

ARTICLES

MOULDING A COMPETITIVE STUDENT IN THE LIGHT OF E. COSERIU'S DEONTOLOGY

Luiza ŞOŞU

"We are discussing no small matter, but how we ought to live"
(Socrates, *Plato's Republic*).

"[...] there is this deontology, this ought to be in culture" (E.
Cosériu).

Abstract

Deontology is an important science for every specialist. In this article we analyze the E. Cosériu's deontological principles which can be used in foreign languages and literatures specialists' preparation.

Keywords: *deontology, specialist, formation, competitive.*

Students of medicine have a special course of deontology, which they study during the whole first year. At the end of their studies they swear a solemn oath: "I swear by Apollo, physician... and I take to witness all the Gods to keep according to my ability and my judgment the following oath: "To consider dear to me as my parents him *who taught me this art*, to live in common with him, and if necessary to share my goods with him, to look upon his children as my own brothers... to impart to my sons and the sons of the master who taught me and the disciples... but to these alone the precepts and the instruction. I will prescribe regimen for the good of my patients... and never do harm to anyone... I will preserve the purity of my life and my art..." This wants to say that surgery and medicine, in general, do not begin with a scalpel and the drug but with the hand which raises this scalpel or prescribes the drug and more precisely with him "who taught me this art".

I think that students of languages and of any other social sciences should have a special course of deontology as well, since their tool - the word, the langue that may be sharper than the scalpel and much more poisonous than any drug, can do harm to other man's spirit.

Deontological ethics or *deontology* comes from Greek δέον, *deon*, "obligation, duty" and λογία, *logia* and is an approach to ethics that judges the morality of an action based on the action's adherence to a rule or rules. Deontologists look at rules and duties. It is sometimes described as "duty" or "obligation" or "rule" - based ethics. The term "deontological" was first used in this way

in 1930, in C. D. Broad's book, "Five Types of Ethical Theory". But the roots of these problems of ethics and morality go deep into history.

A fugitive digression into the history will reveal that Socrates was the first European philosopher concerned with deontological dimension. His famous words are taken as the motto to the article. They prove that his most fundamental preoccupation after science was the morality of the young - their virtues. And what is virtue according to his teachings? To be virtuous means to *know*, because virtue is science. A person is unrighteous not out of bad will but because he does not know himself, does not know what he wants. To know what one wants is to know the righteousness and seek to realize it. The realization of righteousness leads to personal happiness and to the prosperity of the community. Ignorance is the cause of all evil and sin. And he lived according to his precepts.

Plato and Aristotle continued to develop his moral teachings in their philosophical works. Aristotle wrote in his "Ethic Virtues" that "statesmen and anybody who teaches social subjects must have knowledge in the science of the soul, as well, as that one who is willing to cure the eyes or other parts of the body must have knowledge in its construction. And the knowledge of the former is much more important than of the latter because the political art is more precious and full of utility than that of medicine"¹. It should be noted that Aristotle's ethics is part of politics. He considers that man is a social being by his nature and virtue is a perfection of the soul, which is in service to the whole society. That is why the exercise of virtue is very important to the men of state. According to Aristotle virtues can be of two kinds: ethic virtues (moral) and dianoethic virtues (of the mind). Dianoethic virtues of the rational contemplation need time and experience to be learned. Moral virtue of the character is a *habitus*, i.e. a habit which remains in the form of active disposition. They are not learned as such (is Aristotle's answer to the problem which from Socrates preoccupies the entire Greek philosophy, namely to know if virtue can be learned, acquired by science - *know your own self* (Socrates), because the evil has been done as a result of your not knowing the good. So they are gained by constant exercising. The Greek and Roman stoicism continued the same conception of the ethic principle which must conform to the rational nature of the man as a single criterion of our moral actions. While the Greek stoicism is based mostly on logics, the Roman stoicism, due to historic imperial environment approaches more and more by its humanistic principles - that all people are brothers and must be pitied - to the Christian principles.

