The objective of the present note is to recall some of the main features of the different periods of the Circle's activities and to give a brief overview of its achievements. We restrict ourselves to the domain of linguistics, though we are well aware of the rich results in branches other than linguistics, which have been extremely fruitful thanks to R. Jakobson, J. Mukařovský, as well as later to M. Červenka and others. We also have to resign on formulating a systematic account of the rich contributions to these activities in Slovakia by E. Pauliny or J. Horecký, and abroad (at least reflections of some of the latter can be found in Dirven and Fried, 1987). We present only extremely brief notes on the older periods (1926–1945, in Sect. 1 and 2), and add somewhat more detailed remarks on more recent research (Sect. 3 and 4).

1. The Classical Circle

The Prague Linguistic Circle belongs to the first bodies that changed the older diachronic paradigm of linguistics into a synchronic theory. Soon after its first session (taking place in 1926 in the study of V. Mathesius, Professor of English language and literature, the chairman of the Circle till his death in 1945), the Circle entered the international scene first of all with its systematically elaborated phonological theory. Starting with The Hague Linguistic Congress (see *Actes*, 1928), Praguian phonology became the pilot discipline of structural linguistics. The strength of the Circle was in its spirit of dialogue, which kept the Circle receptive to new ideas, rather than in any set of postulates commonly professed (see Leška, 1995; 1999).

While Jakobson (1929) presented the phonological repertory (both in synchrony and in diachrony) as a system of oppositions (mainly binary, privative), based on acoustic distinctive features and understood as the clue to the sound and meaning relationship, Trubetzkoy (1929; 1939) preferred to establish a comparative analysis of phonemic systems, throwing new light on relationships between languages (including the concept of *Sprachbund*). Both of them stressed the systematic, teleonomic nature of language development. Another approach was that of Mathesius (1929a), who stressed the ways in which this repertory is used in the expressions of a language. Both the functional and the structural views, which later started to be used as attributes to the name of the Prague School, were already present in all of these approaches to phonology: the phonemes were defined and delimited
on a functional basis (two different phonemes can distinguish two morphemes), and the established repertory of distinctive features gave a firm foundation to the description of the system of phonemes as a structured whole.

At the First Congress of Slavicists in Prague in 1929, the Circle presented its approach to phonology together with that to fundamental problems of linguistic description in the first volume of the *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* (*TCLP*), which included the *Thèses* of the Circle, outlining the tasks of synchronic phonology, the principles of functional onomatology and syntax, and the functions of language (with the specific goals of the standard language, the spoken norm of which in its dialogue form constitutes a scale of transitions towards the "folk language", and with the values proper to poetic language). The regular publishing of *TCLP* with important theoretically innovative contributions constituted an effective link with international linguistics. The Czech journal *Slovo a slovesnost* (Word and verbal art), published since 1935, was the main inner platform of the Circle. An overview of the main tenets of the classical Circle viewed from inside can be found in Vachek (1960; 1966), another one, viewed from outside, in Raynaud (1990). Toman (1994; 1995) brings and discusses documents on the collaboration between the main representatives of the classical Circle. Mathesius (1928; 1936), inspired especially by the philosophy of language of A. Marty (1908), presented his theory of functional grammar, based on the concept of function as related to universal intentional acts and treated as a dichotomy of functional onomatology and functional syntax. Mathesius (1942) then combined this universal dichotomy with the language specific opposition of function and form.2

The manysided, although not all-embracing influence of de Saussure's *Cours* on the views of the Praguians is analysed by Čermák (1996), who discusses the dichotomies of *langue* and *parole* and of synchrony and diachrony, as well as attributes such as arbitrary, distinctive and others. All these concepts were discussed and accepted (or elaborated) in Prague (with certain exceptions, such as B. Trnka's views on the two dichotomies). The Circle shared de Saussure’s understanding of language as a system of (bilateral) signs, in which only oppositions, rather than fixed entities, play a role.

Among significant enrichments of de Saussure's theory by the Prague School, let us briefly register at least the following ones:

(i) The notion of markedness, characterizing the intrinsic asymmetry of binary (and other) oppositions (not only in phonology, but also in morphology, in semiotics and in many other domains) was first systematically presented by Jakobson
(see Battistella, 1995). It was properly understood and used as an organizing principle of sign systems, also in connection with language universals and language acquisition, and it was taken over by N. Chomsky, who applied it, albeit in a different shape, in his Principles and Parameters theory.

