Conference Toward the Description of the Languages of the World

by Julie Burgoyne

[*Julie Burgoyne is Research Associate in the General Linguistics Program of the Center for Applied Linguistics*]

Burg Wartenstein, a massive 900 year-old medieval fortress in the Austrian Alps, which serves as the European Conference Center of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, was the imposing setting for the symposium, "Toward the Description of the Languages of the World," August 1–8, 1970. The castle's location on a forested peak

BURG WARTENSTEIN

commanding a magnificent view of the entire valley, its isolated historic atmosphere coupled with modern necessities for comfortable living and, above all, the graciousness and efficiency of Mrs. Lita Osmundsen and the Wenner-Gren staff provided a favorable atmosphere for fruitful exchange among the participants both during and after the formal sessions of the conference.

The purpose of the symposium, as stated by the organizer, John Lotz of the Center for Applied Linguistics, was to investigate the possibility of initiating an international cooperative effort to describe the languages of the world. With this large-scale goal in mind, a representative group of linguists from major geographical areas and important linguistic organizations all over the world was invited to discuss the feasibility of such a plan and lend support in their administrative and scholarly capacities in securing the needed cooperation for the success of the project, if realized. The participants, their administrative responsibilities, academic affiliations, and the titles of the papers submitted to the symposium are listed at the end of this article.

The symposium was structured in three parts. The first two days were devoted to discussion of the papers which the participants had previously prepared for the conference.

(The titles are listed below.) Afterwards, a series of reports were given on other large-scale descriptive projects and on the activities of the participants' respective organizations The conference concluded with discussion of specific proposals and recommendations for the initiation of the program

The papers presented were not systematically assigned topics for comprehensive coverage of the proposal, but rather were suggestive of a variety of approaches and problems which such an international project, if realized, would have to consider.

Several papers were concerned with descriptive problems. The importance, and difficulty, of devising appropriate questionnaires for eliciting language data and the necessity for a suitable format for data presentation were emphasized (Tucker, Perrot). It was generally felt that careful examination of existing formats and questionnaires and final decisions on publication aims would have to precede the establishment of any guidelines and descriptive standards for a project such as the one envisaged.

There was considerable discussion of the special problems of description encountered in developing nations and little known areas (Suárez, Wurm). For these areas it was generally agreed that the multiplicity of languages, their identification and classification problems, and languages on the verge of extinction, given the limited manpower and magnitude of the task, would make it necessary to adjust any future standard for description to the particular problems of the area involved.

At the same time, it was indicated that the body of materials included for the description of each language should be comprehensive, if possible, and convertible from one theoretical model to another in order to facilitate retrieval of basic information about the features of a

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS: *The Linguistic Reporter* from now on will be expanded to contain long-range reporting and state-of-the-art papers in linguistic research. It has also been decided that the Reporter will be published on a quarterly basis. Kathleen Lewis, of the Center staff, has been appointed editor. An editorial advisory board consisting of Charles A. Ferguson, Bruce Fraser, William Labov, and Bernard Spolsky has been appointed.

language. If comprehensive coverage is not possible, at least enough data should be gathered so that genetic relationships could be established and the necessary fieldwork planned. Of particular importance in this connection would be a representative collection of basic vocabulary for each language (Hattori).

In order to make the project fully successful, the participants stressed the need for local control of work which is done in developing areas and encouraged the linguistic training of native speakers so the work could be done on a collaborative rather than an informant basis.

Consideration of possible descriptive formats led some participants to deal with the basic problem of language stratification, including such phenomena as: *dialects (both regional and social)*, *diglossia*, *bilingualism*, *multilingualism* and *languages in contact*, *including pidgins and creoles* (Haugen, Pandit, Ansre). It was felt that a complete description must treat languages in their symbiotic setting.

Other papers were mainly concerned with theoretical issues and the difficulties involved in establishing a generalized descriptive framework which would require certain uniform standards while allowing the necessary flexibility to accommodate a variety of theoretical approaches (Pike, Uhlenbeck, Ferguson, Ansre, Jarceva and Greenberg) *In order to insure maximum participation* it was agreed that there should be no restriction as to theoretical models used in the project. A strictly uniform format was therefore not considered feasible, but it was emphasized that the data should be presented as explicitly as possible and in accordance with selected standard requirements.

It was felt that uniform descriptive requirements for the project should be chosen in such a way as to guarantee coverage of the basic features of a given language thus facilitating future comparative work in linguistics and providing a basis for further generalizations about language. How much latitude will be given in the format requirements to describe phenomena which appear, in view of current theories, to be of particular significance for our understanding of natural language will depend on future planning, involving conferences and consideration of existing formats.

It was emphasized several times during the symposium that, generally speaking, linguistic theory and linguistic data are not integrated as well as they should be. Significant theoretical

developments are often not used in descrip-
tions, and there is disregard of available data
in theoretical formulations, with the result that
the theory is unconvincing and the set of data
is a raw, unorganized body of materials. The
hope was expressed that a coordinated descrip-
tion program would contribute to a better syn-
thesis between linguistic theory and linguistic
data collecting.

A number of papers presented at the con-
ference were mainly concerned with the limits
of the program and defining its scope There
were suggestions as to the amount and kind of
background information and sociolinguistic
data to be included (Ansre, Haugen, Pandit);
the inclusion of dead languages and their spe-
cial problems (Winter, Tsereteli), and the in-
clusion of script (Lotz). The question of
whether the project should be broad enough to
include coverage of substitutional systems for
language (e.g. sign language, whistling, and
drum languages) underscored the necessity for
extensive planning and collection of materials
in order to determine priorities, needs and
available resources.

During the second part of the conference,
reports were given on other large-scale de-
scriptive projects and on the activities of the
participants' respective organizations. These re-
ports proved to be very informative. Most of
the participants were not aware of the extent
and variety of linguistic activities already un-
derway or planned. It was expressed several
times that, in view of this extensive activity,
the international project under consideration
would be practical and feasible and would be
especially useful in coordination, establishing
priorities, avoiding duplication or fragmenta-

tion of effort, and in pointing out lacunae for
future research.

The organizations described were: the
Congrès International des Linguistes (Hau-
gen); the Summer Institute of Linguistics
(Pike); the Academy of Sciences of the USSR
and the Oriental Institute of the USSR (Jar-
ceva); the Institute of Oriental Studies of the
Academy of Sciences, Georgian SSR (Tscre-
teli); the West African Linguistic Society
(Ansre); the School of Oriental and African
Studies (Tucker); the Australian National
University and the Australian Institute of Ab-
original Studies (Wurm); the Center for Ap-
plied Linguistics (Lotz); the Royal Institute of
Holland and the Royal Dutch-Indonesian
Society (Uhlenbeck).

The following publications and activities
were also discussed: Sakai gengo gaisetsu [An
Introduction to the Languages of the World]
(Hattori), the forthcoming third, revised edi-
tion of Les Langues du Monde (Perrot); a
planned series of state-of-the-art monographs,
covering most branches of linguistics (Win-
ter); the five-volume Jazyki narodov SSSR
[The National Languages of the USSR] (Jar-
ceva); an encyclopedia of Indian languages
planned by the Inter-American Program in
Linguistics and Language Teaching (Suárez);
the Survey of Language Use and Language
Teaching in East Africa (Ferguson); the Lan-
guage Universals Project at Stanford Univer-
sity (Ferguson); linguistic studies in West
Africa, India and Indonesia (Ansre, Pandit,
Uhlenbeck); and Mexican-Indian studies
(Suárez).

Charles Ferguson reported at some length
on the initial Conference on Languages of the

World held in Washington, D.C. in the spring of 1970. The participants at this Conference addressed themselves mainly to the problems of language survey formats (see page 7 for a detailed account of the Washington meeting).

As a result of the week-long discussions it was decided to pursue the proposal by setting up a program consisting of two phases: (1) a preparatory period of two years devoted to planning and stocktaking; and (2) a subsequent undefined period of time for implementation. Since the final phase of the project will depend on the results of the first, only the activities for the two-year preliminary planning period were outlined in detail in a set of formal resolutions. Basically, this planning phase of the program is to be devoted to a systematic stocktaking of available linguistic resources and to the development of an international communications network between agencies and individuals now active in the field. (The full text of the Resolutions is reproduced below.)

An Executive Committee was selected by the participants to direct the activities of the two-year preparatory period. The committee is broad in its composition but the choice of members reflects the special concern of the group for the difficult problems of description presented by developing nations and little known areas. Gilbert Ansre of Ghana was asked to serve as chairman and other members include: Victoria Jarceva (Soviet Union), P. B. Pandit (India), Jean Perrot (France), Kenneth L. Pike (United States), Jorge Suárez (Mexico), and Stephen Wurm (Australia). At the request of the Executive Committee, John Lotz was appointed Executive Secretary to the Committee, and the Center for Applied Linguistics was asked to serve as its secretariat.

The participants requested the Executive Committee to commission state-of-the-art surveys for each area of the world (including current projects and lacunae) and in general to serve as a source of central guidance in obtaining the information necessary to establish needs and priorities and assess the availability of trained personnel in the respective areas.

It was decided to conclude the preliminary phase of the project with a follow-up conference in the spring of 1972. At that time the committee will evaluate the results of the planning period and present the aims of the project to the XIth International Congress of Linguists to be held in Bologna, August 28-

September 2, 1972.

In general, the plans for the project were considered to be realistically conceived. By setting up a two-stage program, emphasis was not placed on immediate implementation. The conference was considered only the first step in a long-range project which would require both wide consultation and careful planning, and would eventually necessitate the cooperation of the entire linguistic community.

PARTICIPANTS

Following is the final list of participants, including their administrative responsibility, academic affiliation (in parenthesis), and title of symposium paper:

GILBERT ANSRE, Director, Language Center, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana (Senior Research Fellow in Linguistics, Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana): On the Scope of Language Description.

CHARLES A. FERGUSON, President, Linguistic Society of America (1970); Co-Director, Language Universals Project, Stanford University; (Professor of Linguistics, Stanford University): Grammatical Categories in Data Collection.

SHIRÔ HATTORI, Co-Editor, Sakai gengo gaisetsu [An Introduction to the Languages of the World]; Director, Tokyo Institute for Advanced Studies of Language; (Professor Emeritus of Linguistics, University of Tokyo): Trial Test-Lists of Basic Vocabulary.

EINAR HAUGEN, President, Comité International Permanent des Linguistes; (Professor of Scandinavian and Linguistics, Harvard University): On the Ecology of Languages.

VICTORIA JARCEVA, Director, Linguistic Institute and Corresponding Member, Academy of Sciences of the USSR; (Professor of Linguistics, Moscow University): The Problem of Analytical System and Methods of Analysis.

JOHN LOTZ, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.; (Formerly Professor of Linguistics, Columbia University): The Role of Script in Describing the Languages of the World.

PRABODH B. PANDIT, Formerly Director of The Summer Schools of The Linguistic Society of India and Deccan College; (Professor of Linguistics, University of Delhi): Profiles in Multilingualism.

JEAN PERROT, Administrateur, Société Linguistique de Paris; Editor-in-Chief, 3rd Edition of Les Langues du Monde; (Professor of General Linguistics, Director, Institut de Phonétique et de Recherches sur le Langage, University of Paris): Inventory and Description of the Languages of the World.

KENNETH L. PIKE, President, Summer Institute of Linguistics; (Professor of Linguistics, University of Michigan): On Phonemic, Word, and Clause Formats for Comparable Descriptions.

JORGE A. SUÁREZ, Member, Permanent Committee of American Indian and Creole Languages, Inter-American Program for Linguistics and Language Teaching; (Researcher, El Colegio de México and Instituto de Investigación et Integración Social del Estado de Oaxaca)· Problems in Planning the Description of American Indian Languages.

GEORGE V. TSERETELI, Director, Institute of Oriental Studies, Georgian Academy of Sciences; Member, Academy of Sciences of the USSR. (Professor of Arabic and Semitic Languages, Tbilisi University): The Problem of the Identification of Semitic Languages.

ARCHIBALD N. TUCKER, Co-Author in the *Handbook of African Languages* series; (Professor of East African Languages, School of Oriental and African Studies): Questionnaires in Bantu and Non-Bantu Languages.