Since then deontology, the principles of morality, are the core of any philosophical conception and it is a worthy and edifying problem to be studied from the historical point of view but it being not my task here I will resume to the subject of my presentation - to the contemporary philosopher

who revised all deontological dimensions, to the acuity with which he posed these problems. It is homage to the greatest linguist of the XXth century Eugenio Coseriu.

It is not by chance that I mentioned two great philosophers of the past – Socrates and Plato. They lived in accordance with the deontology they expounded in their teachings. Few are, really, those philosophers who followed their own precepts. It is about them that St. Isidor Pelusiot acclaimed “When a man speaks about truth and righteousness and he himself does so in accordance with his powers, then such a man becomes an icon of the whole philosophy”. Such an “icon” of modern philosophy is Eugenio Coseriu. E. Coseriu’s principles of deontology were like footholds in his ascent to the acme of humanistic sciences. In our contemporary society, with shattered moral foundations the value of his moral teachings should not be less estimated than his titanic work in the fields of linguistics, applied linguistics, critics and other domains.

For E. Coseriu ethics is a fundamental thing for any scientist: “When you are an agent of a free activity, you assume the responsibilities to realize this object in the sense it ought to be, the sense of deontology and not because it is imposed by something but because you assumed the engagement. These activities have an obligatory ethics, not in the sense that it is an imposed one, done under duress, under the constraint but in the sense the word *obligatio* had in old Latin – commitment, i.e. engagement”².

His own high ethic principles start with the very first precept from Hippocratic Oath – *to consider dear to me him who taught me this art*. In 2001, after more than 50 years, in an interview in his own alma mater he remembers all his 11 teachers by their full names and has warm and gratifying words for each of them, especially for his first teacher Roman Mândăcanu, a teacher – “I much loved all my life”, as he himself avows.

He has a great respect and consideration for his Italian teachers, as well. “Lectures on General Linguistics” – his first book, he dedicated to his teachers, three great Italian scholars: Antonio Banfi, Giovanni Maver and Antonio Pagliaro. In spite of being of three different political orientations – A. Banfi was a communist, G. Maver was a liberal, A. Pagliaro was a fascist, they appreciated and respected each other as E. Coseriu stated: “I did not dedicate my book to them because one was a communist, one a liberal, and the third a fascist but because all of them were great masters of science and culture”³. It was this coexisting – normal and possible at that time, as Coseriu reveals further, that was a great luck for him and which facilitated his development. It is with much regret and sorrow that Coseriu always mentions about those who remained in the country and were destroyed morally and physically by the communist system.

Later he himself created a very warm, trustworthy atmosphere among his students. And his disciples loved him very much. "There existed a community of post graduates which still exists today. All of them are friends. Thirty three are University professors, heads of Chairs in Germany, Congo, Latin America, Spain and Italy. And all care for me. No enmity between us and among them. There was neither rivalry nor exclusiveness among them because everyone felt free in his scientific options"⁴ - acknowledges E. Coseriu in one of the interviews at our State university during his last visit May 17-20, 2001.

Eugenio Coseriu was exposed to many a culture. His ethic habits were educated in Italy and other countries, in the contacts he had but "they originated from our customs and traditions in Northern Moldova, from certain moral habits which exist till nowadays"⁵ - he confesses. He also mentions that it is not a mere chance that such great writers and artists as Eminescu, Creangă, Sadoveanu, Iorga, Enescu, C. Porumbescu, Luchian, Hașdeu, Stere and so many others were born in Northern Moldova. He concludes that there exist some certain traditions, a special atmosphere which keeps them still alive. He supposes that there exist, too, some old ties that go down to the rest of the European culture, with the Latin school from Poland, for instance.

And in another interview he states: "One should realize science, critics and so on in the sense it ought to be... It is the ideal ethics which I tried following in all my scientific and pedagogical activities"⁶. These ones are based on Orthodox morality on which the Romanian culture nourishes its roots for more than 2000 years. Reading from the Bible, especially from the Psalms was a sacred obligation in every Romanian family. Home breeding was entirely based on it. "How can a young man keep his way pure? By keeping it according to Thy word"⁷ this was the healthy grain which had been planted into his heart from the very childhood, so he had those *seven years from home*, as the Romanians would say. His best friend, Valeriu Gafencu, became martyr of Orthodox faith. The communist regime destroyed him in one of its prisons. The Romanian Orthodox Church will canonize him in the near future.

