STATEMENT

South Florida Journal of Development, ISSN 2675-5459, hereby declares that the article entitled Human language disciplines exchange authored by Younes Benmahammed, was published in v.6, n.5, of 2025.

The journal is online, and the articles can be found by accessing the link:

https://ojs.southfloridapublishing.com/ojs/index.php/jdev/issue/view/127

DOI: https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv6n5-010

As it is an expression of the truth, we sign this statement.

Curitiba, May 6, 2025.

Editorial Team

Human language disciplines exchange

Younes Benmahammed
Doctor in Language Sciences (Linguistics & Translation)
Institution: M'Sila University of Mohamed Boudiaf,
Facuty of Letters and Languages, Translation Department
Address: Bordj Bouarreridj, Algeria
E-mail: younes.benmahammed@univ-msila.dz

ABSTRACT
We focus in our present article on the value of multidisciplinarity between different specialities in linguistics. For the common point relating the diverse branches of language is well observed, we think that the openness on all kinds of linguistics including translation and didactics is at the heart of every serious study. As a consequence, we chose to explain in points the major disciplines of human language, such as philology, translation (studies), didactics, pragmatics, rhetoric, aesthetics, poetry & poetics, terminology, stylistics, aiming at their reciprocal relation for a better understanding of human nature. The overall question is then: Is pluridisciplinarity useful to one's comprehension of human entity through language? How language branches are related to each other?

Keywords: Aesthetics, Didactics, Interdisciplinarity, Language, Translation, Poetics.

1 INTRODUCTION

Our study deals essentially with the fruitful interaction between different disciplines either in language or in other fields of humanities. So, internal and external branches of linguistics, translation, didactics and philology along with other domains (philology, translation (theoretical & practical), didactics, pragmatics, poetics, rhetoric, aesthetics, terminology, stylistics) will be treated in their relationship with each other. A spirit of encyclopaedia reigns here to show the capital importance of fields exchange to produce best results. "The bigger picture and the overall vision" engender powerful outcomes in the speciality and in the intertwined action between diverse sciences.

2 METHODOLOGY

We have adopted an integrated method of research in this article to meet a maximum number of results notably because we are dealing with a multidisciplinary study concerning the specific field of human language. Thus, under a critical and analytical approach our work is based on accurate description, as much as we can, in order to achieve sufficiently explanatory elements for more comprehension of the

linguistic phenomenon. Moreover, a global and integrated methodology is used as it is suitable for a comparative analysis between several (internal) fields in language/linguistics. The reader will find a layout and a development of different specialities in linguistics with an inclusive eye relating them together under the human language as a big title.

3 VARIOUS DOMAINS OF HUMAN LANGUAGE UNDER COMPLEMENTARITY

The focus of our paper is on presenting the diversity of human language fields in their close links where a global view is drawn to understand better the language of the Human Nature. We will enumerate therefore one by one the main specialties of language to grasp a general vision and show the relationships that are set up between them in total complementarity and harmony.

3.1 LINGUISTICS

Every field is independent but closely related to brother-domains! We consider that each river in science in/of the downstream converges to the upstream of the global human Knowledge! This is registered in the general encyclopaedic spirit of research and Creation! Linguistics presents the same situation where it is an autonomous discipline with links with other specialities. It has its own headlines like phonetics, lexicology, syntax and semantics in form of levels of/in the whole system of language. They form the internal disciplines of linguistics.

The rest comes as aid to the central field of linguistics. We cite among them, psychology, sociology and neurology, and the automatic treatment of language. They are the external fields of linguistics. As we can separate no domain from other even if we focus well on the interior of the field, we cannot isolate linguistics from other braches of human knowledge, either. Thus, psychology helps understanding linguistics in description but also and particularly in explanation of the deep mechanisms of language and human condition alike. Sociolinguistics is indispensible for the comprehension of the collective behaviour of the community via the practice of the linguistic instrument. It tells us a lot about anthropology and the relation of people with their material and moral environment.