(ii) Along with phonemes and morphemes, also the sentence was recognized as one of the fundamental fields of systematic oppositions, i.e. as an ingredient of la langue, in the Circle's work. Along with V. Mathesius functional syntax, a structural view of syntax, based on the dependency relation, was elaborated by L. Tesnière (1934), a French member of the Circle, who was a professor of the Ljubljana University; his monograph was published only posthumously (1959), but his papers were known in Prague (see also his analysis of the degrees of cohesion of different language layers, Tesnière, 1939) and his approach to syntax was applied to Czech by Šmilauer (1947), who combined dependency syntax with a constituent based view of the relation between predicate and subject.³

(iii) Mathesius (1929b; 1939) introduced the study of information structure into structural linguistics, preferring the terms Thema and Rhema (used earlier in German linguistics by H. Ammann) to the older psychologisches Subjekt and Prädikat (used by G. von der Gabelentz, H. Paul and others), and understanding the former (the topic) as one of the functions of the subject in English. He distinguished topic proper, comment (focus) proper and the accompanying elements of either of these two parts.

(iv) Issues of the functions and specific properties of the standard, of "language culture" and of the geographical, social and functional stratification of the national language were analysed by Havránek (1929; 1932), who also published detailed studies on the verb diatheses (1928–1934) and on the history of Standard Czech (1936). Together with V. Mathesius, R. Jakobson and B. Trnka, he was engaged in a polemical discussion, in which they convincingly showed that the older views of purism and prescriptive norms, which survived in Czech studies since the epoch of National Revival in the 19th century, should be abandoned. Especially V. Mathesius and B. Trnka, who knew well the situation in English studies, stressed the necessity of the transition towards a liberal standpoint.

Among the writings of the founders' pupils and followers, the most important was Skalička's (1935) structural comparison of Hungarian, Finnish, Czech and Turkish, which was aimed at an explicit specification of the main concepts of synchronic grammar and gave a starting point to the typology of languages he formulated in the later periods (see below).
2. Inter arma silent musae

During the German occupation of Czechoslovakia, the Czech universities were closed, and soon also the linguistic journals were strongly reduced. Only a few results of linguistic research could be published; they documented that the functional and structural methods of the Prague School continued to be applied in fruitful ways to open issues of a considerable significance. Even under the difficult conditions, an important volume of studies on language and poetry was published (Havránek and Mukařovský, 1942). A pertinent account of the fundamental aspects of Praguian functional and structural linguistics was presented by Trnka (1943).

Skalička's (1941) monograph on the typological development of the Czech declension includes a profound discussion with K. Rocher, a forerunner of the Prague School (who stressed the influence of grammatical gender), and with N. Trubetzkoy (who wrote about Czech declension as facing its decay). Skalička presents a characterization of the gradual culmination of inflection in Czech declension and then of the starting reduction of properties of this type. He discusses the validity of G. von der Gabelentz's view of the development in spiral ("isolation – agglutination – inflection – isolation"), claiming that in the eastern (satem) part of the Indo-European languages the reduction of inflection is connected with an intensification of agglutination (at least in what concerns declension).

A general view on the relative autonomy of written language was presented by Vachek (1939), who pointed out that writing systems, although constituting marked counterparts of spoken norms, cannot be analysed merely as derived from the latter. In Slovakia, a comprehensive contribution to structural syntax was published by Pauliny (1943), dealing with his 'intension' of the verb (underlying valency); in many respects, he elucidated the specific properties of deep syntax, as distinguished from surface and morphemics. Phonemic systems of Slavonic languages were characterized from a typological viewpoint (based on Jakobson's implication laws) by Isačenko (1939–40). Ľ. Novák was one of the outstanding personalities of functional and structural linguistics in that epoch.