Another small detail, remembered by E. Coseriu, is significant to the topic. When he was 13 years old an epistle of Our Lady circulated in that part of the country. Allegedly, it had come from the above carried by a small in size but heavy black stone. It said "repent, repent, the doomsday is approaching. And behold, when at the *One Hundred Hills (Centum Monticuli* as described by D. Cantemir) the blood raises to the horse's chest... the time of antichrist will begin". Later he wrote *a Letter* in which his father might have written in 195: "We miss you all who have left but do not come back

because at the One hundred Hills the blood covers the horse and the horseman”⁸.

Eugenio Coseriu revised all ethical teachings from Socrates to Hegel and Kant and advanced 5 principles of deontology - fundamental thing for any scientist, student, public and political man. In an interview to Angela Furtună he exhorts: “Ethical attitude is the most vital. It can help one gain a much more solid position in the long run. But it may happen only on condition that this position has not been sought and on condition that it has not been tried to be obtained via unfair methods, subterfuge and scientific fraud, which exist, unfortunately, on a very large and refined scale”. He does not like to use, as we see, such euphemistic words as plagiarism and scientific speculations. He names things as they are.

1.1. The principle of tradition

The principle of tradition in Coseriu’s hierarchy comes third but in the sciences of culture it is the most important one. In “The Principles of Linguistics as a Science of Culture” Coseriu quotes the famous Spanish linguist Menendez Pidal: “...in culture everything is primarily tradition and only then, in the frame of tradition - new and revolutionary things”. Coseriu enlarges a little bit by adding: “Who asserts only new things, does not say anything, because the true, effective newness in science as well as in culture is something that has its roots in the tradition, it does not ignore what has been done hitherto. It is a satanic self-assurance to say: I am to arrange things; everything that has been done is foolish. This means to despise the entire world, from its origin to present days, this means not to admit that all people wanted to say the truth, to say things as they are. And if they made mistakes - and no doubt they did - it was because of this essential limit of the man and science, because of a certain historic moment and because they viewed things from a certain perspective. From these rationalities I do value tradition and constantly seek in it for antecedents of later theories, seek for this intuition, partial as it is, and try revealing in all my works of historical linguistic the continuity of the problems”⁹.

To exemplify this E. Coseriu emphasizes that there cannot be a delimitation between pre scientific or non scientific (as some say) linguistics and a scientific one with the beginning of the 19 century. He points that a new method emerged in the 19 century, there is no doubt about it, but the problems - both of theory and description - were always the same. Another example is with Italian Renaissance, for instance, where we can find exactly the same principle of historical explanation through substratum and superstratum and socio-cultural differentiation of languages.

Another quotation from “Lingvistica integrală” proves the ponderability of tradition in linguistics: “Tradition weighs most heavily in the langue than in any other activity, because of this otherness (alterity), which means unity

with the subjects from the past and present and solidarity with subjects of the future. A subject from the future will be able to understand what I do in Romanian now if it is in accordance with the possibilities of Romanian. It is the linguist who is aware of this, while the speaker is not conscious of the fact and applies it intuitively, i.e. creates without thinking of the fact that someone might not understand him. In this way we come to the objectivity of the linguistics. And this is the object of linguistics: it must study the language as the objectivisation of a subject among subjects, endowed with alterity"¹⁰.

1.2. The principle of objectivity

In "The Principles of Linguistics as a Culture Science" E. Coseriu argues that this principle is one of the first priority in any science. His excursus now goes down to Plato, to his dialog with the sophist, where this principle was first formulated - *to tell things as they are*. E. Coseriu stipulates that though being the most important, this principle is the most difficult to apply, especially in the sciences of culture. This happens because we always view things from a certain historical situation, in concrete contexts, from a certain perspective. So we must permanently admit other points of view, i.e. to admit a partiality in every problem that has been posed. But we must constantly be aware, stresses Coseriu to the extent of this partiality. "One should completely eliminate oneself, 'enclose oneself into brackets' as a subject, and as an empiric subject in science. 'The object is such' not that I 'consider it to be so'. Hence it follows that in the sciences of culture this very fact, i.e. the objectivity obliges us to subjectivity, because we start from what we know, being the producers of these object"¹¹.

