "relation" and "difference" as the subject of the sentence, as can be inferred from the sentence taken from the work.

Referring to the reflexive thought about the singularity of the listening that was proposed, it is important to highlight that it does not intend to propose any discussion about whether the listening represented by the notes of the listeners were wrong or right. Instead, it is intended to approach the incidence of differences between those notes by means of a bias that allows one to show that, although all participants

of the course listened to the same speech, the listening from each one might have undergone psychological interferences.

Bibliographic references

FREUD, S. (1915). *Conferências introdutórias sobre psicanálise (Partes I e II) - Obras completas*, vol. XV. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.

FREUD, S. [1972 (1901)] *Sobre a psicopatologia da vida cotidiana - Obras completas*, vol. XIV. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.

GAMBARARA, D. [2005a (2006)]. Un texte original Présentation des textes de F. de Saussure. In: *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*, vol.58, n. 58, p. 29-42. Genève: Droz,

GUYTON A. C. (1976). *Tratado de fisiologia médica*. Trad. de J. P. de Campos; L. F. Macedo; R. D. Leibinger; T. P. Lacerda e W. Savino. 5^a Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Interamericana.

HARRIS, R. (2001). *Saussure and his interpreters*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press LtdA.

HARRIS, R. (1993). Translator's Preface. In : SAUSSURE, F.(1993). *Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale (1910-1911): d'après les cahiers d'Emile Constantin / Saussure's third course of lectures on general linguistics (1910-1911): from the notebooks of Emile Constantin*. French text edited by Eisuke Komatsu e English text edited by Roy Harris. Pergamon Press, p. xvii-xxiii.

HARRIS, R; KOMATSU, E. (1993). The Constantin's notebooks. In: SAUSSURE, F.(1993). *Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale (1910-1911): d'après les cahiers d'Emile Constantin / Saussure's third course of lectures on general linguistics (1910-1911): from the notebooks of Emile Constantin*. French text edited by Eisuke Komatsu e English text edited by Roy Harris. Pergamon Press, p. xiii-xv.

KOMATSU, E. (1993). Foreword. In: SAUSSURE, F.(1993). *Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale (1910-1911): d'après les cahiers d'Emile Constantin / Saussure's third course of lectures on general linguistics (1910-1911): from the notebooks of Emile Constantin*. French text edited by Eisuke Komatsu e English text edited by Roy Harris. Pergamon Press, p. vii-xii.

JOSEPH, J. E. (2011). "Harris's Saussure — Harris as Saussure: The Translations of the *Cours* and the Third Course". In: *Language Sciences*, n. 33, p. 524-530.

NORMAND, C. (2009). *Saussure*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade.

SAUSSURE, F. (BOUQUET, S.; ENGLER, R. (org)) (2002). *Escritos de Linguística Geral*. São Paulo: Cultrix.

SAUSSURE, F. [1967 (1986)]. *Cours de Linguistique Générale*. Édition critique préparé par Tulio de Mauro. Paris: Payot.

_____ [1967 (1989)]. *Cours de Linguistique Générale*. Édition critique par Rudolf Engler (Tome I). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____ [1916 (2006)]. *Curso de linguística geral*. Trad. de A. Chelini; J. P. Paes e I. Blikstein. 27^a Ed. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2006. *Cours de linguistique general*. Charles Bally e Albert Sechehaye (orgs.), com a colaboração de Albert Riedlinger.

_____ (1993). *Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale (1910-1911): d'après les cahiers d'Emile Constantin / Saussure's third course of lectures on general linguistics (1910-1911): from the notebooks of Emile Constantin*. French text edited by Eisuke Komatsu e English text edited by Roy Harris. Pergamon Press.

SILVEIRA, E. M.(2009). A teoria do valor no Curso de Linguística Geral. *Revista Letras e Letras*, vol. 25 n. 1, p. 39-54 .

ⁱ The three courses specifically occurred on the following dates: from 16 January to 3 July 1907, the first week of November 1908 to June 24, 1909; of October 24, 1910 to July 4, 1911. Each course had respectively six, eleven, and twelve listeners.

ⁱⁱ Henceforth, we will use the acronym CLG to refer to the “Cours in General Linguistics”, because of its original headline “*Cours de Linguistique Générale*”, from French language.

ⁱⁱⁱ Henceforth, we will use the acronym TCLG to refer to the “Third Cours in General Linguistics – from the notebooks of Emile Constantin”, because of its original headline “*Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale*”, from French language.

^{iv} Henceforth, we will use the acronym ZPA to refer to the “Psychopathology of Everyday Life”, because of its original headline “*Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens*”, from German language.

^v Komatsu and Harris assert that Ms. Secheyay’s notebooks were used as sources to find out the dates and titles of the classes in which each theory of Constantin’s notebook were taught. They also say that Constantin conferred his notes with Dégallier’s ones after the classes. Because of this it is asserted in this work that their notes were used as supplementary material to the making of the TCLG.

^{vi} Since this is a Brazilian research, it was used the CLG in Portuguese (Saussure, 2006) in the analysis.

^{vii} The remarks that refer to the sources used in the making of the CLG are the following: 39, 46, 59, 71, 75, 82, 83, 89, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 102, 104, 109, 112, 116, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 135, 138, 144, 146, 147, 148, 151, 163, 169, 188, 197, 199, 200, 203, 207, 209, 212, 215, 216, 224, 226, 236, 239, 241, 246, 250, 255, 258, 260, 265, 267, 268, 269, 276, 279, 283, 287, 291, 292, 293, 205, 297, 298, 300 e 304.

^{viii} The expression “*en quelque sorte mystérieux*” is taken from Saussure (1916) page 156.

^{ix} Henceforth, BGE.