Neuro-linguistics deals with the brain-controlled acts of human nature in the sense that language is studied as a tool relative to a network of neurones in the human brain. This science is also connected to psychology for they constitute both handle the language phenomena using experimental methods in this practical field. Clinic experiences and brain studies are united to explore theoretically and experimentally human universe. Individual description and collective observation of linguistic phenomenon compose the union of/in the global view of the investigator. In addition, it's really strange that some researchers confine

themselves in only one internal discipline seeing in it all the linguistic perspective in description and explanation. In our turn, we think that the openness of internal branches and also the external ones stands for the magic key to the descriptive and the explanatory linguistics. Obviously, we set out for the linguistic study from the language as an object of experience.

This interior start does not ward off the exterior consideration of other aiding specdialities to complete the picture in form and in content. In consequence, the inquirer benefits from both the concentration verticality of the specialisation internally and externally, on one hand, and the great richness of enlargement horizontally, on the other hand. All sciences have overpasses between them one way or another. For sure!!!

3.2 PHILOLOGY

Diachronic studies in language are very important for the understanding of the etymology of lexicon, style and grammar. The synchronic aspect is also crucial for the comprehensive approach as much as possible. The history of languages is taken in charge by the philology which embraces the birth of a language till its final development passing by more or less modifications.

This historical perspective of language as all other ones in diverse fields of human knowledge, enable the researcher to grasp the general mechanism and the particular phenomena too of a given language. Its a pursuit of a course along time and space of the speakers via texts without, in our view, excluding discourses. But the written corpus is the main matter and stuff of this kind of researches. Philology on the other hand helps interpreting texts, in particular ancient texts in what is called "the interior criticism". Hermeneutics in bad need of philology if one wants to understand deeply the text in question by following its lexical, stylistic and grammatical progress in time and space.

Subsequently, meaning will obligatory be involved and impacted by this historical effort. With this global view of language as a historical creature by the psychology and the mind of its writer belonging in his turn to a given sociology, texts find their meaning and sense that the interpreter approaches more or less. Here too intertwine different disciplines in language to turn it to good account. More, synchronic concentration on a period aids in catching the present picture of language at that time and space. Afterward, the diachronic method steps slowly through time and space to see thank to comparison of corpuses the evolution of the considered and studied language. It is inscribed in a general cultural climate that shows the philological approach.

The more the philological investigation is advanced the best is the result in terms of language as a whole and generic system and in terms of culture of the moment. The comparative and contrastive manner guides in its turn philology to bring out synchronic and diachronic features of the concerned language.

Thus, a shot of the moment with a big picture of the historical course of the studied language fill in the gap of some angles of human nature's incomprehension. Due to this history taking care of the instant, the philosopher of language being also a philologist can enter language phenomenon, reveal (some of) its secrets and disclose mysteries!!!

3.3 TERMINOLOGY (JARGON & CONVENTION + TRANSLATION)

The world of language is vast and rich! Now, we are interested in the lexical level where terms and words are involved both in understanding and transmitting this comprehension to other languages from the initial one. So, we want to assert the fact that every single field in science and art has its own specialised language named "jargon". The specialist and/or the curious person must pass by this particular tongue to apprehend the message in the given domain. Otherwise, the accurate grasping of the adequate and exact sense will be a difficult affair.

Of course, the intelligent reader can more or less easily catch the general idea of the text written in a certain jargon, since the text is formed not exclusively by jargon terms. The message of the speciality could be embraced in its generality by the other words, may be not key-words, composing the text. But, if one would penetrate closely the specific meaning of the message included in the jargon text he should come across the specialised language in the jargon words. Actually, even if the precise terms of the jargon are important for all people ordinary and particularly specialists and scientists at large, they represent only a chosen and selected manner for lexicon. It could be then arbitrary according the conventionalism of language under the Creative power of mankind. As we have previously emphasised it, the natural correspondence between the form (orthography/phonetics) and the matter (content) of the term may occur, nevertheless, the most essential issue is the Creational might of human nature.