E. M. UHLENBECK, Co-Editor, *Lingua*; Vice-President, National Council for Science Policy of The Netherlands; (Professor of Javanese Language and Literature, Professor of General Linguistics, University of Leiden): The Need for Transparency in Language Description.

WERNER WINTER, Secretary, Societas Linguistica Europaea; (Professor of Linguistics, University of Kiel): Some Reflections on Basic Problems in the Description of Dead Languages.

STEPHEN A. WURM, President, Linguistic Society of Australia; Chairman, Linguistic Program, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra; Editor, *Pacific Linguistics*; (Professor of Linguistics, Australian National University): The Languages of the South Western Pacific.

In addition Joseph H. Greenberg, Stanford University, submitted a paper, "On the 'Language of Observation' in Linguistics," although he was unable to attend.

An untimely death prevented the distinguished Brazilian linguist, J. Mattoso Câmara, from attending the conference.

Mrs. Julie Burgoyne and Miss Catherine Stone from the Center for Applied Linguistics served as *rapporteuses* of the symposium.

Resolutions passed at the symposium, "Toward the Description of the Languages of the World," August 1–8, 1970, Burg Wartenstein, Austria.

Preamble

Participants in the Symposium assembled at Burg Wartenstein August 1–8, 1970, recom-

mend a long-range international cooperative program to further the description of the languages of the world through systematic planning on a global scale.

The idea of describing the languages of the world is not new. It has an established tradition in the history of linguistics. Attempts to list the world's languages date back centuries, and several surveys of the world's languages have been published. Recently, various national and regional language descriptions have been completed, such as that of the Soviet Union. Other similar projects are presently underway and are likely to increase in number.

Recognition of the increasing importance of linguistics in scholarship and the corresponding increase in available manpower make such a project practically feasible for the first time. In addition, modern technology provides previously unavailable aids in production and reproduction of materials and information storage and dissemination. In order to most efficiently utilize these resources and avoid a fragmentation of effort, it is desirable to encourage international coordination of language description projects.

Such a large-scale program should distinguish two kinds of geographical areas: those in which the languages are well-described and those in which they are less well-known. It is clear that the project will mean little for the major languages of the world and also that many descriptions will contain only very fragmentary information; but for a large number of languages significant new contributions could be made. The project would determine lacunae for future research. It would also focus attention on disappearing languages and provide the last opportunity for descriptions of these languages.

It is important that control of the project be locally based in cooperation with regional and national agencies; but it is also important that all relevant resources be utilized. For the success of the program, it is also vital that many more native speakers be trained to describe their mother tongue.

The program presupposes some general requirements as to format and content: information about main features of grammar and lexicon accompanied by texts and tapes on the one hand, and bibliography and sociolinguistic data on the other. Uniformity in theoretical approach shall obviously not be required, pro-

vided the theoretical basis is made as explicit as possible and maximum attention is given to the presentation of data.

This undertaking is expected to make a substantial impact on linguistics, giving for the first time access to all available information on the languages of the world. It would contribute to linguistic theory, to language typology, and to the establishment of language groupings through comparison, and also to other fields such as education, language planning and public administration. It would also be of value to other disciplines concerned with language.

The program is envisaged as consisting of two phases: (1) an initial period of approximately two years for planning and (2) a subsequent period of implementation. The work during the preparatory phase should be supervised by a small and representative committee.

Resolutions

The following resolutions constitute recommendations of the Symposium participants for the initiation of the program:

RESOLVED:

A. 1. That a preparatory phase of approximately two years should be devoted to a review of past and present activities in the field of language description.

2. That to facilitate the stocktaking, the following steps should be taken:

a. Information on current activities in the field of description should be collected and made available in a preliminary form. It should cover major public and private collections of linguistic materials, surveys, and publication series. Special attention should be paid to areas where little descriptive work has been done.

b. Questionnaires for eliciting language data and guidelines for their presentation should be collected and made available for inspection and comments by individuals and institutions concerned.

c. Plans should be initiated towards the creation of a series of republications and translations of descriptions and surveys now not generally accessible.

3. That steps should be taken towards the development of an international network to facilitate communication between agencies and individuals now active in the field and for the gathering and processing of information on language description.

B. That during the preparatory phase the Center for Applied Linguistics be requested to coordinate and implement these programs.

C. That a summary report of this conference be prepared, including the recommendations, and that it be immediately given wide distribution.

D. 1. That in order to promote international discussion of the aims of the project the Comité International Permanent des Linguistes should be asked:

a. To devote one of the plenary sessions of the International Congress of Linguists planned for Bologna in 1972 to the project; and

b. To set up an exhibit of language survey materials including publications and maps, such as the U.S.S.R. language series and the Pacific and Oceania monographs.

2. That a follow-up conference, with essentially the same participants, be held (preferably early) in 1972 to review the intervening activities and to discuss the presentation at the Bologna Congress.

Interim Organization

To execute the above resolutions, the following interim organizational structure was established:

1. Participants at this conference formed an initial Interim Committee for the preparatory period.

2. An Executive Committee was selected to direct the activities of the preparatory phase of the program. The members are: Gilbert Ansre (Ghana), Chairman, Victoria Jarceva (Soviet Union), P. B. Pandit (India), Jean Perrot (France), Kenneth Pike (United States), Jorge Suárez (Mexico), and Stephen Wurm (Australia). All those selected agreed to serve.

3. At the request of the Executive Committee, John Lotz was appointed Executive Secretary to the Committee, and the Center for Applied Linguistics was asked to serve as its secretariat.

Acknowledgments

The participants expressed their gratitude to the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and especially to the Director of Research, Mrs. Lita Osmundsen, and the following staff members from the New York office: Charlotte Frey, Karl Frey, Arlene Sheiken, and Judy Webb.

Washington Conference on Languages of the World

by Kathleen Lewis

[*Kathleen Lewis is Research Associate, General Linguistics Program, Center for Applied Linguistics and Editor of* THE LINGUISTIC REPORTER.]

On April 23-25, 1970, the Center for Applied Linguistics held its first of two conferences for the purpose of developing an international plan to describe the languages of the world. This conference was supported by contract funds from the U.S. Office of Education and a matching grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (the NEH grant was matched in turn by funds from the American Hungarian Studies Foundation, the American Speech and Hearing Association, the Institute of International Education, New Century, and the Speech Association of America). The conference was organized by John Lotz, Director of the Center for Applied Linguistics, as part of a series of conferences planned in connection with the Center's Tenth Anniversary Celebration. Charles A. Ferguson of Stanford University served as chairman.

The following persons submitted papers and participated in the conference: Robert Austerlitz (Columbia University), "Previous Plans for Describing the Languages of the World"; Emmon Bach (University of Texas), "Language Universals"; Charles A. Ferguson (Stanford University), "Grammatical Categories"; Ives Goddard (Smithsonian Institution), "Indian Languages in North America"; George W. Grace (University of Hawaii), "Languages of Oceania"; Joseph H. Greenberg (Stanford University), "Language Classification and Considerations Relating Thereto"; Joseph E. Grimes (Cornell University), "Toward World Lexical Coverage"; Samuel Jay Keyser (Brandeis University), "Phonological Problems in Describing the Languages of the World"; Einar Haugen (Harvard University), "Bilingualism"; Heinz Kloss (Centre International de Recherches sur le Bilinguisme), "Standard Languages"; John Lotz (Center for Applied Linguistics), "The Role of Script in Describing the Languages of the World"; Norman A. McQuown (University of Chicago), "Description of the Languages of Central and South America"; Jean Perrot (Université de Paris), "Plans and Preparation for the Third

Edition of *Les Langues du Monde*"; Kenneth L. Pike (University of Michigan), "Problems of Describing the Languages of the World: The Experience of the Summer Institute of Linguistics"; William C. Stokoe (Gallaudet College), "The Study of Sign Languages"; Carl and Florence Voegelin (Indiana University), "The Archives of the Languages of the World and the Languages of the World File." George L. Trager (Southern Methodist University) was unable to attend, but submitted a paper, "Language Nomenclature."

At the first session, the organizer of the conference, John Lotz, described the program, and discussed the relation of this initial conference to the second international conference, which was to be held in Austria, in August 1970 (see page 1 for an account of the second conference). Many of the world's languages have never been described at all, and some of these are threatened with extinction. For the first time enough manpower and the necessary technical aids exist to carry out a large-scale project to describe these languages. However, the success of such a project depends on (1) international cooperation, (2) wide consultation, and (3) careful planning. The purpose of the second conference would be to formally launch the project and to secure international cooperation. The participants in the Washington conference were asked to consider what questions of theory and policy would have to be solved if the project were to succeed. Lotz mentioned specifically the questions of what format should be used in the descriptions, and the technical aids available for the task.

The first discussions were therefore exploratory and covered a broad range of problems. The participants urged careful consideration of the purposes of the survey and what role theory would play. It was agreed that two primary aims were (1) the development of general theory in language, and (2) the characterization of a particular language or language variety. One of the central problems for linguists today is the need to test the hypotheses of modern linguistic theory against a greater mass of data than has hitherto been available. This fact prompted the suggestion that the descrip-

tive format follow a particular theory, e.g. transformational generative theory, and that questions should be included to test its assumptions, for example those concerning language universals. However, most of those present felt that a survey of this sort must focus on facts and that the presentation of these facts should cut across theories. They did not rule out, however, the inclusion of questions that would be substantively useful to a specific linguistic theory.

Another question raised concerned the criteria that should be used to select the languages and organize the data. The majority of those present favored a genetic classification. Even those who favored typology agreed that studies in that field are not so advanced as genetic studies and that its use would present too many difficulties. As far as the selection of languages was concerned, there are political as well as linguistic considerations involved. This problem is closely connected with problems of multilingualism and language contact, and the question of language versus dialect. The participants also discussed the possible inclusion of surrogate languages in the survey.

The question of what data should be collected proved to be very complicated. Lexical items, for example, might be chosen with an eye to the needs of social scientists other than linguists, such as anthropologists or sociologists. Certainly questions would have to be included on the use of language, designations, attitudes, etc. The format might also include information on script. While it was agreed that extra-linguistic data would be collected, the question of specific items of information was left undecided.

In discussing organization and financing, the conferees concluded that international cooperation and overall coordination by some central organization were prerequisites to success. Moreover, adequate funding would require not only the help of linguistic institutions in other countries but also help from other disciplines whose members would benefit from the project. All approved the establishment of priorities, because of the urgency of recording dying languages.

These, then, were some of the points touched upon at the conference. For the most part, no definite conclusions were reached; this was not, in fact, the main purpose of the meeting. In the final discussion, a few general recommendations were made:

1. A better formulation of problems was needed, particularly with respect to what should go in the phonology and syntax parts of the questionnaire, and what languages and varieties should be treated at what level.

2. It was agreed that there should be non-linguistic input but further consideration was needed to determine what information needs, and what people needed to be satisfied.

3. More time was needed to deal with problems of administration, personnel, and financing.

4. While no definite format was decided upon, all were of the opinion that the format chosen should allow for convertibility from one theory to another, and should be flexible enough to meet the varying demands of very disparate languages. Provision should also be made for different levels of description.

5. Existing institutions or surveys should be used wherever possible, and existing data should be utilized.

6. Technical aids such as computerized concordances and microfiche would be essential, but more thought should be given to this matter. The final product might be in the form of computerized data.

Romanian-English Contrastive Analysis Project

The Center for Applied Linguistics is pleased to announce receipt of a three-year grant of $94,000 from the Ford Foundation for a contrastive analysis of the Romanian and English languages, under the joint administration of the Center and the University of Bucharest and the Romanian Academy of Sciences. The project will produce a systematic comparison of salient aspects of the sound systems, grammars, lexicons, and writing systems of Romanian and English, together with specimen teaching materials. The aim of the project is to improve methods for teaching English to Romanians and Romanian to speakers of English. It will also provide professional opportunities for younger American and Romanian scholars. The Romanian institutions are providing partial support for the project. The grant will cover salaries, stipends, travel expenses, equipment, and administrative expenses.