3. The Circle after the second world war

In the first post-war years, the Circle resumed its work under the leadership of B. Havránek; it lasted several years before the situation got stabilized after losses such as the death of N. Trubetzkoy in 1938 and of V. Mathesius in 1945, the forced emigration of R. Jakobson and other disasters. The publishing of Slovo a slovesnost was resumed in 1947; it was still impossible to publish theoretical monographs.
The Circle had to defend its views against attempts to implant Marrism in Czecho-
slovakia; it was to this aim that Skalička (1947–1948) specified the differences in
the views of the Praguian and the Copenhagen schools of structural linguistics,
stressing the Praguian functionalism (which made it possible to discard Marrist
criticism of the "formalist" structural school).

The enthusiasm of the members of the Circle, connected with their pioneering
spirit and their international success, was present again. It is no wonder that a new
generation of young linguists was attracted to its activities by the leading personal-
ities of this epoch, i.e. by B. Havránek, B. Trnka, V. Skalička, J. Vachek, P. Trost,
K. Horálek and, in Slovakia, E. Pauliny. Trnka (1948) characterized the development
of linguistic thinking as typical for the shift of scientific structures in the direction
of "objectivizing orientation, in which the noetic model begins to be supplied by logic."

The Circle now devoted its efforts mainly to problems of language structure, of
poetics and also of the process of communication and of written language. In the
first of these domains, Skalička (1946–1948) continued his typological explor-
ations. Analyses of the properties and position of written language were carried
on by Vachek (1948). As we have mentioned in Sect. 1, also Šmilauer's (1947)
monograph on syntax essentially belongs to structural linguistics.

Contacts with international research, interrupted during the war, were still very
limited. There were almost no connections to western countries before the 1960s,
so that the decisive part of the linguistic world was not informed about the results
achieved in our country at that time. Let us add that Vey (1946) published the re-
sults of his investigations of everyday spoken Czech, based on material he gathered
in the 1920s.

4. The Prague School activities in communist times

At the beginning of the 1950s, the members of the Circle could not react against
the politically supported influence of the linguistic contributions by J. Stalin in
a way similar to their previous reaction against Marrism. Since B. Havránek was
respected both by the Communist leadership and by many members of the Circle
as an outstanding personality, it was possible for the Circle to get merged into two
of the associations belonging to the then established Academy of Sciences and thus
to ensure a continuation of its methods. Along with Havránek's Soviet-oriented
wing of the School, working as (or within) the Czechoslovak Linguistic Associ-
ation, there was another wing, B. Trnka's Group of Functional Linguistics within
the Circle of Modern Philology, which preferred the principles and methods of the
classical Circle as the sources of their research and pedagogical activities. During the 1960s and 1970s several adherents of the former wing one after another started to participate also in B. Trnka's Group, which at first seemed to be the weaker of the two.

Many researchers and teachers were excluded from the academic life, or could continue working only with strict limitations. Except rare occasions, even the Circle's name could not be used in publications; it was only possible to speak of the Prague School of functional and structural linguistics, and especially R. Jakobson became a persona non grata. Even so, at least in the relatively liberal epoch of the 1960s, the then excluded direct continuation of TCLP was substituted by the series of Travaux linguistiques de Prague, Vol. 1–4, 1964, 1966, 1968 and 1971, initiated by J. Vachek and F. Daneš. In this series, as well as in contributions published in Czech journals, or (rarely) abroad, V. Mathesius' ideas were still understood as an important source of linguistic traditions, and trends such as V. Skalička’s typology of languages6 or B. Havránek's theory of standard language and stylistics were discussed and developed by many adherents.7 The theory of phonology and the classification of different kinds of oppositions in the system of language, established by R. Jakobson and N. Trubetzkoj, did not stop to be understood to constitute a basic component of linguistic theory; it was defended against the more recent generative views especially by Vachek (1964a).

Among further results from that period there is the theory of Functional Sentence Perspective (information structure; now see Firbas, 1992, and the writings quoted there, also Daneš, 1974; 1988), as well as Dokulil's (1994) systematic account of derivatology and his principled and adequately specified distinction between linguistic meaning (underlying sentence structure, values of morphological categories, etc., with ambiguity of the respective means of expression) and ontological or cognitive content (not directly structured by language). Also the dependency based syntactic theory of F. Daneš and Z. Hlavsa (1981) has been of high significance, as well as contributions to text linguistics. All of these results gained a large positive response within and outside Czechoslovakia. As for the information structure of the sentence, especially the contribution to the general theoretical issues by M. A. K. Halliday and the empirically oriented studies by N. E. Enkvist, E. Conte, H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast and others are highly valuable.