This latter permits eventually the creation of forms and contents in language to pass successfully a certain message from the sender to the receiver.

Thus, the jargon convention of words, although their natural correspondence sometimes, often or always in form and content, remains a option of speakers accepted by the linguistic community. It can therefore be changed or modified at will (and) depending on the needs of the time and the space. The form bears only the content that is the meaning which comes first. That remark, important a crucial one, is valid and applicable to/in other specialities of science and art.

The Idea and Insight constitute indeed the core stuff the domain in question. The envelope, here and now lexical, is secondary and follows the mainstream of the Creators of the community, local or humanely universal, in language and other branches of human Knowledge. In the second situation, one finds the translation which is a technical operation but registered in a generic cultural climate with its

proper Ideas and concepts. Naturally, as all translators (in theory –translation studies- and professionals) know, the translation process uses greatly notably in jargon texts, the special/specialised words and terms to report the sent meaning of the text. It can be special and general and the task of the translator consists in respecting as much as possible the intentionality of the writer interpreted of course by the translator's skills and tools of understanding.

3.4 TRANSLATION SCIENCE/STUDIES (THEORETICAL & PRACTICAL)

In the special field of translation, we deal with two shutters; the theoretical and the practical. All sciences and arts possess this particularity of theory in mind and practice on the ground. We begin by the theoretical aspect called "translation science/studies" looks after the inner and deep mechanisms mentally and psychologically that produce the final fruit in "the target text" from "the source text". This domain is in fact the definition of philosophy of language in general and to the translation work in particular. Where acuteness is present and operative sacred and holy philosophy comes in quickly to enrich and enlarge thinking and analysis thanks to objective and efficient criticism.

The studies implicate the description of "the source text" as the origin of the translation labour and "the target text" playing the role of the ultimate product of the professional translator. It involves the mission of understanding and entering the text superficially and profoundly according the hermeneutical effort of the translator.

Still, the practical exercise of the translation could utilise the instruments of analysis offered by the theoretical researcher in/of the translation studies. The same professional can, not obligatory ignore, swim freely in the text to give the reader an idea about its content in the "original text". Thus, he can pass away from the theoretical tools furnished by the theorist in translation studies. The work of this latter completes and fertilise the endeavour of the former in a rich and fecund translation operation and process. In the other part, the theorist is not mandatorily a professional of translation in the sense that he insists in his works on the theoretical description of the translation as it can and may appear in the translator's mind and soul.

As always, the gathering of several tasks, like here the translations studies as theory and the translation itself as practice and exercise, depicts the highest level of ingenuity and Creation. Naturally, the translation exercise intended by the translator grows, incidentally like the theoretical effort, progressively and gets better gradually through clever repetition along time and space. The more we practice the best our achievement will be. More, we think that the descriptive stage of the theorist of the translation operation must be consulted and exploited at the very least from time to time by the professional to improve his fashion of working and also his ended and finished product. And, the need for

the theoretical description holds office in human Knowledge separately from the ground or indeed tightly related to the terrain of doing well.

We, at last but not least, mention our equilibrated position concerning the inclination to the "source" or to "the target". First, we consider the translation both as an act of Creation of the translator, on one side, and as a fidelity to the writer's own creation, on the other side. Subsequently, the translator, to us, adopts the free Creation attitude in his "target text" by respecting more or less and as much as possible the initial exploration of the author of "the source text". We think that a balance could be found if Creativity is deployed in Liberty with the required consideration of the original text. Indeed, the translation is an action of personal comprehension, interpretation and re-creation or creation by the re-writing by the translator of his final text in "the target language".

Yet, a minimum of truthfulness towards the origin text is demanded to preserve the source writer copyright and his intellectual possession. It's an adaption of the circumstances of the "source text" with what it bears of Ideas to the culture of "the target text". This incitation to Creation by Creativity must not hide the fact that the adaptation to "the arrival text" relative to its culture and conditions of reception must be moderate. The temperance in this balance of adaption of the translator is essential to the fidelity that he shows in regard to the origin author.