LINGUISTICS IN THE 1970's

by Kathleen Lewis

On November 12, 1970, the Linguistic Society of America and the Center for Applied Linguistics cosponsored a briefing on Linguistics in the 1970's, which was held under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution and its Center for the Study of Man, at the National Museum of History and Technology in Washington, D.C. Representatives of interested governmental, academic and private groups participated in the briefing, whose purpose was to describe current theory and research in linguistics, its present and potential contributions to language problems, and the directions the discipline might take in the future.

The previous such meeting was held in November of 1966 and was sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, with participants from public and private organizations and linguists representing the Linguistic Society of America, the ACLS Committee on Language Programs, and the Center for Applied Linguistics. Two topics were considered, "Continuity in Linguistics" and "Linguistics as a Discipline", and some time was devoted to the historical background of the field and the development of linguistics as a science in the United States. The topics discussed at the latest briefing recognized the wider applications of linguistics today and its theoretical importance to other fields.

The participants were welcomed by Charles Blitzer, Assistant Secretary for History and Art, the Smithsonian Institution. He described the early linguistic involvement of that Institution, and pointed out that it was scholars from the Bureau of American Ethnology (1879-1965) who had laid the groundwork for comparative linguistics in North America. John Wesley Powell, in particular, viewed the Indian languages as a means of classifying the numerous tribes, which he realized were threatened with extinction. The materials and data gathered in the field by anthropologists and correspondents under his guidance formed the basis for the Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, "Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico", published under Powell's name in 1892. In addition to comparative work, the Institu-

tion has concentrated on discovery procedures and amassing data, and in 1911, another major work was published, the first two volumes of Franz Boas' *Handbook of American Indian Languages*. (A third volume was published separately somewhat later, New York, Augustin, 1933-38.) At present, linguistic research is carried on by the Department of Anthropology of the National Museum of Natural History, and a projected handbook on North American Indians will include a chapter on linguistics.

Next, Charles A. Ferguson, President of the Linguistic Society of America, spoke briefly about the topics of the meeting. He said that public interest in linguistics is much greater today than it has been in the past, and linguistics is widely applied in a number of different disciplines. He mentioned particularly present efforts to use linguistic theory to solve the language aspects of social problems. The briefing, he continued, would be concerned with what is now going on in the field, its current problems and theories, and lines of research. He pointed out that the field had changed so much since the briefing before the ACLS in 1966 that it was no longer possible to have comprehensive coverage, and it would be more accurate to describe the present briefing as "Linguistics in 1970".

The first paper, "Linguistics as a Pilot Science," was presented by Joseph H. Greenberg, Professor of Anthropology at Stanford University. He described various attempts to use linguistics as a model for other sciences, invariably other social sciences rather than natural sciences. In the nineteenth century, comparative historical linguistics was imitated consciously and there were efforts to create a comparative mythology, a comparative law, etc. Utilizations of linguistics as a model since then have been based on the linguistics of the particular period. Greenberg discussed several such attempts, what linguistics seemed to promise, and the reasons for success or failure in each case. He used an agricultural metaphor and described linguistics as a highly productive field. Workers in less productive fields will imitate those in successful ones, but for different

reasons and with varying degrees of success. Because the fields of the natural sciences have been most successful in the past, it is the resemblance of linguistics, itself a social science, to the natural sciences in its methods and results which has prompted its frequent imitation by other social sciences.

In the nineteenth century, comparative historical linguistics was imitated because it appeared to be successful like evolutionary biology, although in actual fact the latter clearly owed a considerable debt to the comparative linguistics of the Romantic era. It explained the degrees of similarity and difference among languages by a dynamic process of change from remote ancestors. As a by-product of this type of change, the peculiarities of existing languages could be explained as evolving from features of a common ancestral language. The process of comparison also made it possible to reconstruct the hypothesized ancestral form in many details.

The success of this theory in reconstructing Proto-Indo-European led to the application of its methods in other fields, particularly mythology, religion and law. However, instead of a formal mode of application where the methods to be imitated are applied to new materials while retaining their original form, the methods were more directly dependent on the actual data and results of comparative linguistics. This method Greenberg called a material imitation. It proved to have quite limited results because language is the only human cultural phenomenon that is relatively impervious to external environment and planned changes.

In the twentieth century, the interest shifted to an understanding of language in terms of its internal structure instead of as a product of historical evolution, a trend generally known as structuralism. It was believed that a language could be exhaustively described by the isolation of fundamental units, the phonemes and morphemes, and the laws of their combination. This kind of analysis resembles chemistry, and seemed so impressive to such people as the anthropologist, Lévi-Strauss, that he compared the rise of structuralism to the Newtonian revolution in physics. The formal mode of imitation was seriously tried in American anthropology, and it was hoped that functionally relevant units of description could be isolated in terms of which the culture as a whole could be described.

Again, the attempt was only partly success-

ful because of the nature of language as a code. In the cultural realm, it was not so easy to isolate discrete units. Moreover, because structuralism was synchronic in its methods, it could not handle cultural change.

Most recently, generative grammar as developed by Noam Chomsky has been influenced by two developments within philosophy—the reaction against positivism in natural science theory, and the formalization of logic and the foundations of mathematics. These developments led to a reexamination of descriptive linguistics, and the development of new techniques. Generative grammar resembles mathematics and logic in generating sentences from a set of abstract entities designated by symbols and rules for their formal manipulation. This approach involved a different conception of language as an internalized mechanism of rules for producing sentences. This theory, which is incompatible with behaviorism, has strongly influenced psychology, which must deal with language as a psychological mechanism. Any change in the conception of the mechanism necessarily entails changes in the psychological analysis of that mechanism. The theory has also been applied successfully to the study of kinship terms in anthropology, and to the study of universals of language.

Greenberg concluded that attempts to use linguistics as a model have not been too successful. He reasoned that this is owing to such peculiarities of language as the arbitrary nature of the relation between form and meaning, which does not obtain in other fields. However, the emergence of general principles such as marking seems to be leading to a body of interrelated generalizations which might be compared to laws in physics. Different fields differ in the extent to which certain characteristics do or do not exist, and are applicable to different subject matters. Linguistics does seem, he said, rich in a number of characteristics which provide grounds for varied types of success.

The central concern of Norman McQuown's paper, "Applied Linguistics in a Broad Context", was with the problems of teaching and learning foreign languages in 1970, which he compared with the situation that existed in 1870. Then, only a few privileged individuals learned foreign languages at institutions of higher learning, and the languages learned were either classical, or European languages closely related to English. In the highly com-

10

plex societies of 1970, the development of mass communication media and increased social mobility have led to a situation where the possibilities available to people for inter-group and inter-ethnic communication have increased exponentially. More and more individuals learn other varieties of their mother tongue or additional languages. Moreover, the number of foreign languages from which selected individuals in highly developed societies may choose is at least tenfold what it was in 1870 Today in the United States we have begun to recognize our multilingualism and there is greater concern with the problems of speakers of non-standard dialects or of other languages within our borders.

McQuown pointed out that the problems of language cannot be isolated from those of culture and social relations and must be considered in the context of other social sciences as well. We need to do basic research on the mechanisms of intercultural and interpersonal communication, with precise descriptions of media and contexts. Attention should be paid to such diverse aspects of communication as the refinement of instrumental aids, and training more research workers and teachers.

With such needs, only a large-scale, intensive project can succeed. Such a massive attack, which McQuown called "Project Communication", would require financial assistance and cooperation from public and private institutions, both here and abroad. He emphasized the fact that he was defining the study of communication very broadly to mean the "selective study of selected aspects of language relating to societal problems". Such a study would utilize the findings of theoretical linguistics, socio-psychological theory, and applied anthropology, and would include studies of body motion, standard versus non-standard language, and bilingualism.

Morris Halle began his paper, "Frontiers of Linguistic Theory", with the question often put to linguists by laymen: why should anyone not interested in learning a foreign language be interested in studying language? A possible answer was suggested by the French physiologist, Claude Bernard, who had said over a century ago that language was the window into man's mind. Halle commented that undoubtedly Bernard had chosen language over other manifestations of man's mind because language was even then understood in greater detail and to a greater depth than other mental phenom-

ena of comparable complexity. To support this contention Halle cited the fact that linguists, despite gaps in their knowledge, have been in agreement for centuries on what facts of language should be specifically noted and described in their grammars and on the way in which the different topics are to be treated.

The reason for this high degree of agreement, Halle suggested, is that the standard approach appears to be very effective in allowing linguists to produce useful grammars of all sorts of languages. Since this relative success could hardly be due to a happy accident, it is necessary to assume that in some sense the standard way of describing language found in the traditional grammars does, in fact, represent true insights into the nature of language. Halle next observed that knowledge of the nature of language would be of use not only to the linguist, but would also be helpful to anyone who wanted to learn a language. It stands to reason that the better a learner's understanding of the nature of language, the more rapid his progress. It would allow the learner to ask the right questions and to avoid all sorts of false starts and detours; in short, to draw the correct inferences about the nature of linguistic phenomena on the basis of very little factual data. Halle drew attention to the fact that the most rapid learners of languages were children, who are known to master a new language in a few months' time. To account for this fact one would have to suppose that in some way—which is not necessarily accessible to conscious introspection—children have access to the equivalent of perfect knowledge of the nature of language. Halle proposed that to the extent to which the linguist's insights into the nature of language are correct, these must be identical with the "tacit" knowledge of language that every normal child must be supposed to possess.

Halle gave a demonstration to show that the theoretical framework regularly used in linguistic descriptions exhibits the required property of drawing correct inferences about linguistic phenomena on the basis of very little data. He used English stress placement as his example. Stress placement varies from language to language Stress is fixed in some languages, such as French, where the last syllable of each word is stressed; whereas in English, stress has been said to be unpredictable, but English speakers, the author pointed out, somehow master it without memorizing the stress con-

tour of every word in their vocabulary. Halle went on to say that he and Noam Chomsky, in tthe course of studies for *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968) had discovered that the stress in a large class of English words is totally predictable from the phonetic form of the word, that is, given the sequence of consonants and vowels, the location of stress can be determined automatically, which most textbooks had denied for years. Halle proceeded to show how the theory would lead us to describe the stress of a small class of words. He then noted that this description was applicable not only to the words originally considered, but also to a much larger class of words that initially had not been taken into account. From the point of view of someone learning a language, the preceding observation illustrates how by committing certain facts to memory in a particular form, a language learner might get other facts for free. The child's acquisition of language, Halle suggested, presupposes that the child innately has access to the knowledge implicit in such a theoretical apparatus. For unless we presuppose such innate capacities, we would have to assume that each child goes through something analogous to the history of linguistics. Halle finished by remarking that since the capacity to learn languages is part of the child's mental endowment, the study of language is a plausible means of gaining insight into the mental capacities of man.

The final paper presented was William Labov's, on "The Place of Linguistic Research in American Society." The speaker pointed to two distinct traditions in the relation of linguistic research to society: a social and an asocial one. Although at the turn of the century, some prominent historical linguists such as Meillet were convinced that the field would benefit from a close association with sociology, this association did not materialize. Instead, linguistics became an autonomous, self-contained discipline which depended on purely internal evidence. The influence of Ferdinand de Saussure was particularly strong, and in the last twenty years linguistic research was based on a study of *langue*, the abstract knowledge of linguistic structure, which de Saussure considered so general that knowledge of it was obtainable from any individual, even the linguist himself. *Parole*, the individual aspect of language, was considered too variable for study, and data on the ordinary use of language by native speakers in the linguist's own society was not accessible for linguistic analysis. There has lately, however, been a noticeable movement toward a view of linguistic structure and evolution which includes the evidence of everyday speech outside of the university community. This results from a desire to find a sounder empirical base for linguistic theory, a belief that social factors play a stronger part in language evolution than was hitherto thought, and a feeling that linguistic knowledge should be applied to urgent social problems. This has required an enlargement of the notion of *langue*, or competence in generative terms, to include skill in the use of language. These recent efforts have been interdisciplinary in nature with methods drawn from fields such as sociology, anthropology, and psychology.