The situation of the School became even more difficult after the Soviet-led invasion of 1968. However, even then, structural and functional methods were used in investigations into many problems of general linguistics, as well as of Czech and other languages. The Functional Generative Description (FGD) was formulated as
a response to N. Chomsky's programme of an application of formal methods. This approach has brought a linguistic description that could also adequately account for the information structure as one of the aspects of (underlying, tectogrammatical) sentence structure, see Sgall et al. (1986) and the writings quoted there. The semantics of negation and different kinds of entailment was discussed by Hajičová (1984).

Uhlířová (1972; 1987) published important analyses of Czech word order. Analyses of functional sentence perspective and several further issues in general and English linguistics have also been continued by Dušková (now see her selected contributions, 1999); her comprehensive account of English grammar based on Praguian functional approach was published as Dušková et al. (1988). For Romance studies, Šabršula's (1980) insightful discussion of issues of word classes and syntax is of great importance, as well as the deepened analysis of modality in Spanish by Zavadil (1980). In the domain of Russian studies, different parts of the verb system were scrutinized from the functional viewpoint by Barnet (1965) and Barnetová (1975).

The selected studies on the typology of languages by Skalička (1979) characterize his analyses of most different languages, showing how rich subsystems of properties of the morphemic, syntactic and phonemic levels of language structure can be identified and characterized on the basis of his types viewed as coherent bundles of features. The possibility to specify a single property from which other features of a given type can be derived (the fundamental property being favourable to them in the probabilistic sense) was explored by Sgall (1986;1995, with this underlying feature understood as the way of expression of grammatical values), and also by Popela (1991). Skalička's views on typology were applied to issues of French by Uhlíř (1969) and to those of Germanic languages by Čermák (1978). A specific approach to the typology of languages was presented by Kurzová (1981); as for a later elaboration, see Kurzová (1993) and Hoskovec (1999–2002).

Trnka (1964;1982) articulated the form-function relation in the context of semiotics as divided into several steps in his system of the levels of language, going from the phoneme up to utterance. He and also Vachek (1976) contributed significantly to the explorations in English synchronic and diachronic phonology. One of the deepest going thinkers of the Prague School, Trost (1968; 1989; 1995), paid attention to the basic issues of linguistic theory as well as to partial problems of syntax, language contacts and interrelations of language and literature.

In informing the international linguistic community about the developments of the Prague School, much has been done especially by Vachek (1964b; 1966; 1983);
see also Luelsdorff et al. (1994). The pedagogical aspects and applications of the Prague School approach were discussed in Fried (1972). Neustupný (1978) discusses Skalička's views in a generally oriented framework. A significant branch of structural studies, stressing the character of language as a system of signs, was elaborated by Schooneveld (1959), Tobin (1988; 1990) and others (now see esp. Andrews and Tobin, 1996). Further aspects of the Circle's work have been reflected in a new framework in S. C. Dik's Functional Grammar.

5. The revived Circle

As O. Leška found in the spring of 1989, the existence of the Circle was never interrupted from the legal point of view. He assembled a group of linguists and literature theoreticians wanting to restart the Circle's activities. In 1990, M. Dokulil was elected the new chairman (followed by O. Leška and then by E. Hajičová), and the Circle's lectures and discussions, and later also publications were resumed. As the reopened series of *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague (nouvelle série)*, published in Amsterdam/Philadelphia by J. Benjamins with the parallel title *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers*, the Circle again has found good contacts with well known linguists and philosophers in different countries, such as E. Holenstein, B. H. Partee, W. U. Dressler, E. Battistella, J. Mey, K. Sparck-Jones, W. Abraham or Z. Topolińska. As in the classical Circle, also here no unification of approaches has taken place and a spirit of dialogue is present. The situation of course has changed; the linguistic scene is more diversified than it was in the 1930s and Prague does not have such a distinguished position as it had. The challenges and stimuli coming from outside are much more voluminous, many-sided and urgent, and the scale of the research as well as of its goals is much broader. These factors are both supporting and hampering the dialogue, the presence of which nevertheless is crucial.

