If we study speech from several viewpoints simultaneously, the object of
linguistics appears to us as a confused mass of heterogeneous and unrelated things. [This]
procedure opens the door to several sciences—psychology, anthropology, normative
grammar, philology, etc.—which are distinct from linguistics, but which might claim
speech, in view of the faulty method of linguistics, as one of their objects.

As I see it there is only one solution to all the foregoing difficulties: from the very
outset we must put both feet on the ground of language and use language as the norm of
all the other manifestations of speech.

Linguistics is only a part of the general science of semiology [which would
concern all systems of signs: “the alphabet of deaf-mutes, symbolic rites, polite formulas,
military signals,” mime, railway semaphores, stoplights, etc.]

Language is not a function of the speaker; it is a product that is passively
assimilated by the individual.

Synchrony and diachrony designate respectively a language-state and an
evolutionary phase.

Synchonic facts, no matter what they are, evidence a certain regularity but are in
no way imperative; diachronic facts, on the contrary, force themselves upon language but
are in no way general.