Labov discussed some of the problems of trying to study speech, particularly the most casual style, the vernacular, which is used only when the speaker is giving a minimum degree of attention to the societal norms of speech. Current sociolinguistic techniques are designed to converge on the data from different directions: interviews, casual and anonymous observation, etc. In the study of syntax there is the problem that most structures of theoretical interest do not occur often enough to make naturalistic observation worthwhile. Here techniques of intervention must be used.

Labov discussed some results of the study of language in its social context, and the theoretical questions which these findings have raised. Recent work on the analysis of sociolinguistic patterns of Black speech communities shows that much variation thought to be unsystematic, random and chaotic is really rule-governed in intricate ways. He discussed in particular, the contraction and deletion of the copula in Black English which has become an issue in education programs. Careful study in a dozen cities shows that the use of such forms as the optional *He over there* obeys natural laws like those governing contraction in colloquial white English. Such findings necessitate a revision in our notion of the kinds of linguistic rules which can appear in grammars, inasmuch as optional rules are found to apply in a regular way more often in one context than another. The same situation occurs with the pronunciation of final and pre-consonantal /r/, where there is a high correlation with social status. These sociolinguistic patterns reveal

12

a number of interesting questions for future research.

Another problem is the fact of continuing differentiation among social groups in large cities, despite the high level of inter-group communication. It may be hypothesized that linguistic diversity permits cultural pluralism to flourish and that it may sometimes be desirable for one group not to communicate with another. The author pointed out that one of the most important functions of dialect studies is to bring a note of realism into the classroom, and to create a healthy respect for the vernacular of students by giving them knowledge of it. Language teaching should be based on the resources that the child brings to the classroom, and we need to promote interest in local dialects alongside the educated standard.

He also discussed coexistent systems and bilingualism, and raised the question of what a system is and how it is defined. In his definition, a system is a set of rules or relations in equilibrium, which jointly carry out a given function. A system is in equilibrium when it cannot be shifted in one part of its rules without affecting the set of such rules. In contrastive analysis, much needs to be done in uncovering the systematic interconnections in each system which may interfere in moving to another system.

Labov pointed out that it was clear that, while cognitive and structural factors played a role in the evolution of language, they were not sufficient to account for social problems of communication or for linguistic divergence. Research so far shows that the massive reading failure observed in inner cities results more from psychological problems having their origin in cultural and political conflict than from innate disability.

Moreover, it appears that the survival of socially stigmatized forms is not pathological as some unsympathetic teachers believe, but possibly reflects the existence of covert values which do not normally appear in formal test situations. The whole question of differences in the use of language by different subcultures needs to be investigated, particularly the development of formal rules of discourse.

The paper ended with a discussion of the relation of language and thought. He stated

that in all the areas discussed by him there was a common theme: that the most important applications of linguistic method do not lie in the area of grammatical research but in the formal study of verbal interaction and the value systems inherent in this behavior. Some linguists now feel that all languages have the same "deep" or logical structure. This theory of universals, which is in contradiction to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis that different grammatical systems produce different conceptual systems, has great importance for the analysis of the development of logic in the child. In the light of recent psychological theories which suppose the inherited ability to form concepts, linguists who are interested in abstract levels of semantic analysis find their work highly relevant to such questions as the recent controversy over whether children who speak the vernacular are intellectually inferior. He indicated that adequate research on language in its social context depends upon the development of a combination of good field work and good theoretical research. He made some specific suggestions concerning the structure of research projects, and adequate training of personnel in light of the fact that it may be difficult to find students with both kinds of ability.

Abstracts of the papers were distributed at the time of the briefing, and a preliminary edition of the papers themselves was published by the Center for Applied Linguistics a few weeks later (see notice on page 15).

A Conference on Lexicography will be held at Indiana State University on April 16, 1971. The one-day session will concern itself with the history of dictionaries in England and North America, as well as their study. The speakers and discussants will include members of the committee on lexicography of the Modern Language Association, as well as other authorities. For further details, write: Professor J. Edward Gates, Department of English, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana 47809.

The Pacific Conference on
Contrastive Linguistics and Language Universals

by William W. Gage

[*William W. Gage is Senior Linguist in the Foreign Language Program of the Center for Applied Linguistics.*]

This conference convened at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, for the entire week of the eleventh through the sixteenth of January 1971. It brought together from many corners of the world a wide variety of those interested in contrastive linguistics and its implications for language teaching. (Countries represented ranged from Thailand and Indonesia at one geographical extreme to Yugoslavia and Israel at the other.)

The value of the conference seemed to lie not so much in the content of the fifty-four talks given during the week as in the general interaction and exchange of views among the participants. Some of the discussion sessions turned into contending declarations of faith either about the applicability of contrastive analysis to language teaching, or about theoretical positions in linguistics. Yet the reality of interchange of ideas taking place was often in evidence, and was most highlighted by the large number of speakers who began their presentations by declaring that they had substantially rewritten their papers since hearing what others had been saying at the conference.

In general, papers were grouped into "symposia" dealing with the following topics: The Value of Contrastive Analysis; The Output of a Contrastive Analysis; The Verification of Contrastive Analysis; Contrastive Analysis and Deep Structure; Transfer, Interference, and Difficulty; Variables in a Hierarchy of Difficulty; The Selection of Units for Contrast; The Value of Language Universals; Contrastive Analysis and Language Universals; The Nature of Translation; Contrastive Analysis and Translation. Several additional presentations, not clearly fitting one of these categories, but limited like those in the symposia to fifteen minutes, were presented in two extra sessions. Two longer invited papers were given by Charles Fillmore of Ohio State University, dealing with problems of analyzing systems of deixis, and by Akira Ota of the Tokyo University of Education, on comparison of tense and aspect in English and Japanese.

Of the two announced topics of the conference, contrastive linguistics received by far the greater amount of attention. Discussion ranged from its theoretical underpinnings to the details of its practical application. It is perhaps worth noting that by the end of the week "contrastive analysis" seemed to have become the predominantly used expression among the many synonyms that appear in the literature for the field under discussion. Some crusaders against contrastive analysis were actively concerned both with denying that any principled basis existed for undertaking such an activity and with depreciating the usefulness of whatever alleged knowledge one might amass in such studies. The general tenor of the meeting, however, seemed to be reflected in the summary description given in one paper by Edward A. Levenston of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who characterized it as predominantly made up of applied linguists, practitioners who want to improve conditions for language learners, and who see enough positive empirical evidence of the value of contrastive analysis that for them attacks on it are not to be taken seriously.

There was, of course, a fair amount of concern for universals. In particular, one paper by Irwin Howard of the University of Hawaii seemed to be breaking new ground in regarding universals as pressures on linguistic systems rather than as constants in linguistic systems.

Translation was really in second place among topics dealt with by participants. Considerable attention was devoted to the need for contrastive analysis in depth in judging the adequacy of a translation. The light to be shed on language universals by the translation process also received frequent mention.

A period of unusually stormy weather did violence to most newcomers' preconceptions about the Hawaiian Islands, but was credited by many with keeping interest in the meetings at a high level.

meetings and conferences

April 2–3. College English Association. Jacksonville, Florida.

April 16–18. Chicago Linguistic Society Annual Meeting, 7th.
Chicago, Illinois.

April 22–24. University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, 24th.
Lexington, Kentucky.

May 17. Association for Computational Linguistics. Atlantic City,
New Jersey.

May 30–June 2. Language Association of Eastern Africa, 1st. Nairobi,
Kenya. [Write: Mr. Clifford Lutton. Box 30641, Nairobi.]

June 7–August 27. Linguistics Institute of the Linguistic Society of
America. Buffalo, New York.

June 14–19. Symposium of Inter-American Program in Linguistics and
Language Teaching. 6th. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

June 22–August 5. Inter-American Linguistic Institute. San Juan,
Puerto Rico.

July 2–August 13. Canadian Summer Institute of Linguistics. Calgary,
Alberta, Canada.

July 24–25. Linguistic Society of America Summer Meeting. Buffalo,
New York.

August 22–28. International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 7th.
Montreal, P.Q., Canada.

October 1–3. International Seminar on Linguistics and Translation, 1st.
Montreal, P.Q., Canada.

recent CAL publications

Linguistics in the 1970's. *Washington, D. C.,
Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971. 75 pp.
$3.00.*

Contains four papers presented at a briefing
on current theory and research in linguistics,
which was held at the Smithsonian Institution,
November 12, 1970, co-sponsored by the Cen-
ter for Applied Linguistics and the Linguistic
Society of America, under the auspices of the
Smithsonian Institution and its Center for the
Study of Man. The first paper, by Joseph H.
Greenberg, "Linguistics as a Pilot Science",
describes the use of linguistics as a model by
other social sciences. "Applied Linguistics in a
Broad Context", by Norman McQuown, is
concerned with the problems of teaching and
learning foreign languages in the world of
today. Morris Halle, in "Frontiers of Linguis-
tic Theory", shows how rules developed by
himself and Noam Chomsky for English stress
placement support the thesis that the theoreti-
cal framework regularly used in linguistic de-
scriptions reflects that required by the human
organism to make it possible for men to learn
languages. "The Place of Linguistic Research
in American Society", by William Labov,
treats the results of the study of language in
its social and historical context, and also deals
with the theoretical questions which these find-
ings have raised.

book notices

The Acquisition of Language: *The Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics*, by David McNeill. *New York, Evanston, and London, Harper & Row, 1970. viii, 183 pp. cloth $6.95.*

This work is concerned with the development of sentences in the language of children and how they influence the course of language acquisition. The approach is that of transformational generative grammar. In a brief introduction in Chapter 1, the author states the argument that the facts of language acquisition show that the concept of a sentence is available to children at the start of their learning, and is the guiding principle in the child's attempt to organize and interpret the linguistic evidence that fluent speakers make available to him. Chapter 2 is devoted to methodology. Chapter 3 describes the structures that appear in child speech which suggest biological preparation, while Chapter 4 places child language in the context of animal communication. Chapter 5 contains the major theoretical arguments of the book; it explains the facts of development discussed in Chapter 3. The sixth chapter is on the acquisition of transformations, and Chapter 7 is a brief discussion of linguistic experience. Chapters 8 and 9 treat semantic development and sound development, respectively. A Linguistic Appendix contains an introduction to the main ideas of transformational generative grammar.

Kinesics and Context: *Essays on Body Motion Communication*, by Ray L. Birdwhistell. *Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970. xiv, 338 pp. paper $3.95.*

A collection of the author's published and unpublished essays on body movement and human communication, whose central thesis is the conviction that body motion is a learned form of communication, which is patterned within a culture, and which can be broken down into an ordered system of isolable elements. Part 1 is largely concerned with children's learning of kinesic systems, and communication in families. Part 2 contains theoretical observations, Part 3 includes essays on American movement, Part 4 treats data collection, and Part 5 includes a detailed analysis of an interview.

Principles of Phonometrics, by Eberhart and Kurt Zwirner. *Translated by H. Bluhme. (Alabama Linguistics & Philological Series, 18.) University, Ala., University of Alabama Press, 1971. viii, 193 pp. $12.00.*

This is the authorized translation of *Grundfragen der Phonometrie*, from the 2nd enlarged edition of 1966, which contains valuable editions to the original publication of 1936. The authors give a brief outline of phonometrics in Part 1, followed by notes on the history of phonetics in Part 2. Part 3 treats the methodological foundations of phonometrics, on both the physiological and acoustic levels. Part 4 is concerned with the phonometric view of the sound system, while Part 5 discusses phonometric procedures.

Principes de grammaire générative, by Joseph Nivette. *(Langues et Culture, 5.) Brussels/Paris, Labor-Nathan, 1970. 133 pp. [In French.]*

Treats the source and evolution of generative grammar, and explains its postulates. Chapter 1 discusses the concept of grammar, and structuralism and its methods. Chapter 2 is concerned with finite state and phrase structure grammars. Chapters 3–6 are devoted to a detailed exposition of generative grammar itself. Chapter 7 discusses the implications of generative grammar for machine translation, foreign language teaching, stylistics, and future research in other areas.