At least the following branches of linguistic research have been developed, with stress being laid on different aspects of the functional and structural views:

(a) Fundamental accounts of the Prague School thought, concerning among other issues those of the teleonomic account of the system of language and of its development, were formulated by Leška (1991; 1995; 1996). Posthumously, in Leška (2003) his profound and many-sided structural description of Standard Russian against the background of dialects is presented.

(b) Corpus linguistics, which is crucial for empirical studies of the functions of structural units, has been developing mainly thanks to the efforts of F. Čermák, the head of the Institute of the Czech National Corpus which he founded in 1994.
with the task to put together a very large collection of texts and open it (equipped with user friendly tools) to researchers and students (see Čermák, 1997). The corpus, now available as a collection of 100 million word occurrences, is an irreplaceable resource for linguistic studies, which has been documented by an increasing number of papers based on corpus material as well as by the design and development of a richly annotated part of the corpus, the Prague Dependency Treebank (see under (c) below).

(c) The Functional Generative Description has been further developed in the sense of a challenge for the Chomskyan and other views on an explicit (if not fully formalized) linguistic description, based on dependency syntax and on an understanding of the interactive character of natural language, see esp. Panevová (1994) on sentence structure and Hajčová (2004) on focus and discourse coreference. Sgall (1992) presents arguments for a reduction of the number of levels of the language system: the relationship between tectogrammatics and morphemics can be understood as direct, without being mediated by a level of "surface syntax". Various aspects of this approach were confronted with those exploring sentence structure and its relations to semantics under the angle of post-Montaguian intensional semantics in Hajčová, Partee and Sgall (1998), where the possibility of accounting for the interpretation of the information structure of the sentence by tripartite structures (Operator – Restrictor – Nuclear Scope) has been pointed out. In the programme of the Prague Dependency Treebank (see Hajič, 1998; Hajič et al., 2001), FGD has been tested on continuous texts taken from the large Czech National Corpus, the result being that several specific enrichments of the theoretical framework are advisable, especially the recognition of a third kind of dependency relations along with 'arguments' and 'adjuncts', viz. the quasi-valency relations (see Lopatková – Panevová, in press). It has been confirmed that the framework as such can be understood as fully able to capture the core of language as exhibiting a relatively simple structuring, corresponding to general human mental capacities (see Sgall, 2002). The study of statistical approaches to morphemic corpus annotation was initiated by Hajič (2004).

(d) Everyday spoken Czech has been studied from different viewpoints: discussions on issues of colloquial and Standard Czech, which started earlier, are still continued, see esp. Sgall et al. (1992), Čermák (1993), and also contributions by J. Hoffmannová, O. Müllerová, S. Čmejrková and others, as well as the critical view of the functional approach presented by Z. Starý and elaborated as concerns the understanding of the Standard esp. by Cvrček (2006). The specific sociolinguistic
issues of Czech have found rich attention abroad, starting with the path-breaking study of oscillation of Standard and non-Standard phenomena in everyday Czech by Kučera (1955); a systematic description of the main non-Standard variety of Czech was presented by Townsend (1990), among the studies on the oscillation in Czech fiction there are Gammelgaard (1997) and Bermel (2000); an analysis of the speakers' attitudes towards this variety and of their insufficient information about the actual situation can be found in Bayer (2003), and an analysis of the morphemics of TV conversations in Hedin (2005); as for further contributions, see esp. Eckert (1993) and Janda et al. (2002). In Russia, especially the sociolinguistic explorations of G. Neščimenko are closely related to Praguian research.

(e) Relationships between sentence and discourse patterns are analysed esp. by Daneš (1995), as well as by S. Čmejrková, J. Hoffmannová and O. Müllerová, and also by Hajčová et al. (2003). P. Karlík explores sentence syntax, taking into account different pragmatic factors. Several important contributions, esp. by E. M. Uhlenbeck, N. E. Enkvist, P. L. Garvin, R. de Beaugrande, W. U. Dressler and others can be found in the festschrift for F. Daneš edited by Čmejrková and Štícha (1994).