The transmission of the ideas and the transfer of insights of "the source text" must no way be perverted nor extrapolated. Only, the translator has the right to keep to his own apprehension of "the source text" by his own tools linguistically and philosophically, in spite of his close attachment to "the same source text". In other words, the core message of "the source text" must be conserved without concession by the translator who in the meantime thrives in striving to Create a new text in "the target language". It's really an acrobatic game in a serious atmosphere of Creation in "the final/arrival text" after understanding "the starting text".

Every language is a vehicle of a given cultural ambience in "the source text" which should be made visible in "the target text" according to the reception audience. There is witnessed several stages and levels of adaption to the receivers' climate so that first the crucial message of "the source text" must take place, and secondly the communicational operation via translation must be successful due to just and right adaptation of the origin by the translator to the arrival culture. So, we insist (1) on the total respect of "the source text" without perversion, with (2) an effort of Creation depending to (3) the level of perception of the target audience and final public. The Creative translator has not own "the origin" but plays the noble and paramount role of transmitting it to others in another language with its culture!

3.5 DIDACTICS

Language embraces all small and big fields relative to it! As a result, linguistics with its diverse levels (phonetics, lexicon, grammar and style and rhetoric), translation and didactics belong truly to the generic title: language.

Only, the difference lies in method of work with its tools, nonetheless, the global methodology is common to the multiple evoked domains. We must recall that in scientific research at large the methodology as an entire vision plays the part of the head, followed by the specific method in the specialised domain and at last the whole process ends with the particular used instruments in the micro-speciality. It's, in our view, one network and one tissue for the service of all! We will expose different methods of teaching and learning knowledge in general and languages specially.

Before that, we note that didactics and pedagogy are synonyms but if there is a necessity to make difference in precision, then didactics takes care of theory of teaching/learning while pedagogy is the object of exercise and practice (of the theory in didactics). Secondly, we inscribe our description here and our analysis in "an integrated method", loyal as we are to our 'global view principle', including (1) behaviourism, (2) constructivism, (3) socio-constructivism and (4) cognitive approach. We believe that the assembling of the maximum of methodologies and approaches leads to a fruitful results at the end of the day.

Therefore, (1) the exposure and the presentation of data and information to the learner by the teacher and the master, prepare him to gather inputs for analysis in the construction of knowledge on his own. (2) This edification of knowledge by the learner himself is key is all the pedagogical process of learning. (3) When the group is associated to this analytic and synthetic operation the phase is then collective after having been personal and individual in the precedent stage. (4) Neurosciences on the other hand aids in understanding the whole didactic/pedagogical process by combining theory and experience inside this branch itself, and by consulting the ground of pedagogy in classes (classrooms). Like that, we witness along the entire pedagogical omission the teacher involvement to encourage the learner's will individually and collectively under inputs and additions of neurosciences.

Again, the Creativity power and skills of the learner must interest the most the teacher and the master. He is responsible for bringing out the maximal amount of self-confidence of the learner in order to discover principles and then create his. It's summed up in two bases, precisely (1) providing data (2) and leaving Freedom Creates without boundaries or red lines. The rest pursues its course fluently and naturally to engender Creators not gatherers of data and "parrots"!

3.6 PRAGMATICS

"Context" holds office in language! Language as a total system is confined in dictionaries in collective form and used by speakers in different situations and circumstances in/of life. As such, we consider language as a collective matter and stuff translated in individual linguistic behaviour by people in diverse conditions of discourses. Thus, "the context" is linguistic in language as an abstract object inscribed in dictionaries to be utilised in "real and life context" in the mouth of speakers. The linguistic context joins in the real situation!

Words have their meaning(s) in sentences representing the structural context till the whole text and book. This is "the textual context"! Whereas, "the context of circumstances" supported by the sender as a speaker and the receptor as reader or listener of the message spoken or written. What determines the sense partially and totally with/at degrees defined by the level of the receptor in the entire communicational operation, lies then in the language tools linked and associated to/with the life conditions. These conditions are in fact the circumstances of the pronunciation of the act of speaking or writing.