"We have to admit the plurality of points of view which only taken as a whole, can be helpful - at least to some extent may render the object in its totality, in the way it presents for intuitive cognition. This principle of objectivity in our sphere (as in other as well) is the very plurality of points of view and continuity in research and at the same time even a certain *generosity* to the positions that are opposite to ours"¹².

In "Lingvistica integrală" he suggests to schematize the linguistic activities from which the first is: "There is an activity the scheme of which is presented as O (object), where the subject does not present himself, but on the contrary, presents only the object. This is scientific activity. It presents the object in its objectivity - this means *to tell the things as they are* -and tries to eliminate all that is subjective. Even when it is asserted - in theories of modern science - that the observer has determined in a certain way the object, this very fact means that he who makes an assertion is aware that part of it is due to the observer and that the object itself is not, in fact, as it is determined, eventually, by the perspective of the observer"¹³.

And as a corollary to the principle of objectivity is the principle of universality. Here Eugenio Coseriu explains that if we try telling things as they are, these things are the same for others, in ideal sense for all the people who out of good will approach these things and are willing to study them. Eugenio Coseriu firmly opposes to the idea of a science for a certain span of time or for a certain social or political situation: "Science ought to be constructed with the same objectivity and universality every moment and in every situation even with the eventual sacrifice of our physical liberty"¹⁴.

1.3. The principle of humanism

This principle for the *Culture Studies*, asserts Coseriu in *Principles of Linguistics*, arises from the principle of objectivity. If the goal and criterion of the science is to tell things as they are, then in the sphere of culture sciences this means to tell them as they are for the man in the sphere of liberty, because they deal with what the man creates as a free universal subject. The liberty, Coseriu understands here in its philosophical sense: "... a free activity is an activity whose object is infinite, an object that is being created continuously and is a priori boundless. A free activity never exhausts the object, because it continuously creates it"¹⁵.

Hence it follows, as the first corollary, "that the basis of the culture studies is not the same as in sciences – a necessarily hypothetic foundation – but something we all already know, as being subjects of these activities. In this way the basis of culture studies and of the linguistics as well, is the original, intuitive knowledge which the man has in connection with what he creates as subject of these activities (this refers of course, to universal activities, not to individual ones"¹⁶. Then Coseriu asks what it means for science, if the basis of it is this primary knowledge, this knowledge which every man has concerning himself. And answers that: "It implies that in the realm of language science and other culture studies, in reality, our problem, the problem of the man of science is to ascend from one level of knowledge to the next, from the level which the speaker has, namely the intuitive one, (unexplained and unjustified) to the other level of justified knowledge, to the explained one, i.e. the transition from *bekannt* to *erkannt* as Hegel stated, i.e. from what is intuitive knowledge to reflexive and justified knowledge"¹⁷.

Further, E. Coseriu reveals that the above theory ensues from an extraordinary treatise on the theory of cognition written by the German philosopher G.W. Leibniz - *Meditatio de cognition, veritate ac ideis* (By the way, E. Coseriu advised his disciples in Tübingen to learn this small treatise by heart, to be fully aware of what is being done in humanistic sciences). Here Leibniz establishes, following the conception of Descartes, "these levels of culture and where the author presents a type of cognition, which he names *cognitio confusa* which is reliable knowledge, however unjustified and *cognitio clara* which can be not only *confusa* but *clara adequate*, i.e. adequate

knowledge, justified and well-grounded which is the goal of all sciences. In this very treatise Leibniz identifies also the artistic cognition and linguistic cognition of the speaker – of all those who are subjects of an activity with *clara confusa*, i.e. accurate (valid) but unjustified. He identifies the scientific cognition with *clara adaequata*¹⁸.