The volume edited by Nekula (2003) includes contributions by researchers of various further trends.10 Furthermore, Štícha (2003) presented a comprehensive comparative grammar of Czech and German. Tláskal's (2000) discussion of the system of levels in French, especially of marked syntactic positions of lexemes, is of high interest. Basic issues of lexical semantics have been discussed by J. Filipec, R. Kocourek and others. P. Zima devotes attention to African languages and to issues of interlinguistic relationships. In the domain of Oriental studies, O. Švarný has significantly contributed to synchronic and diachronic questions of Chinese and I. Vasiljev to those of Vietnamese. The Praguian typology of languages was enriched especially by Giger and Vykypěl (2001).

The work of the Circle has always been largely known and reflected in Slavonic countries. In Russia, Bondarko's (1991) monograph was devoted to issues of functional and structural understanding of the fundamentals of grammar as well as to empirical domains of the grammar of Russian (aspect, taxis in narration) and of discourse patterns. Also A. A. Reformatskij, J. S. Maslov, as well as, in Poland, Z. Topolińska, A. Bogusławski, Z. Saloni and other linguists published significant contributions to functional and structural understanding of various grammatical phenomena. The international position of Praguian linguistics has been strengthened by Vilém Mathesius Centre at Charles University, founded in 1992 thanks to support by G. Soros' foundations and devoted first of all to the organization of
series of lectures (taking place at first twice a year, then once a year) given by well known linguists from the USA and different European countries and attended mainly by young researchers from Central and Eastern Europe.

In 1996, several conferences were organized either on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the start of the activities of the Circle or of one hundred years since the birth of one of its founders, Roman O. Jakobson. Both these aims were in the focus of the conference "Bridges and Interfaces", held in Prague in March, 1996. Several of the more than 80 contributions presented here by researchers from different countries and different linguistic trends were published in *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, n. s.*, vol. 3 (1999). Along with contributions concentrating on the history of Prague linguistic thought (by O. Leška and by P. Sgall), two studies continuing the Praguian phonology can be found here (by C. H. van Schooneveld and by Y. Tobin), as well as a series of papers on morphology (by B. H. Partee, E. Stankiewicz, W. U. Dressler and others), on sentence syntax (including information structure), and so on.

Among the other Jakobsonian conferences organized that year in Europe, let us mention just one, which took place in Crêt-Bérard (Switzerland) in September. Its many-sided programme corresponded with Jakobson's rich activities in many domains of research, as is reflected in the volume edited by Gadet and Sériot (1997). The contributions cover most different domains from West-East relationships in old and modern times (E. Holenstein, P. Sériot, J. Toman and others) to the impact of F. de Saussure's linguistic theory and E. Husserl's phenomenology on the Circle's work and to issues such as the acceptance of this work on the international scene.

Notes

* The research underlying this contribution has been carried out in the frame of the projects 1ET201120505 and MSM0021620838.

1 In more recent terms, it is possible to speak of language as a goal-oriented system, although issues concerning the mechanism of its control still have to be analysed (cf. Trost, 1989); important findings on the history of teleonomy were presented by Sériot (1999a,b). Other aspects of the philosophical (phenomenological) foundations of the Praguian approach, esp. of its elaboration by R. Jakobson, were analysed by Holenstein (1975; 1985).

2 Karcevskij (1927; 1929) pointed out how the danger of an unrestrained semanticism can be avoided, bearing in mind that the unrestricted richness of the communicated content is linguistically structured in the form of the (underspecified, often vague or indistinct) set of restricted linguistic meanings.
3 Šmilauer's syntax may well be called structural, although due to his puristic orientation in the ardently discussed issues of the standard language (see point (iv) below) he was an anti-structuralist personality.

4 It should be recalled that Jakobson's (1941) most influential analysis of the fundamental relationships in language structure, turning attention to their universal aspects, fully belongs to the context of his Praguian research activities, although it was written in exile.

5 Although he at first belonged to ardent critics of the Prague School, P. Sgall was one of those who soon stated that the School's tradition was worth to be continued and who found occasions to recognize the significance of this tradition in their own research and in reviews (see e.g. Sgall, 1964), and even to recall the name of the Circle, as was done in his review of an American volume edited by L. Matějka (Sgall, 1978), and also in the first commemorative volume devoted to P. Trost (Hajičová et al., 1987).