An Introductory Transformational Grammar, by Bruce L. Liles. *Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 1971. viii, 167 pp. cloth $7.95; paper $4.50.*

This work is concerned with post-1965 discoveries in transformational syntax and phonology, and is restricted to the English language. It attempts to fuse theory and application, and contains a series of exercises at the conclusion of each chapter. Part 1 contains chapters on grammars of English, the structure of the sentence, the auxiliary, and lexical features. Parts 2 and 3 deal with transformations. Part 4 is devoted to phonology. The explanations show that there are still many aspects of English that are poorly understood. Intended for beginning students of linguistics.

16

Twelve Nigerian Languages: *A handbook on their sound systems for teachers of English, by Elizabeth Dunstan. London/Harlow, Longmans, Green & Co., 1969. vi, 185 pp. 21/.*

The object of this book is to present the sound systems of twelve Nigerian languages in such a way that teachers may have a better understanding of why their students have difficulty in certain areas of the pronunciation of English. The impetus for the book came from an English Language Workshop sponsored by the Ford Foundation in Nigeria in 1964, and the material for Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo was developed during that workshop. Each description contains information on the consonants, vowels, syllabic structure, and tonal or intonational structure of the language. Following this, there is a discussion of major difficulties a speaker of that language might encounter in learning English. Finally, there is a list of publications on the particular language which may be useful to the teacher.

Turkish Basic Course: Graded Reader, *by Selman N. Agrali and others. Washington, D.C, Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, 1970. 312 pp. $2.75. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.*

This volume, the third and last of the FSI *Turkish Basic Course*, contains selections from history, geography, religion, prose and poetry, and reviews and political literature. Unfamiliar words are glossed with each selection, and are all given in the end glossary. These materials were developed under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

Studies in Language and Linguistics, 1969–70, *edited by Ralph W. Ewton, Jr. and Jacob Ornstein. El Paso, Texas, University of Texas at El Paso, 1970. 232 pp. $5.00. [Order from Texas Western Press, El Paso, Texas 79999]*

A collection of eleven original papers in linguistics, many with emphasis on the issues and problems of the multilingual Southwestern United States. The papers included are: 'The linguistic puzzle of figurative language and the ESL student', by Patricia G. Adkins; 'Phonology, grammar, and semology', by Edward L. Blansitt, Jr.; 'A two-syllable affective affirmation in spoken Spanish', by Dolores Brown; 'Tarahumara phonology (Rocoroibo dialect)',

by Don H. Burgess; 'Some additions: Lexicon of *The Tongue of the Tirilones*', by Lurline H. Coltharp; 'Annotated bibliography and American Spanish', by Jack Emory Davis; 'The contrastive semology of Spanish and English verbs of visual perception', by Charles Elerick; 'Sociolinguistics and new perspectives in the study of Southwest Spanish', by Jacob Ornstein; 'Does Johnny's teacher need "linguistics"?', by Ray Past; 'The inverse dictionary: A new tool for linguists', by William M. Russell; and 'The origin of some non-standard lexical items in the Spanish of El Paso', by John M. Sharp.

Linguistic Variability & Intellectual Development, *by Wilhelm von Humboldt. Translated by George C. Buck and Frithjof A. Raven (Miami Linguistics Series, 9.) Coral Gables, Florida, University of Miami Press, 1971. xx, 296 pp. $15.00.*

This is the first English translation of von Humboldt's classic, first published in 1836 by the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin under the title *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwickelung des Menschengeschlechts*. While it is based entirely on the original German edition, certain aspects of the work have been clarified for the modern-day reader. There are numerous translator's notes and initials have been provided for individuals mentioned in the text. There is also a complete bibliography of works cited by von Humboldt in the text. The work is considered the first book on linguistics, although linguistics as a discipline did not exist in von Humboldt's time.

The Dialects of Ancient Gaul: *Prolegomena and Records of the Dialects, by Joshua Whatmough. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1970. xix, 85, 1376 pp. maps, tables. $30.00.*

Brings together Whatmough's 'Keltika: Being Prolegomena to a Study of *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*', published in 1944, and *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul* (1949–51), heretofore available only on microfilm, along with addenda to each of these prepared in 1963. The work is organized by geographic areas and covers the Alpine Regions, Gallia Narbonensis, Aquitania, Lugdunensis, Belgica, Germania Inferior and Superior, and the Agri Decumates with the Upper Rhine and Danube.

A **Linguistic Description and Computer Program for Children's Speech,** by *Geoffrey J. Turner and Bernard A. Mohan. (Primary Socialization, Language and Education, 2.) London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970. xi, 203 pp. $7.50. [Distributed in the U.S. by Fernhill House, Ltd., 303 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010.]*

Presents a statistical comparison of linguistic features in the speech of 450 five-year-old working-class and middle-class children. The objective was to isolate the social class differences in usage which Basil Bernstein's theory implies are of educational consequence. The linguistic description consists of a modified and simplified version of scale-and-category grammar. A computer program was developed which takes a syntactic description of natural languages as input, and outputs frequencies of categories in the description.

Child Language: *A Book of Readings, edited by Aaron Bar-Adon and Werner F. Leopold. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1971. xvi, 477 pp. $11.95.*

Intended for the beginning student of child language, this book provides both a historical account of research as far back as the 18th century and a survey of major theories and research methods of language acquisition by children. The selections represent a number of different fields and special attention is focused on contemporary and recent research. All aspects of child language are considered: phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. The study of first language acquisition within a generative-transformational theory of language and the search for linguistic universals are also treated. The choice of studies was limited by considerations of space, but the editors have included a list of bibliographies and reference lists, and a section of reviews on child language.

Meaning and the Structure of Language, by *Wallace F Chafe. Chicago/London, The University of Chicago Press, 1970. 360 pp. $10.50.*

This work approaches language from the direction of semantic structure, which the author considers basic to an adequate theory of language, on the assumption that language is a system linking meaning with sound. The attempt is made to identify certain noun-verb relations as forming the backbone of semantic structure. Chapters 2-6 describe language structure in increasingly complex terms, following a hypothetical sequence of changes that may have taken place during language evolution. In Chapter 7, the author summarizes the view of language which emerges, and discusses some general considerations regarding semantic structure. Most of the remainder of the book attempts to formalize various aspects of semantic structure with reference to English, however Chapter 17 illustrates semantic structure and post-semantic processes in a language of a different type.

ANNOUNCEMENT

At a special meeting held on March 15, 1971, the Board of Trustees accepted with regret the resignation of Dr. John Lotz as Director of the Center for Applied Linguistics and President of the Corporation, effective June 30, 1971. In so doing, the Board expressed its sincere appreciation to Dr. Lotz for his careful stewardship of the finances of the Center, his constant concern with quality of performance, and his imagination in the development of a broad range of new programs. It is the sense of the Board that the Center for Applied Linguistics has been enriched in many ways because of his association with it.

At the same time, the Board is pleased to announce that Dr. Lotz will continue his connection with the Center as Program Director for General Problems in Language Research. This program, which focuses upon the general and interdisciplinary problems underlying the entire field of applied linguistics, includes, as one of its activities, the Survey of World Languages, a project in connection with which there has been considerable recent activity, and to which the bulk of this *Reporter* is devoted.

The immediate concern of the Board of Trustees is the continuity of the Center, which will necessarily depend upon the selection of a new director who will bring to this post the energy, ability, and vision which have characterized its past incumbents. A Search Committee is in the process of formation and is expected to begin immediately to canvass the field for possible successors.

Albert H. Marckwardt
*Chairman, Executive Committee,
Board of Trustees*

THE ECOLOGY OF LANGUAGE

by Einar Haugen

Most language descriptions are prefaced by a brief and perfunctory statement concerning the number and location of its speakers and something of their history. Rarely does such a description really tell the reader what he ought to know about the social status and function of the language in question. Linguists have generally been too eager to get on with the phonology, grammar, and lexicon to pay more than superficial attention to what I would like to call the "ecology of language." I believe we could profit from paying special attention to this aspect, which has been explored in some depth in recent years by linguists working in cooperation with anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, and psychologists. Most linguists have been willing to leave the field to the non-linguistic social scientists, but I believe that there is a strong linguistic component in language ecology.

Language ecology may be defined as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment. The definition of environment might lead one's thoughts first of all to the referential world to which language provides an index. However, this is the environment not of the language but of its lexicon and grammar. The true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes. Language exists only in the minds of its users, and it only functions in relating these users to one another and to nature, i.e. their social and natural environment. Part of its ecology is therefore psychological: its interaction with other languages in the minds of bi- and multilingual speakers. Another part of its ecology is sociological: its interaction with the society in which it functions as a medium of communication. The ecology of a language is determined primarily by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others.

In writings of the nineteenth century it was common to speak of the "life of languages", because the biological model came easily to a generation that had newly discovered evolution. Languages were born and died, like living organisms. They had their life spans, they grew and changed like men and animals, they had their little ills which could be cured by appropriate remedies prescribed by good grammarians. New species evolved in the course of their "progress", often as a result of competition which ensured the survival of the fittest. Others looked on language change as a degeneration from the perfection of a classical para-

dise, which in an imperfect world could only be partially restored by eternal vigilance on the part of the guardians of good taste. I need hardly document the titles in which such metaphors are contained; they are familiar to all of us.

Today the biological model is not popular among linguists. It was clearly a metaphor only, which brought out certain analogues between languages and biological organisms, but could not be pushed too far. Any conclusions drawn about language from this model were patently false: a language does not breathe, it has no life of its own apart from those who use it; and it has none of the tangible qualities of such organisms.

Other metaphors have replaced the biological one, generally in response to the strong constructive aspect of our industrial civilization. Language is called a "tool" or an "instrument of communication," by which it is compared to a hammer or a wheelbarrow or a computer, each of which serves as a means to achieve a human goal that might be difficult or impossible to achieve without it. But unlike these it has usually not been deliberately constructed. It cannot be taken apart and put together again, or tinkered with to improve its efficiency: to overlook this is to fall into the trap of calling for greater "efficiency" in language. Even the term "structure" as used in linguisitic description is misleading, since it builds on the notion of language as an organized entity in which (as Meillet put it) every part depends on every other. It should be, but is not always clear that when we speak of the "structure" of French, we are speaking of something quite different from, say, the structure of the Eiffel Tower.

Even if we reject the biological, the instrumental, or the structural metaphors, we recognize the heuristic value of such fictions. Languages do have *life, purpose,* and *form,* each of which can be studied and analyzed as soon as we strip them of their metaphorical or mystical content and look upon them as aspects of human behavior. We recognize that behavior is always dual: it is outward action, performance, but it is also inward potential, competence, which we infer from the performance and in turn use to explain the performance. There is consequently no reason to ask whether language is an *érgon,* a product, or an *enérgeia,* an activity. It is both: we study it in performance, but the generalizations we draw

from the performance constitute the competence. It appears as action, like all behavior, but it exists in the mind as a potential, which can be treated as a thing, a thing that implies the possibility of action.

In this paper I propose to treat the "life" of language in the spirit which I take to be that of the science of ecology. The term grew up as the name for a branch of biology and may be defined as "that branch of biology that embraces the interrelations between plants and animals and their complete environments" (Park 1966). Sociologists have extended the meaning of the term to the interrelations between human societies and their environments, e.g. in A. H. Hawley, *Human Ecology* (1950). Language ecology would be a natural extension of this kind of study and has long been pursued under such names as psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and the sociology of language. Linguists have been concerned with it in their work on language change and variability, on language contact and bilingualism, and on standardization. In the United States recent work has been associated above all with the names of Uriel Weinreich, Charles A. Ferguson, William A. Stewart, William Labov, John Gumperz, Joshua Fishman, Dell Hymes, Joan Rubin, and Edgar Polomé, to mention only a few.

The only previous use of "ecology" in relation to languages, which was unknown to me when I first prepared this paper, is that made by the Voegelins and Noel W. Schutz, Jr. in a paper entitled "The Language Situation in Arizona as Part of the Southwest Culture Area" (1967). The long-time concern of Carl Voegelin with problems of this kind is well-known. Being in a position astraddle the field of anthropology and linguistics, it was natural for him to initiate the use of the term in dealing with the complex interrelationships of the languages of the American Southwest. He restricts the term to bilingual or trilingual societies (p. 405), but in a later paper (Voegelin and Voegelin 1964, p. 2; actually written after the 1967 paper) the Voegelins speak of an "intra-language" as well as an "inter-language" ecology. They suggest that "in linguistic ecology, one begins not with a particular language but with a particular area, not with selective attention to a few languages but with comprehensive attention to all the languages in the area." While this is true, the

choice of region can be fairly arbitrary, as in the case of the American Southwest; one can equally well speak of the ecology of a particular language or dialect, seeing the problem from the point of view of its users.