Here E. Coseriu traces another corollary, namely, the fact that whatever is interpreted in the humanistic dimension has a theoretical basis, the universal knowledge we already have, at least in an intuitive form. And if we have this intuitive knowledge, it means that we always have a theory because of this knowledge of universality, as subjects of these activities. This means that theory itself is not anything else than the cognition of universality in facts, in concrete facts. It justifies its connotation ‘to see’, “to contemplate” in facts their universal essence and means to acknowledge the universality of these facts. In this context E. Coseriu very seldom mentions that the universe can be studied from a shell (It is Hegel who says about Aristotle that the latter was capable to see the universe in a shell, could see the universality in it). E. Coseriu learned this in Italy and then tried applying it first in Uruguay. He implanted this principle to his students, especially to those who were complaining of a very limited theme. He would say to them: “You can see the entire man in one single phoneme. You should study a simple linguistic fact and would conceive the whole language and through it the entire man and his creative possibilities”¹⁹.

Then he derives another corollary from the above mentioned - the unity of the theory and empiric studies. He develops his thought: “There does not exist a theory previous or independent of the facts, previous to the empiric studies because theory itself is the recognition of the universality in facts and there does not exist an empiric study without a theory (deficient as it might be, without doubt). Every serious interpretation of a fact is a contribution to the theory. An interpretation can be made only on the basis of, at least, implied theory”²⁰.

From the above mentioned E. Coseriu emphasizes the hermeneutic character of the cultural studies. He asserts that the cultural studies are sciences that always interpret. When even it seems that we describe, in fact, “we interpret relying on what we know and on what we have learned from others, from those who attained an explicit formulation before us in the course of history. It does not limit itself to the description of actual facts, or as it is expressed in linguistics – synchronically, but to all historic facts. In fact we interpret ourselves in the limit we are capable to assume, on the basis of fundamental alterity of the man, the personality and others’ way of thinking even in very remote times”²¹. Collingwood, an English philosopher who treats in his works the essence of history and whom E. Coseriu appreciates very much says that, “in fact, when we wonder why Brutus

killed Caesar, we ask why I in the same historical conditions would have killed Caesar”²².

He (Collingwood) does not say that any historian *should* ask the question in this way, but that he really *puts* it in his way, even when he thinks that he puts the problem very objectively in connection with Brutus. We do the same in linguistics when we ask ourselves about the linguistic change, i.e. facts that are created in the langue and then become objective in a linguistic community.

1.4. The principle of antidogmatism

In “Lingvistica integrală” E. Coseriu holds that the researcher must “understand the author, his concepts from within with generosity and tolerance. Instead of thinking that, obviously, the author is not right we should think in what sense he may be right and which are his motives”²³.

In “The principles of Linguistics as a Science of Culture” Coseriu outlines: “all theories, if they are sincere and of good will, are based on the same intuitive and original knowledge and all of them tell things as they are, at least from one perspective. All of them contain a grain of truth. Not a single mistake is a mere mistake; they contain something – at least an intention of truth. And the duty of the researcher, while interpreting, is to interpret in this light of truth, not merely criticizing, as it leads nowhere”²⁴. Coseriu further develops this thought saying that any researcher in any field must seek to find what is true and acceptable in a theory, the rest should be rejected. Instead of denying all other theories he should accept them all to the extent they tell things as they are. Here E. Coseriu makes an allusion to the teachings of Leibniz who said that all philosophical theories are true by what they affirm and false by what they negate. This can be attributed to the linguistic theories as well. They all investigate things from a certain perspective about langue. This way to view things does not mean an eclectic position – it is antidogmatism. Any theory should be criticized in a positive sense. In “Lingvistica integrală” Coseriu asserts that he does not make any concessions, that the reality of the langue can be sacrificed neither to Bloomfield nor to Hjelmslev, but before rejecting Hjelmslev because he has reduced linguistics to a kind of algebra, one should ask himself what is the reason of it. Instead of rejecting Bloomfield (an idealist and an outstanding linguist, as Coseriu admits), because he does not admit significance one should see the inner necessity of his very coherent behaviorist system. E. Coseriu understands that if Bloomfield sacrifices significance, he is quite aware of it, because he has a certain conception about science.