6 Skalička's theory of typology was one of the objects of ideologically biased criticism; the theory was defended by Sgall and attacked by F. Trávníček and K. Horálek (see esp. Sgall, 1955; a depreciating remark was added to this paper by Horálek (p. 435), who however soon acknowledged the high significance of Skalička's theory in an international context, see Sivertsen, 1958, s. 31).

7 Issues of everyday spoken Czech were discussed by B. Havránek, J. Bělič, P. Sgall, M. Jelínek, P. Novák, M. Krčmová, R. Brabcová, B. Dejmek and others, in Russia esp. by A. G. Širokova.

8 Hajičová and Sgall (in press) discuss the fundamental significance of the information structure. Important insights in this domain have been presented by Uhlířová (1996). Svozboda's (1981) notion of 'diatheme' is still connected with several unclear points, especially in what concerns its relationships to contrastive (part of) topic and to the opposition of paradigmatic and syntagmatic phenomena.

9 For technical aims of the transition from morphemics to tectogrammatics in the analysis of the corpus texts, the auxiliary 'analytic level' has been added to the repertory of sentence representations.

10 A comment on the "selfdestruction" of the Circle can be found in Sgall (2005).
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*Eva Hajičová and Petr Sgall: EIGHTY YEARS OF THE PRAGUE LINGUISTIC CIRCLE*

On the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the foundation of the Prague Linguistic Circle it is important to recall at least some of the main features of the different periods of the Circle’s activities and to give a brief overview of its different achievements. The authors restrict their attention to the domain of linguistics, though they are well aware of the rich results in branches other than linguistics, including besides language studies especially in aesthetics and the theory of literature, in which R. Jakobson, J. Mukařovský, as well as later M. Červenka, and others made extremely fruitful contributions. The limited space
also does not allow to discuss what has been achieved by the Circle's activities in Slovakia and abroad. Attention is paid both to the older periods (1926–1945, in Sect. 1 and 2), and somewhat more detailed remarks are presented on more recent research (Sect. 3 and 4). The bibliography (which by far cannot be complete) contains a selection of relevant writings.

In Section 1, the classical Circle from the 1930s is characterized as having been broadly accepted on the international scene thanks to its deeply elaborated phonological theory. The views of its main authors, i.e. N. Trubetzkoy and R. Jakobson, were far from unified; in fact, the strength of the Circle was in its spirit of dialogue, which kept the Circle receptive to new ideas, rather than in any set of postulates commonly professed. The many-sided, although not all-embracing influence of de Saussure's *Cours* on the views of the Praguians was combined with significant insights concerning the notion of markedness, V. Mathesius’ functional and structural view of syntax and of the information structure, and also B. Havránek’s account of the social and functional stratification of the national language. Among the writings of the founders' followers, V. Skalička's specification of the main concepts of synchronic grammar gave a starting point to his typology of languages.

In spite of the limitations enforced by the German occupation of Czechoslovakia between 1939 and 1945, certain important results could be published, which we briefly characterize in Section 2. In Sections 3 and 4, we point out some of the main achievements the Circle gained in the first post-war years, having resumed its work under the leadership of B. Havránek, J. Mukačovský, B. Trnka, V. Skalička and J. Vachek. However, after the Communist take-over in 1948, the Circle, which before that had to defend its views against attempts to implant Marrism, reacted with a less active defence against the politically supported influence of the contributions by J. V. Stalin. The Circle's name could only rarely be used in publications, and R. Jakobson (in exile since 1939) became a *persona non grata*. Even so, the Prague School's methods continued to be applied in domains such as typology of languages, derivatology, phonology, information structure and theory of Standard language and stylistics, as well as text linguistics.

Section 5 is devoted to the period after the Circle's revival in 1989, initiated by O. Leška. As in the classical Circle, no unification of approaches has taken place and a spirit of dialogue is present. At least the following branches of linguistic research have been developed, with stress being laid on different aspects of the functional and structural views:

(a) issues of the teleonomic account of the system of language and of its development;
(b) corpus linguistics, crucial for empirical studies of the functions of structural units;
(c) a further elaboration of the Functional Generative Description, being developed already since the 1960s as a challenge for the Chomskyan and other views on an explicit linguistic description and based on dependency syntax and on an understanding of the interactive character of natural language;
(d) discussions on issues of everyday spoken Czech;
(e) relationships between sentence structure and discourse patterns.