The importance of having competent linguists working on topics of this kind is evident when we turn to the now fifty-year old tradition of research in human ecology. It is rather shocking to find that most writers in this field failed to consider language as part of this environment. Pioneers in the field like Park, Burgess, McKenzie, and Hawley concentrated on the American metropolis with its phenomenal spatial growth. In the spirit of Darwin they studied the "struggle for existence" in this environment, and only later realized that a person's membership in an ethnic group (with its own language) might be a factor in his ecological behavior (Hollingshead 1947). A classical study in this new spirit was Everett C. Hughes' *French Canada in Transition* (1943); similar studies of ethnic groups in the United States brought out the importance of shared values in determining spatial distribution (Theodorson 1961). Very few, however, made it clear that the possession of a common language might be one of the shared values in question. Since the rise of a sociolinguistic school in the 1960's the role of language cannot be as totally neglected as before. In 1964–65, Charles Ferguson brought together in the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Sociolinguistics sociologists like Everett Hughes and linguists like the present writer. There we were confronted with a younger generation of scholars from various disciplines like Susan Ervin-Tripp, Joshua Fishman, Dell Hymes and John Gumperz, to mention only a few. This proved to be a meeting of likeminded people who had previously been working in disparate areas.

The name of the field is of little importance, but it seems to me that the term "ecology of language" covers a broad range of interests within which linguists can cooperate significantly with all kinds of social scientists towards an understanding of the interaction of languages and their users. One may even venture to suggest that ecology is not just the name of a descriptive science, but in its application has become the banner of a movement for environmental sanitation. The term could include also in its application to language some interest in the general concern among

laymen over the cultivation and preservation of language. Ecology suggests a dynamic rather than a static science, something beyond the descriptive that one might call predictive and even therapeutic. What will be, or should be, for example, the role of "small" languages; and how can they or any other language be made "better," "richer," and more "fruitful" for mankind?

We cannot here enter upon all the possible aspects of the ecological problems of language. We shall have to take for granted certain familiar principles of the learning and use of languages: that a child internalizes whatever language variety or varieties it is functionally exposed to in the first years of its life; that the competence it acquires is different from that of every other child; that it has a greater passive than active competence, being able to receive and interpret signals which it would not normally be able to reproduce; that maturation leads to certain restrictions on the adult's ability or willingness to learn new languages; and that societies are so organized as to impose other, more or less arbitrary restrictions on the actual learning of language, by the reduction of contact from a theoretical infinity to a practical minimum.

Among the factors that recur in many parts of the world and are probably universal are the partially independent factors of *status* and *intimacy*. We here use *status* to mean association with power and influence in the social group. While status may be ordered on one or several scales, in dealing with two varieties we may speak of one as having [+ status], the other as [− status]. This marks the fact that the plus status variety (H) is used by the government, in the schools, by persons of high social and economic rank, or by city-dwellers, while the minus status variety (L) is not used by one or all of these groups. *Intimacy* is used here in the sense of being associated with solidarity, shared values, friendship, love, in short the contacts established through common family and group life Certain forms of address and behavior are appropriate between interlocutors having high intimacy which would be resented or misunderstood between strangers. Again we are dealing with a continuum, which would be segmented differently in different cultures, but in most cases it is not difficult to locate language varieties along a scale of [+ intimacy] and [− intimacy].

As shown by Brown and Gilman (1960)

and Brown and Ford (1961) the use of pronouns of address in European languages and of last names in American English are describable in terms of these two factors. While Rubin (1968a) found that she could not use the same two dimensions in ordering the use of Guaraní and Spanish in Paraguay, she did find that these factors were strongly present in the situations she investigated. Her detailed questionnaire concerning such situations brought out the importance of a series of choices made by potential interlocutors; these were (1) *location* (rural: Guaraní, urban: both); (2) *formality* (formal: Spanish, informality: both); (3) *intimacy* (intimate: Guaraní, non-intimate: both). From this series one must, however, extract a factor to which she refers, which is fundamental in language choice: expectation (or knowledge) of the interlocutor's linguistic potential. Her question 21 asked which language one would speak to "a woman in a long skirt smoking a big black cigar". It is not surprising that 39 of 40 answered Guaraní, since only a rural woman would appear in this situation and rural speakers are by definition speakers of Guaraní. The factor of *location* must therefore be discounted as being non- bilingual in the case of the rural Paraguayan: he speaks Guaraní primarily because it is the only language in which he feels at ease or even capable of communicating at all.

The remaining factors clearly fall into the dimensions of *status* and *intimacy:* Spanish is [− status], while Guaraní is [− intimate], and for many speakers these are mutually exclusive. Paraguayans, we are told, use Guaraní abroad to emphasize their solidarity, even if they might use Spanish at home (Rubin 1968b: 523). Abroad, the status relation among them is suspended, and solidarity grows in a hostile environment. Even at home, we learn that growing intimacy in courtship leads to the use of Guaraní for saying "something which is sweeter" and in non-serious situations as well, because "jokes are more humorous" in Guaraní.

There is no reason to see anything unique in the Paraguayan situation, except insofar as every situation is historically unique. I have myself observed at first hand the identical factors at work among Norwegian immigrants in America and have reported on them in detail (Haugen 1953). The same scale of status relationships applies to English among Norwegians in America as well as to Spanish among the

Guaraní. The initial consideration is of course communicative potential: there is no use speaking English to a monolingual Norwegian or vice versa. But even within the bilingual group there is a clear differentiation between topics, occasions, and persons which lead to the status use of English and those in which intimacy leads to the use of Norwegian. Stewart (1962) has reported a similar set of attitudes among the creole languages in the Caribbean, which force a choice of either standard or creole according to the dimensions of status (which he calls "public-formal") and intimacy ("private-informal"). Among his examples of the former are "official governmental activities, legal procedures, academic and other formal educational activities, public speaking, the programmed part of radio and television broadcasts, and ceremonies of introduction between strangers (1962: 39). The last is an example of [− intimacy], while all the rest are examples of [+ status], as these are determined by the power structure of the countries involved.

There *is* in this respect *no* difference between the standard-creole relationships of the Caribbean and the standard-dialect relationships of Europe. Moreover, the many types of diglossia and bilingualism induced by the conquest of one language group by another or the immigration of one group into the territory dominated by another are of the same nature. What does differ is the degree of language distance between the dominant and the dominated varieties, what one may call their *autonomy*. In some cases, e.g. in Jamaica, there may be a continuous scale, while in others, e.g. in Haiti, there may be a clear break, even where the varieties are related. The cleavage is even greater where the languages are unrelated, as with Breton or Basque against French. The extremity of [+ status] is the case in which a population (or a small segment of the population) imposes on itself a language used almost exclusively in written form and transmitted only through the school system, either for reasons of religious and cultural unity and continuity, or for purposes of wider scientific and international communication. This second language may be the standard of another country (as when the Flemish accept Dutch or the Swiss accept German); it may be a unifying religious language (Biblical Hebrew for the Jews or Classical Arabic for the Arabs); or it may be simply an archaic version of one's own language, adopted for

reasons of cultural continuity, i.e. communication with the past (Katharevousa in Greece).

From the point of view of the language learner, these situations represent varying burdens of second language learning. If we assume that his infancy is blessed with a single vernacular used for all purposes, he may either grow up in a society which permits him merely to add range and depth to his vernacular as he matures; or he may grow up in a society which asks him to continue learning new grammars and lexica or even to unlearn almost completely the one he learned first. Whatever vernacular he learned first, if he continues to use it, is likely to remain the language of *intimacy*. With minor additions in the form of a writing system and an expanded vocabulary, it may also become a *status* language which he can use in all possible life situations, with minor variations to express degrees of status or degrees of intimacy. In most European countries this would only be true for children born in upper-class families, where the spoken form of the standard is established as a vernacular. It is generally true for middle and upper-class Americans, born into educated families of white, Anglo-Saxon background. As things now stand, it is not true in most of the countries of the world, where children face a status ladder that increasingly removes them from their language of intimacy.

Various interesting attempts have been made to establish a universal scheme of ecological classification of languages. Ferguson (1959) characterized the situation he called *diglossia* as having a high (H) and a low (L) variety of the same language. His examples of L were Swiss German, Dhimotiki Greek, Spoken Arabic, and Haitian Creole. These were a rather mixed bag, because Swiss German is a prideful symbol of Swiss nationality, and Dhimotiki is the literary medium of radical Greek writers, while Spoken Arabic and Haitian Creole appear to be looked upon with disdain by most of their users. However, they all illustrate the situation of inverse correlation between *status* and *intimacy*, already discussed. The special claim made, that no one speaks the H languages in daily, informal life, even among cultivated families, neglects the fact that models are available elsewhere for both German and French, well-known to the educated classes. In any case, the general relation of H to L, with overlapping due to the

fact that status and intimacy are not direct contrasts (*status* differences can exist among intimates, and *intimacy* differences among status bearers), is not only characteristic of all standard-dialect relations, but also of vernacular-classic relations (e.g. Yiddish vs. Hebrew, as pointed out by Fishman 1967). H then becomes a shorthand expression for *high status/ low intimacy* varieties in contrast with L for *low status/high intimacy* varieties.

Ferguson (1962) has also characterized the state of the languages themselves in terms of two parameters, *writing* and *standardization*. *Writing* is given three index numbers (W^0 W^1 W^2) for "normally not written", "normally written", and "used in physical science." "Normal" use includes the production of letters, newspapers, and original books. Standardization is similarly given three index numbers (St^0 St^1 St^2) for "no important standardization," "conflicting standards," and "ideal standardization," the last being "a single, widely accepted norm which is felt to be appropriate with only minor modifications" (Ferguson 1962. 10). Most of the world's languages fall into the categories W^0 and St^0; in fact, we may regard this as the "normal" state of a language. Writing and standardization are imposed by governments, schools, and churches, *inter alia*, and very few people speak "according to the book." Even though the countrymen of Dalecarlia, Jutland, Bavaria, or Sicily understand the respective standards of their countries, they do not often speak them except as status, non-intimate languages, if at all.

Another useful attempt to classify the possible situations of a language is that of William Stewart (1968). He assigns four attributes to a language: (1) standardization; (2) autonomy; (3) historicity; (4) vitality. Each of these is then taken as an either-or quality (plus/minus) and seven types are distinguished: Standard (plus 1-4), Classical (plus 1-3), Artifical (plus 1-2), Vernacular (plus 2-4), Dialect (plus 3-4), Creole (plus 4), Pidgin (all minus). The classification is useful for some purposes, such as making a compact sociolinguistic profile of a given region, particularly when supplemented with specifications for functions (of which Stewart lists ten) and degrees of use (in terms of percentage of the national population) The real problem is that the four attributes are not independent of one another: *autonomy* (as German vs. Dutch) is

dependent on separate *standardizations*. Vernaculars are distinguished from dialects by having *autonomy* and both are distinguished from creoles by having *historicity*. Since all three types function as first languages in their communities and lack the prestige that comes from standardization, it is hard to see just what synchronic importance the differences have. Classical and artificial languages are distinguished from standard ones by lacking *vitality* (i. e. native speakers); but most standards also have few native speakers, while classical languages like Hebrew have become vital in Israel and an artificial language like New Norwegian now claims both *historicity* and *vitality*.