This very principle is a standpoint in all Coseriu’s works and he is certain of the fact that if he applies others’ ideas which he considers adequate and true, without any fear, does not make him unoriginal. Originality, as Coseriu

understands, does not consist in telling new foolish opinions but in admitting old truths and utilize them in new synthesis, in a new interpretation as adequate and close to the objective reality as possible. Coseriu uses mostly this principle in his work "Leistungen und Grenzen" – "Alcances y Limites", where he writes about realizations and limits of different theories, what can be utilized and about necessary boundaries which are due to a certain view in science or due to the conception about the langue itself.

Coseriu relates in his last interview that he himself started from a rather rigid school (University of Iasi) where his great friend, George Ivănescu had a habit of saying: "Wrong is... X who supposes..." When his own disciples are puzzled and wonder if they always should seek for the truth he tells them a parable (not without exaggerating a bit) about Aristotle. He warns his students that if they find anything wrong in Aristotle's teachings, the students must think it over, because it is hardly ever possible that Aristotle might be wrong. There must have been truth they could not comprehend. Coseriu's wife finds him like one of Aristotle's disciples. The latter had very much faith in his master. He could believe his master even when he asserted that a standing man was sitting. Coseriu himself agrees with the disciple because when Aristotle asserts something it means that he has understood something by this and we must see what namely, because Aristotle is inerrant, incapable of being wrong, Coseriu says.

1.5. The Principle of Public Utility

In his "Lingustica integrală" E. Coseriu writes: "This principle, which I call the linguist's principle of public responsibility, implies many an issue. Firstly, the linguist should be preoccupied by everything in which the speaker is interested. These are: the linguistic correctness, linguistic policies, educational problems, linguistic studies, language teaching and translation problems. Secondly, he/she should not refuse to the level, otherwise may insult the reader. Thirdly, he should not take a parochial view of his domain but must express clearly for everybody's understanding, avoiding formalities and using a terminology which is very close to colloquial speech. The above mentioned reveals the morality of science, in particular the science of the langue"²⁵.

In "The Principles of Linguistics as a Science of Culture" Coseriu alludes to Leibniz who said that *scientia quo magis theorica, magis practica*, i.e. the more theoretical the science – the more practical it is. First of all, the scientist should not isolate himself; he must not take a parochial view or remain in the community of the men of science. In reality he should speak for all those who might get interested in the same facts and those who may be interested, in fact, are all people. Here Coseriu reminds a saying of an old scholar 'who reads must understand'. This means that the scientist should use an

adequate language, a proper terminology, to be explicit for as many people as possible. E. Coseriu thinks that the words should be of a current use, colloquial. He himself transforms them into technical terms but preserving their basic significance in the language. When he mentions significance and designation he uses the word in his basic sense in everyday language and at the same time he delimits it in a technical sense as a term. He regrets that he was very often misunderstood.

Secondly, this principle requires that the scientist should not be isolated; he must take in earnest all the interests of the speakers. He formulates it as follows: "the langue functions via and for the speakers not through and for the linguists!" So, everything that interests the speaker must interest the linguist. The linguist starts from what the speaker thinks. In a way, the speaker is always right"²⁶.

Further E. Coseriu emphasizes that besides the interest in the language, the linguist should show his concern in all the applied forms of the linguistics. And he gives an example with the speaker who is interested if the language spoken in Chisinau or in Mihăileni (Coseriu's native village) is other than Romanian language. Then the linguist should explain that it is not other but the same language, spoken elsewhere by all Romanians. The speaker is concerned about the assertion of his national, native language. So, the linguist must deal with this problem as well. He also should be preoccupied with linguistic planning and with linguistic politics. He should point to the real problems, ought to take a position as a political subject. This is from the presumption that a man of science ought not be a practical or political failure. There is not any minor problem in the applied linguistics, as Coseriu imperatively states.

The problem of the language correctness though comes last is not least for E. Coseriu. In "Linvistica integrală" he asserts that: "there exists as well a morality, a series of inner norms of the langue. There exists a deontology of the langue, a deontic dimension of the langue, and namely how the langue should be. It is what the speakers consider when evaluating the langue. And this is the morality of the langue as such: to be *congruent* at the universal level, to be *correct* at the level of languages, to be *adequate* at the level of discourse or text, i.e. to be adequate to the situation (in accordance with Aristotelian principle)".