No word has its proper and appropriate meaning outside the written sentence, in one part, and no speech has its precise sense "extra-situation context", in the other part. We can add the case of idiomatic expressions having a great cultural charge and forcing the speaker or the receptor for interiorising its content for/in comprehension and transmission via translation. There are then (1) correspondence when sequences are conform words for word, (2) equivalence in general meaning only without matching terms, and (3) neologism by creating novel words and guarding the same meaning an sense of course.

The work of understanding and translating demands first the integration of "the cultural context" of these idiomatic expressions to pass to the second arena of "circumstantial contextualisation" of both the sender and the receiver of the linguistic, the cultural and the circumstantial message. The two overlap completely at last to make successful the communication in language but also in exterior conditions of the speech. Also, we see in the linguistic context of the text some sort of pragmatics of/in the sentence among the structure of the words. Yet, the classical and correct definition of pragmatics concerns speech and discourse in real life inside the linguistic and social community.

Time, space and other factors are taken into consideration by the speaker and the hearer to give to the speech its diverse levels of understanding. Pragmatics too permits the diversification of situations *via* different comprehension and *vice versa*. Thus, collective language in dictionaries weds written texts with spoken discourses in taking care of multiple circumstances and conditions.

3.7 POETICS

Poetics is poetry and deep metaphor at the same time! We mean by that assertion that naturally the first definition of poetics deals with composing poems. But, the other interesting face related to the first classical definition emphasises on the depth, the profoundness and the penetration of understanding behind superficial sense. "The between lines" is involved and looked for by the reader as a wise receptor in his relationship with the writer as sender. In principle, there is intentionality on behalf of the author towards the receiver of the message, but not always.

The writer has the right to give "open end and/or interpretation" to his text without even headlines or outlines of comprehension. The most of the time, one can observe intentionality at least in the general idea embodied in the text and transmitted by the writer in the communicational operation and process. The poetics is closely connected to hermeneutics so that we remark three main levels of apprehension of the text or discourse (we use text at large designing written and spoken texts –discourse & speeches-). (1) The first stage is the superficial and apparent sense due to the simple and ordinary organisation of words in the sentence. This is "literality"!

(2) The second phase is the call for "metaphor" as a rational and literary procedure for the final but also open understanding of the message. (3) The ultimate and the most obscure with its interest lies in "the symbolism" where mere words are in charge of a great meaning wanted and drawn by the author thank to his intentionality. Here, the capacities of analysis of the reader/receptor both linguistically and rationally according his background enter on the scene. These faculties determine then the interpretation of the text and the discourse more or less close to his mainstream sense traced by his author.

It's in fact an interaction between the writer and the reader depending on the intentionality and the Creation of the first artist and sender (the author), on one hand, and the interpretation tools of the reader/receptor, on the other hand. The culture in the large sense of the term composes the key to the approach of text/discourse reading and thus comprehension. Nevertheless, sometimes texts and at less degree discourses, present a closed communication and contact for they seem, and they are, hermetic to the decrypting of the inner and acute message. (4) This is thus the most difficult and occult situation surely put by the writer for various reasons. One of them is for instance the incitation of the reader imagination and the will of involving and engaging him in the understanding process as an actor not only a passive receiver.

Because, even if the message of the text discourse appears locked to the outsiders/readers, it remains always true that it exists a window of approaching it more or less with precision, accuracy and correctness. "Metaphor" constitutes, in our open and rich system, the crucial instrument of literary and

even philosophy in the sense that the apparent meaning is enforced and enhanced owing to depth by "the profound sense beneath words and between lines".