Another weakness of this classification is its exclusion of linguistic overlap among speakers. It is of less interest to know that ten percent of the speakers in a country use a language than to know whether they also use other languages and under which circumstances. It is important also to know whether their bilingualism is stable or transitional, i. e. what the trend in language learning is within the group of speakers. A typical profile of a speech community (A) in contact with another (B) is that A, if it is dominated by B, may change from monolingual A to bilingual Ab (A dominant, B subordinate), AB (A and B equal), aB (A subordinate, B dominant), and finally to monolingual B. These three types of bilingualism may be described as *supplementary* (AB: in which B is only an occasional *Hilfssprache* for specific purposes), *complementary* (AB: in which the two alternate according to important functions in the speakers' lives), and *replacive* (aB: in which A has become only a language used with older people while B fulfills all the important functions). Another set of terms might be *inceptive, functional,* and *residual,* when these three types are seen as historically ordered in a transitional bilingualism. But of course each one of them can also be stable, if there is no incentive or possibility for change of group membership through learning language B.

The analysis of ecology requires not only that one describe the social and psychological situation of each language, but also the effect of this situation on the language itself. As a starter it will be necessary to indicate the languages from which influence presently flows, as reflected in the *importations* and *substitutions* now being created in each. This is

usually obvious enough, since current creations are often the subject of discussion and even controversy. A fuller account would require some description of the composition of the total vocabulary from this point of view. For English, for example, it involves recognition of the existence of at least two structural layers, the Germanic and the non-Germanic, mostly Mediterranean (French, Latin, Greek, Italian). Historically this means that at certain periods in the life of each language, influential men have learned certain languages and have enriched (or in the opinion of some, corrupted) their languages by modeling their expression on that of certain teacher languages. Similarly, Finnish and Hungarian have been "Indo-Europeanized" by borrowing from their West European neighbors.

The whole notion of *borrowing,* however, is open to grave objection, and we may say that the so-called "cultural" loans are only islands in a sea of interrelationships among languages. The concept of a language as a rigid, monolithic structure is false, even if it has proved to be a useful fiction in the development of linguistics. It is the kind of simplification that is necessary at a certain stage of a science, but which can now be replaced by more sophisticated models. We are all familiar with certain specific situations of linguistic symbiosis, in which language systems are stretched almost out of recognition. One is that which is known as a "foreign accent": in effect this means that one can speak a language with an entirely foreign sound system. A study of "Marathi English" by Ashok Kelkar (1957) has shown that speakers of Marathi have their own well-established dialect of English, using the Marathi sound system which may even make it difficult for native English speakers to understand. We may call such a dialect a "substratum" or "contactual" dialect. Then there is what may be called "learner's dialect", in which language learners struggle their way from one language into another, replacing not only the sound system, but also the grammar with novel creations unforeseen by native speakers. In stable bilingual communities there is a further accommodation between symbiotic languages, such that they cease to reflect distinct cultural worlds: their sentences approach a word-for-word translatability, which is rare among really autonomous languages. I have observed this process in immigrant American communities first hand (Haugen 1956: 65). The result

24

was an immigrant language in which nearly every concept was American, so that either a *loanword* or a semantic *loanshift* had aligned the modes of expression under the pattern of the dominant language. Gumperz (1967) has made similar observations from India, in areas where informal standards of Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages have lived in centuries of symbiosis.

The key to this development is the possibility of *switching* or *alternation* among languages. Psychologists have been deeply interested in the problem of how languages are stored, whether as separate entities or as a single store of concepts to which words are attached. It does not appear that either of these possibilities is entirely true to the facts. Rather one can say that each item stored is somehow tagged as belonging to one or the other language and is called up by a common switching device that blocks out the items not so tagged. However, the similarity between items in different languages leads to confusion: the tags fall off, and the items become available in both languages. This reduces the speaker's effort in switching, and in time it leads to the homogenization of the two languages. Such a reduction of difference goes on all the time between mutually comprehensible languages and dialects. But it also goes on between mutually unintelligible languages wherever there are bilingual speakers who are required to alternate between them. Their systems quickly become *intermediate systems* (or as Nemser, 1969, has called them, *approximate systems*) between the "pure" forms of their languages, the latter being those that are maintained either by monolingual populations or by rigid regulation. However, even the pure systems are *intermediate* between the past and the future of their own language and intermediate between their neighbors on all sides. They just happened to get frozen for a time, either by governmental or by literary fiat.

For any given "language," then, we should want to have answers to the following ecological questions: (1) What is its *classification* in relation to other languages? This answer would be given by historical and descriptive *linguists;* (2) Who are its *users?* This is a question of *linguistic demography*, locating its users with respect to locale, class, religion or any other relevant grouping; (3) What are its *domains* of use? This is a question of *sociolinguistics*, discovering whether its use is unre-

stricted or limited in specific ways; (4) What *concurrent languages* are employed by its users? We may call this a problem of *dialinguistics*, to identify the degree of bilingualism present and the degree of overlap among the languages; (5) What *internal varieties* does the language show? This is the task of a *dialectology* that will recognize not only regional, but also social and contactual dialects; (6) What is the nature of its *written traditions?* This is the province of *philology*, the study of written texts and their relationship to speech; (7) To what degree has its written form been *standardized*, i. e. unified and codified? This is the province of *prescriptive linguistics*, the traditional grammarians and lexicographers; (8) What kind of *institutional support* has it won, either in government, education, or private organizations, either to regulate its form or propagate it? We may call this study *glottopolitics;* (9) What are the *attitudes* of its users towards the language, in terms of intimacy and status, leading to personal identification? We may call this the field of *ethnolinguistics;* (10) Finally we may wish to sum up its status in a *typology* of *ecological* classification, which will tell us something about where the language stands and where it is going in comparison with the other languages of the world.

REFERENCES

BROWN, ROGER AND ALBERT GILMAN. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. Style in Language, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 253-276. New York: The Technology Press.

BROWN, ROGER AND MARGUERITE FORD. 1961. Address in American English. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 62.375-385.

FERGUSON, CHARLES A. 1959. Diglossia. Word 15.325-340.

——— 1962. The language factor in national development. In Rice 1962, 8-14.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. The Journal of Social Issues 23.29-38.

———, ed. 1968. Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

GUMPERZ, JOHN J. 1967. On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. The Journal of Social Issues 23.48-57.

HAUGEN, EINAR 1953. The Norwegian Language in America: A study in bilingual behavior. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. (Re-

printed 1969, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press).

——. 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas: a bibliography and research guide. Publications of the American Dialect Society, No. 26. (Reprinted 1964, 1968).

HAWLEY, AMOS H. 1950 Human ecology: a theory of community structure. New York. The Ronald Press Co.

HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B. 1947. A reexamination of ecological theory. Sociology and social research 31.194-204. (Reprinted in Theodorson 1961, 108-114).

HUGHES, EVERETT C. 1963. French Canada in transition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KELKAR, ASHOK R. 1957. "Marathi English": a study in foreign accent. Word 13.268-282.

NEMSER, WILLIAM. 1969. Approximative systems of foreign language learners. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, Studies B.1. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics.

PARK, ORLANDO. 1966. Animal ecology. Encyclopedia Britannica 7.912-923.

RICE, FRANK A., ed. 1962. Study of the role of second languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

RUBIN, JOAN. 1968a. National bilingualism in Paraguay. The Hague: Mouton.

——. 1968b. Bilingual usage in Paraguay. In Fishman 1968, 512-530.

STEWART, WILLIAM A. 1962. Creole languages in the Caribbean. In Rice 1962, 34-53.

——. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In Fishman 1968, 531-545.

THEODORSON, GEORGE A., ed. 1961. Studies in Human Ecology. New York: Harper & Row.

VOEGELIN, C. F. AND F. M., AND NOEL W. SCHUTZ, JR. 1967. The language situation in Arizona as part of the Southwest Culture Area. Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics, ed. by Dell H. Hymes and William E. Bittle, 403-451. The Hague: Mouton.

VOEGELIN, C. F. AND F. M. 1964. Languages of the World· Native America Fascicle One. Anthropological Linguistics 6 6. 2-45 (Contemporary language situations in the New World).

Linguistic Practices of the Federal Trade Commission

by D. Terence Langendoen

[D. Terence Langendoen is Professor of English, Brooklyn College and Professor and Executive Officer, Ph.D. Program in Linguistics, Graduate Center of the City University of New York. His major field of interest is English Syntax. The following paper was read at the Annual Meeting of The Linguistic Society of America, December 29, 1970.]

According to the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, as amended 1938 and 1964, the Federal Trade Commission is an independent regulatory agency which is empowered by Congress to prevent "unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce . . ." (15 U.S.C. §45 (a) (1) (1964)). Included within the scope

D. TERENCE LANGENDOEN

of its authority is the regulation of advertising[1] and other commercial practices involving the use of language, such as product naming and labeling. In practice, the FTC has limited its authority in false advertising cases to those which are clearly interstate in character; up to now it has not pressed its authority to regulate ads which originate in one state but which are carried in media across state lines (Alexander 1967:3; Kirkpatrick 1969:52-54), but it is probably only a matter of time now before it begins to do so.[2]

The first question that must be asked in connection with the problem of whether a given advertisement, product name, or product label is deceptive is: "deceptive to whom?". Justice Hugo Black, writing in 1937 for the majority of the Supreme Court in upholding a critical FTC ruling (FTC v. Standard Education Society), expressed the view that the law should protect those who believe everything that they read and hear:

> The fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced There is no duty resting upon a citizen to suspect the honesty of those with whom he transacts business. Laws are made to protect the trusting as well as the suspicious. (Quoted in Alexander 1967.7, n.46)

George Alexander (1967:8) has put together the following composite picture of the person the FTC sees itself as protecting, based on a variety of decisions from 1930 to 1965:

> General stupidity is not the only attribute of the beneficiary of FTC policy He also has a short attention span; he does not read all that is to be read but snatches general impressions He signs things he has not read, has marginal eyesight, and is frightened by dunning letters when he has not paid his bills. Most of all, though, he is thoroughly avaricious Fortunately, while he is always around in substantial numbers, in his worst condition he does not represent the major portion of the consuming public.

As this caricature was intended to suggest, it is not obvious how one could possibly frame an advertisement that would properly communicate, were the FTC to insist on protecting those with all of the properties just listed. In fact, however, few advertisers up to now have felt the need to worry about this problem, because of the piecemeal way in which the FTC has operated in choosing cases to decide, and the ineffectiveness with which its decisions carry the force of law throughout the market place. Indeed, the more serious problem may well be that posed by the substantial number of "trained and experienced" persons who today regard advertising as pure bunk, and given the character of advertisements in the mass media, expect to receive very little true or useful information from them. (Cox *et al.* 1969. 15-16)

There is another aspect of the "deceptive to whom?" question that leads directly to some questions of linguistic interest. The FTC and the courts have both ruled that the dictum that a customer should always get what he asks for must be enforced, even if he has an irrational preference for one form of an item over a functionally identical or even superior one. In the words of Justice Benjamin Cardozo, writing for the majority of the Supreme Court in 1934 in upholding the Commission in the case of FTC v. Algoma Lumber Co.:

> The consumer is prejudiced if upon giving an order for one thing, he is supplied with something else . . In such matters the public is entitled to get what it chooses, though the choice may be dictated by caprice or by fashion or perhaps by ignorance. (Quoted in Alexander 1967:67)

The case in question concerned the practice of labeling a particular species of yellow pine

grown in California as "California white pine." In 1934, there existed a considerable commercial preference in the East for white pine over yellow pine When this species of yellow pine first appeared on the market in the east, it came into competition with eastern white pine. It was then sold under the label of "California white pine" to certain customers who wanted genuine white pine. Leaving aside the question of whether white pine is in fact superior to yellow pine (which it was then found to be), the FTC and the courts ruled that the use of the name "California white pine" for a variety of yellow pine was deceptive

The "California white pine" case involved a deception which was fairly obvious to the customers being deceived. An earlier series of cases involving so-called "Philippine mahogany" involved a subtler form of deception, which had a considerably different legal outcome. "Philippine mahogany" is a species of hardwood grown in the Philippine Islands which botanically is not of the mahogany family. In a series of rulings from 1927 to 1929, the FTC prohibited the continued use of the name (on the grounds that when a customer wants mahogany, he should get wood which is botanically mahogany). The Court of Appeals upheld the Commission's decision and the Supreme Court refused to rule further on the matter. However, in 1931, the FTC reversed itself, and declared that it would only require of any company that

> . . . in its sale, description, and advertisement of the wood of the Philippine Islands which it has heretofore designated and described as 'Philippine Mahogany'. . it will not employ the word 'Mahogany' in connection with the sale of said wood without the modifying term 'Philippine' (Quoted in Alexander 1967.70, n 181)

This case is instructive for a number of reasons. First, it reveals that the FTC has no clearly defined set of standards for judging the deceptiveness of product labels of this sort Second, it can be used here as a convenient starting-point for the consideration of two complex and interwoven linguistic issues: (1) the problem of secondary meaning and (2) the distinction between functional and literal meaning.