To speak incorrectly means to insult the other, not to consider him or her. This means in the long run, that you do not take seriously the linguistic activity, as well as not to take in earnest yourself, without understanding that you are, in a sense, the entire content of your conscience, i.e. you are this langue or language as well. So if you assert that it is not important to follow a certain tradition, it implies you despise yourself.

"So there exists this morality and you are immoral if you do not respect the rules without any motives. But it is very moral not to respect these rules if you have a motive and if you consider that there is a superior rule or norm

for the sake of which you may deviate from the inferior norm. These norms are suspended from bottom to top”²⁷.

In “Principles of Linguistics as a Science of Culture” Coseriu mentions that the problem of correct expression was considered a minor one, a problem of the dilettanti. The positivists would say: leave the langue alone, i.e. it develops itself. Coseriu thinks they are naïve from epistemological point of view. He has a quite contrary idea, considering this problem a very serious one from the point of view of the linguistic theory. It was as far back as half a century ago, in 1957 that he wrote a book “Problema exprimării corecte”. This book has not been published yet but there he focuses on the basis and the profoundness of the problems of language correctness. He states that the speaker puts the problems mostly intuitively and in not quite proper formulations but the duty of the linguist is not to reject these formulations. His obligation is to fathom their true sense and pass from the intuitive level of cognition to the superior one – to the reflexive one.

Throughout all his academic career Eugenio Coseriu followed these five deontological principles and it helped him found some schools in linguistics, influence a number of researchers in the fields as diverse as the language of gestures and semiotics of theatre, impart his vast knowledge to his many disciples who are now renowned linguists. When asked about the relationship between the master and the pupil and the creation of a school of research he expounded the following principles and rules which can be of great value in raising and educating young generations of competitive specialists in any domain. They are formulated in “Lingvistica integrală”: “Scientific activity should not have as its purpose the creation of a ‘school’. The purpose is the research, the truth, the development of methodology and scientific conceptions; “school” is the result of the enthusiasm and convictions of the master who knows how to stimulate them in the students; the master’s convictions should not be imposed but should be adopted critically by the students; the master should impart to his students the results of his own experience, as the latter should profit out of this experience; the generosity of the master abides in this: students must be spared the deceptions and failures which the master has been confronting with; the master should neither demand from the students to investigate the same facts as he does nor assert the same thesis or ideas; the master must stimulate the capacity and interest of the student, must guide student’s success in the domain of his utmost capacities; the student’s thesis or ideas may be contrary to those of the master and a genuine master should let himself be convinced by the thesis of his disciple if he brings solid arguments and has a methodology; a true master must understand that his disciples may surpass him and he necessarily must stimulate their excelling; the young people from the very start should be kept in check because they have not only very disperse but also very vast preoccupations and give forth non realistic projects; they should be guided to the not sufficiently researched domains, towards the problems open to discussion, which merit to be studied; they should study the technique of the research and get

informed in two directions: about the conception and about the facts; their general outlook should embrace the conceptions which predominate in a certain epoch, otherwise not to misinterpret one single point of view with an absolute one; very often many a particular problem or interpretation evade understanding because the starting conception is not known"²⁸.

Eugenio Coseriu's scientific and spiritual legacies are for future estimation and future appreciation. He is like a mountain - only by departing from it one can see its height. Takashi Kamei, an outstanding Japanese linguist, in one of his articles says that E. Coseriu is the linguist of the XXI century. E. Coseriu himself is aware of the eternity of his deontology: "I do not know how much will remain from what I have realized in linguistics as a man of science. The facts I have interpreted will be interpreted otherwise later. Other criteria and other perspectives will be established. But I think that *what will remain and I hope it will - is this ethic attitude in science*. This, and many other ideas of mine come from Aristotle and then from Hegel, namely this: the identification between *sein* and *sein sollen*, i.e. between to be and ought to be. So when we speak about culture, about science and stand inquiring which is the essence of culture and science we are eager to know not only how it is but how it ought to be. Science, if it is not as it ought to be, if it is not an ideal science, is not a science at all because *sein* and *sein sollen* do not coincide in this case"²⁹.