3.8 RHETORIC

Form bears content! It's has the characteristic of a vehicle of ideas in words and sentences! Still, the most paramount issue is "the semantic charge" inside terms and structure of language. Thus, rhetoric –for well expressing and telling thoughts as clearly as possible- wears essentially two clothes, namely (1) the aesthetical form of words and terms and (1) the stylistic tissue and costume. Such as, rhetoric fills and fulfils the role of passing a message in the communication between the sender and the receiver.

Of course, the form and the format matter! If the content and the semantic charge are pure, dense and deep the form in/of rhetoric must be at the same level to express clearly and plainly the transmitted insights underneath words form. In discussions and especially in polemics the rhetoric is very important since it allows the conviction of the audience with true and also false argument. The format in rhetoric is capital however the writer inclines his arguments and proofs towards his own convictions.

If he is genuine his ideas serve the truth in a dialectic style and manner; if he is on the contrary hypocrite or indifference to truth (personal profits for example) he resorts to "sophism" without interest to truth or honest dialog and exchange of opinions. Moreover, the style is no more than the fingerprint of the author and the touch of the Creator with his double cap of man of letters and Philosopher. Literature in the hands of the writer helps formulate ideas incorporated by the thinking of the Philosopher.

There form and content or shape and matter are united and reunited to converge to the clearness and the clarity for a possible conviction and persuasion of the reader. This latter naturally enters in contact with the message of the text and/or the discourse to try to treat them with his proper and personal tools and instruments. As we have several times mentioned it (hermeneutics), the access to the sense and the grasp of the meaning depends hugely on the receiver's capacities natural and by acquisition (effort & endeavour). It's his background in/of training that aids him or not in his comprehension trip. We detail the twos points just below!!!

3.9 AESTHETICS (RATHER WORDS & TERMS)

Above we have talked about rhetoric as a pure account of what happens in one's mind and soul of the human nature's entity. The first factor was then the formal aesthetic of words & terms consisting in harmonising phonetics of words between each other. An aim of beauty is addressed behind this aesthetic procedure touching words for rime for instance. Both prose and poetry are included in it with the

constraints relative to every genre! In consequence, the rhetorician searches (for) harmony of words to give a special taste to the whole phrases targeting in their turn the stylistics.

This fine and nice order of terms benefits firstly the right soundness of words and secondly profits the general sentence structure. We can cite the flagrant difference between rhythmic poems and the simple relation & account of prose despite the presence, from time to time and according to writers' skills, of rime and rhythm in it. Novels are not poems! Prose is not poetry! So, the formal aesthetic and beauty of terms in their connection between them in the entire sentences cover the text with a particular formidable veil. In our view, all kind of texts and discourses belong to this pursuit of Beauty in form and in content.

The form or words' aesthetics pour into sentence's style or stylistics. Philosophical, literary, artistic and law texts (and discourses), etc. use this formal aesthetic in words with a link to the sentence's structure. We think that important and serious matter does no way exclude or neglect formal aesthetic. On the contrary, the more the content is dense and deep the more the text/discourse must be aesthetic and beautiful. In the simple and correct definition of rhetoric, one insists on the right choice of words and, once again, the correct and just structure. Yet, it's a question of literary taste and flavour acquired across a lot of readings with a penetrating criticism linguistically for a rational description and explanation.

Further, we handle now the form beyond the rightness or the falseness of the transported ideas and insights. Nevertheless, completeness has its alone and unique interest, profit and usefulness, for form serves content. In addition, a rational explanation after a right description of the aesthetic of words and also the style (stylistics) is needed to satisfy human condition thirst for justification by proofs and evidences of good and nice texts or not. As we have said previously, the taste thanks to former knowledge of the literature or the language in profoundness precedes the future argumentation of this fact (aesthetics & stylistics). Eventually, we mean by "rational explanation and argumentation" what is compatible to "the conventionalism features of language".