Rounding up my presentation I again come to what I have begun with: the word, the langue, the justification of the social functions through them. The first dimension of the langue is alterity, otherness "And this alterity, - as Eugenio Coseriu says, - is the foundation of the society. It was noticed by Aristotle who at the beginning of his Politics says - as in the Bible - the langue is the conscience of the good and the evil... And this privilege, this prerogative of man among other beings is the basis of the family and state"³⁰.

Notes

¹Aristotel, 1943, p. 102.

²Coseriu's answers in an interview with Angela Furtună, August, 20, 2000, Suceava.

³Coseriu, 2004, p. 49.

⁴Coseriu, 2004, p. 36.

⁵Furtună, 2001, p. 2.

⁶Coseriu, 2004, p. 51.

⁷Psalms 119:9.

⁸Coseriu, 2004, p. 25.

⁹Coșeriu, 1992, p. 15.

¹⁰Coșeriu, 1996, p. 124.

¹¹Coșeriu, 1992, p. 12.

¹²Coșeriu, 1992, p. 12.

¹³Coșeriu, 1996, p. 122.

¹⁴Coșeriu, 1992, p. 12.

¹⁵Coșeriu, 1992, p. 13.

¹⁶*ibidem*.

¹⁷*ibidem*.

¹⁸*idem*, p. 14].

¹⁹Coseriu, 2004, p. 50 (interview, 2001, Alecu Russo State University of Bălți, from the book "The Universe in a Shell").

²⁰Coșeriu, 1992, p. 14.

²¹Coșeriu, 1992, p. 15.

²²*ibidem*.

²³Coșeriu, 1996, p. 120.

²⁴*idem*, p. 16.

²⁵Coșeriu, 1996, p. 130.

²⁶*idem*, p. 18.

²⁷Coșeriu, 1996, p. 131.

²⁸Coseriu, 2004, p. 169.

²⁹Coseriu, 2004, p. 50.

³⁰Coseriu, 2004, p. 13.

References

ARISTOTEL. *Virtuțile etice și dianoetice*. Antologie filosofică (filosofi străini). Ediția a doua. Casa Școalelor, 1943 (in English: ARISTOTEL. *Ethic and Dianoetic Virtues. Philosophical Anthology (Foreign Philosophers*. II edition. Casa Școalelor, 1943) [=Aristotel, 1943].

COSERIU, E. *Universul din scoică* (interviu realizat de G. Popa, M. Șleahițchi și N. Leahu). Chișinău: Editura Știința, 2004 (in English: COSERIU, E. *The Universe in a Shell* (interview granted to G. Popa, M. Șleahițchi and N. Leahu). Chișinău: Știința Press, 2004) [=Coseriu, 2004].

COȘERIU, E. *Lingvistica intergrală* (interviu cu E. Coșeriu, realizat de N. Saramandu). București: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1996 (in English: COȘERIU, E. *Integral Linguistics (interview with E. Coseriu, carried out by N. Saramandu*. Bucharest: Romanian Cultural Foundation Press, 1996) [=Coșeriu, 1996].

COȘERIU, E. *Principiile lingvisticii ca știință a culturii* // *Analele Științifice ale Universității „A.I. Cuza” din Iași* (Conferință ținută la Universitatea A.I. Cuza din Iași, 13 aprilie, 1992) (in English: COȘERIU, E. *Principles of Linguistics as a Culture Science* // *Scientific Annals of A. I. Cuza University of Iași* (Conference held at A.I. Cuza University of Iași, April 13, 1992)) [=Coșeriu, 1992].

FURTUNĂ, A. *Cu gândul la nefericita Basarabie* (interviu cu E. Coseriu, 20 octombrie, 2001) (in English: FURTUNĂ, A. *Thinking of Unfortunate Bessarabia* (interview with E. Coseriu, October 20, 2001)) [=Furtună, 2001].