In other words, "the rational argumentation & explanation" of rhetoric (aesthetic & stylistics) is done only conforming to the linguistic option of/by the linguistic community of one language with its own rules and lexicon, i. e. idiosyncrasies. Rationality –here in its relativity- works and operates thus within the frame set up by language community, and not absolutely as in ideas and concepts for example. And, in spite the holy properties of Reason, it approaches –except in great spirits and exceptional Creators wedding Truth totally- Truth of Ideas and Insights. Often, people ordinary and intelligent –not the big Geniuses- strive to grasp a glimpse of the Truth, which is their own feat corresponding to their natural abilities & acquired endeavours. So, a special type of rationalism in language!

3.10 STYLISTICS (RATHER STRUCTURE AND SENTENCES)

We undertake now the second point of rhetoric, which is the stylistics! Stylistics is deemed to concern sentences rather than words. Let's recall tow principal elements, notably (1) the rational explanation is relative and must respect the framework establish by the linguistic community, (2) the role played by linguistic taste and flavour produced particularly by "comparison" gained through rate and large readings and consultation. Additionally, the rules of grammar like the lexicon of language are the same and unchanged but the style is different! This latter refers to words and grammatical laws of language and it is the writer who has the total responsibility and the complete liberty to choose his words and order them as he pleases.

Here lies the personal touch of the author when his final sentences in the text and the book take form to show a special taste being part of the writer's Creative talent. We judge that the most accurate assessment and just evaluation relies greatly and mostly, if not totally, on the largeness of reading literature and especially studying it carefully and slowly for sure conclusions as much as we cane. From "comparative and contrastive studies" is found some kind of linguistic taste and literary flavour that allows the expert to settle the issue of rhetoric. The more one reads literature with attention, the best will be his ultimate judgment of/on the (writer's style).

It's really a tough task, nonetheless having in mind the relative character of this "rational and linguistic decision and assessment", the consequences will be satisfactory to the advanced reader and judge. Sometimes, one can feel that this kind of evaluation belongs to "the unspeakable & the ineffable". Reason as usual is bolder and is always eager to tackle this field for more understanding, comprehension and grasp.

4 CONCLUSION

After passing in review some scientific branches related to language with a deep sense of criticism nourished by a large and wide climate of encyclopaedia, we have come to these results:

- The human language is a unique phenomenon in the Existence.
- The atmosphere of largeness and openness leads necessarily to better consequences in the speciality and in the inter-disciplinarity.
- The start with the speciality does never mean the ignorance of other fields more or less near each other.

- The human language is the producer of links and bonds between various domains such as linguistics, grammar, translation, didactics, poetics, rhetoric, aesthetics, philology, terminology, stylistics, etc.

- The more we are open on varying sciences the better it will be in terms of outcomes in quality and quantity.

- The law of overture and the law of progressivity go hand in hand to achieve the ultimate target of enriching and enlarging human knowledge continuously.

REFERENCES

ANSCOMBRE Jean-Claude,2003, "Les proverbes sont-ils des expressions figées", *in* Cahiers de Lexicologie, n° 82, 2003, pp. 159-173.

CHOMSKY Noam, 2002, Syntactic structures, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin-New York.

HOUSEHOLDER F.W., 1952: ["] Review of Harris Z., Methods in Structural Linguistics (1951) ["], in International Journal of American Linguistics, 1952, vol. 18, pp. 260-268.

JAKOBSON R., 1969: "Saussure's Unpublished Reflections on Phonemes", in Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure, 1969, vol. 26, pp. 5-14.

JOSEPH J.E., 2002: From Whitney to Chomsky: Essays in the History of American Linguistics. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. —, 2018: Language, Mind and Body: A Conceptual History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. —, in press a): "Language-Body Continuity in the Linguistics-SemiologyPoetics-Traductology of Henri Meschonnic", in Comparative Critical Studies.

KOERNER E.F.K., 2000: "J.R. Firth and the Cours de linguistique générale: An Historical Sketch", in Mišeska Tomić O., Radovanović M. (eds.), History and Perspectives of Language Study: Papers in Honor of Ranko Bugarski. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 115-130.

MCCAWLEY J., 1968: "Concerning the Base Component of a Transformational Grammar", in Foundations of Language, 1968, vol. 4, pp. 243-269.