It could be argued that the FTC was right to reverse itself in the Philippine mahogany case because in the absence of any other accepted general name in English for this hard-

wood of the Philippines, the name "mahogany" had secondarily come to be associated with it (just as in ordinary English "silk" has a secondary meaning which allows it to be used to refer to "corn silk"). However, against this, observe that this argument grants license to any advertiser who wishes to associate any term X (such as "mahogany") that has a positive connotation with any product Y (that may or may not have the characteristics of those items ordinarily called X) by mounting an expensive advertising campaign to identify Y as X in the public's mind. I think it is wrong and dangerous to grant this license and that the FTC must insist on rigorous standards for the determination of secondary meanings

But even if "mahogany" does not have a secondary meaning "hardwood of Philippine origin", suppose "Philippine mahogany" is functionally equivalent to ordinary mahogany Would that not suffice to allow the use of the name? [3] By itself, it does not, as we can see from Justice Cardozo's opinion quoted earlier. There must also be a lack of public interest in the distinction. Thus, if it can be shown that charcoal made from corncobs is functionally equivalent to charcoal made the ordinary way from wood, and that there is no significant public interest in the distinction between corncob-based and wood-based charcoal, then the name "charcoal" should be allowed to stand for both kinds. Such a decision was in fact reached by the FTC in 1963 in dismis-

sing a complaint against the Quaker Oats Co (cf. Alexander 1967:61).

FTC treatment of the problem of functional equivalence and of functional definitions has not always been so enlightened, however. The decision in the case of the Quaker Oats Co was exceptional, usually the FTC has refused to countenance the use of the term in standard use for a product or process to designate a functional equivalent, even where no consumer interest in the cases was apparent. The reason for this may well have been the presence of industry interest, forbidding the use of the standard term for a new product which is equivalent or even superior to the old has a distinctly anticompetitive effect.

Questions of functional equivalence arise in advertising as well as in product-naming. In the late 1950's, the Chevrolet Company mounted a campaign to push the sales of "Authorized" replacement parts for its cars by advertising that "Your Chevrolet knows the difference." The ad, however, did not mention that certain of these parts were made by independent producers who sold identical parts to independent retailers (in which case, your Chevrolet could not possibly have known the difference). A complaint was made to the FTC; it was dismissed (cf. Alexander 1967:60). Indeed, the FTC has in general refused to act on complaints against the advertisement of supposed product differences, even where it can easily be shown that the differences in

question are in name only. In other words, the FTC has tacitly given its approval to marginal differentation of otherwise identical products.

I turn now from the question of "deceptive to whom?" to consider the principles by which the FTC has decided which words or phrases in commercial language to regulate.[4] In advertising in particular, there are certain key words and phrases which occur over and over again because they are felt to be potent for attracting people's attention or for disposing people favorably toward the product or brand name being advertised. Among these, such words as "free", "sale", "best", "guaranteed", "cure" have received considerable attention from the FTC; others such as "happy", "new" (on this word, cf. Cox et al. 1969:20-22), have not. There are two sources for this distinction. First, false-advertising sanctions are aimed at preventing deception; the misrepresentation of a product or brand that a consumer presumably already has an interest in. They do not apply to techniques of nonrational persuasion aimed at implanting the feeling of need for a particular brand or product, since the question of deception does not arise for such techniques. Second, certain aspects of "sales talk" have always been exempt from false advertising law. Before there ever was a Federal Trade Commission around to protect consumers from fraudulent salesmen, it was (and still is) possible under common law to sue for damages if one was led to purchase something under false pretenses. However, there is no remedy under common law if the purchaser relies on statements by the seller that the product is "excellent", "a good buy", "valuable", etc. (Alexander 1967. 102). Such statements, called "puffs", cannot be the basis for a misrepresentation case under common law unless they can be shown to be purported statements of fact. To some extent, the FTC continues to be bound by this restriction, although it has succeeded in narrowing somewhat the traditionally accepted notion of puffing. For example, the indiscriminate use of superlatives, dangling comparatives, and other means of establishing uniqueness or superiority without evidence has been enjoined.[5] And, in the case of Goodman v. FTC (1957), it was affirmed that statements made to induce purchase cannot be defended as puffing, for example, representations that a given product is "safe" (Alexander 1967:103).[6]

In general, however, the FTC has not been successful in clarifying the distinction between "statements of fact" (which if deceptive are illegal) and "statements of opinion" (which are not illegal, even if deceptive). Indeed, the distinction, when applied to mass-media advertising, is dysfunctional, since all that an advertiser needs to do to convert a misleading statement of fact into a misleading statement of opinion (which is hence exempt from sanctions) is to put it in the mouth of a celebrity or "average consumer". Current FTC regulation of the use of such testimonials is shockingly lax; an advertiser is not even obliged to disclose that the endorser of his product has been paid, and if so how much.[7] To some extent, the fault lies not with the FTC but with the courts. In 1932, the Second Circuit Court reversed an FTC decision requiring the manufacturer of Cutex products to reveal that the socially prominent persons who endorsed those products were paid:

> If the testimonials involved here represent honest beliefs of the endorsers, there is no misrepresentation concerning the product and no unfair competition is created. We have no right to assume that endorsers of commercial products falsify their statements because they have received compensation. (Quoted in Alexander 1967:179)

However, it is not to the FTC's credit that it has never challenged this ruling, especially now that the courts no longer take such a dim view of government intervention and regulation in false-advertising cases. I would suggest not only that the FTC return to the position it took in 1932, before it was overruled, but that it apply the same standards that it uses in regulating statements of fact to testimonials of all sorts. Thus if it finds statements like "X shaves closest of all" deceptive, it should equally well rule that an advertisement in which a celebrity says "X shaves me closest of all" is deceptive.

The question of whether to regulate nonrational persuasion techniques and if so how, is more difficult to answer, since it would appear that the FTC has no authority under present law to do so.[8] If it is agreed that these techniques should be regulated, then two avenues of attack suggest themselves. First, request Congress to pass legislation specifically authorizing the FTC to prevent the abuses of appealing to nonrational motives. This avenue should be tried, but it is obvious that it will not be easy to get such a law passed in the foreseeable future at least. The second avenue

of attack would be for the FTC to attempt to interpret current law as giving it authority in this area. The Commission could do so in the following way: the FTC currently has some authority to force advertisers to make certain disclosures about their products where it is deemed that this information is necessary if the consumer is not to be deceived about the product. The most important case to date involving this authority is a current one in which the FTC is attempting to force cigarette advertisers to disclose the tar and nicotine contents of cigarettes in their advertisements. For such disclosures to have the intended effect, they must be reasonably prominent. They cannot be prominent, however, if the bulk of the advertisement is a nonrational appeal to the individual to smoke the particular brand of cigarette being advertised. Therefore, nonrational techniques of persuasion, interfering as they do with the prevention of deception, must be regulated in the interest of preventing deception.

This tactic might just work, but unfortunately it is based on the FTCs power to force disclosure of information in advertising, and the extent of that power is moot.[9] Once again, part of the problem lies with the courts; after some years of vacillation by the courts, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals ruled, in the 1950 case of Alberty v FTC, that the Commission's power to force disclosure of information was sharply limited:

> Our dissenting judge [Judge Bazelon] says "The Act's purpose is to encourage the informative function of advertising." That view reflects clearly the difference between us. We think that neither the purpose nor the terms of the act are so broad as the encouragement of the informative function. Both purpose and terms are to prevent falsity and fraud, a negative restriction. When the Commission goes beyond that purpose and enters upon the affirmative task of encouraging advertising which it deems properly informative, it exceeds its authority. But we think that the negative function of preventing falsity and the affirmative function of requiring, or encouraging additional interesting, and perhaps useful, information which is not essential to prevent falsity, are two totally different functions. We think that Congress gave the Commission the full of the former but did not give it the latter . . . (Quoted in Alexander 1967:23-24)

If the FTC were to challenge the courts again today on this issue, it is not at all clear what the outcome would be. However, since 1950, there has been specific legislation passed which mandates the disclosure of certain information in product labeling, specifically the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and the Truth-in-Lending Act. Perhaps, as Alexander (1967:24) suggests, the FTC will be able to launch out from this base to require positive disclosures by advertisers without incurring the disapproval of the courts.

Let me conclude by pointing out that while I do recommend that the FTC should become involved in the regulation of advertising techniques of nonrational persuasion, and that it should work toward the goal of making advertising genuinely informative, I do not have any clear idea of what specifically the Commission should do to implement these recommendations. To give some idea of the complexity of the issues involved, consider the fact that people are easily deceived even by truthful disclosures. For example, we are all familiar with the "minimum daily requirements" of human beings for certain vitamins and minerals, from the disclosures of vitamin and mineral contents in certain packaged foods and food supplements. Yet how many of us have been deceived into thinking that as long as we ingest this "minimum daily requirement" we have an adequate diet?

NOTES

1. The Act also specifies that "It shall be unlawful . . . to disseminate . . . any false advertisement" [15 U.S.C. §52 (a) (1964)], where "[t]he term 'false advertisement' means an advertisement . . . which is misleading in a material respect . . ." [15 U.S.C. §55 (a) (1) (1964)].

2. FTC reluctance in this area purportedly is based on the 1941 Supreme Court ruling in the case of FTC v. Bunte Bros., in which the Court held that the Commission has jurisdiction only over that portion of commerce that Congress had constitutional control over. It is extremely unlikely however that the courts today would find that the FTC had no power over interstate communication of the sort described above

3 On this point, compare Commissioner Humphrey's dissent in the original FTC rulings which forbade the use of the name "Philippine Mahogany" "The contention of the majority here is that if any person of common understanding wished to buy this Philippine wood, that has all the beauty and dura-

bility of mahogany—in fact, all the best characteristics of mahogany—that it cannot be described to him so as to reach the common understanding, by calling it "Philippine Mahogany," but in order to keep him from being deceived and so it is either Lauan, Tanguile, Almon, Batan, Apitong, Lamao, Orion, Abatang, Bagaac, Batak or Balachacan. This proposition, it seems to me, would be highly complimented by characterizing it as absurdly ludicrous." (Quoted in Alexander 1967:69, n.177)

4. I will not go here into the way in which the use of particular words or phrases has been regulated by the FTC. In those cases that would particularly interest a semanticist, the FTC has not distinguished itself. The one word that has vexed the FTC the most has been "free", about which Alexander (1967· 147), has this to say· ". . . the one contribution the Commission was in a position to make in its fifty-odd years of enforcement was the contribution of a certain policy—one way or the other—on the use of 'free'. Instead, it has provided confusion and contradiction."

5. But not consistently. For example, the FTC dismissed a complaint against the Celanese Corp. of America (1953) for advertising that Celanese fiber was "different from any type of fiber ever made", that it was like nothing ever known, and in a class by itself. The Commission explained itself as follows: ". . . Many of the foregoing expressions may properly be considered as mere puffery, and certainly a producer should be allowed some reasonable latitude to extol his wares, as otherwise the practical and economic justification for advertising and publicity ceases to exist." (Quoted in Alexander 1967.59-60)

6. But once again not consistently. In the case of Bristol Myers Co. (1949), the Commission dismissed a complaint against the company's advertisement of its toothpaste as leading to brighter teeth and a more attractive smile on the grounds that it was puffery and hence unobjectionable (Alexander 1967:113).

7. In 1966, the Commission did manage to force disclosure of a blatant misrepresentation of corporate endorsement: Proctor & Gamble's

claim that washing-machine manufacturers had approved one of its soap products by packing a box of it in each machine sold. What was left undisclosed was that the soap had been supplied free and that on occasion Proctor & Gamble would promote certain brands of washing machines in its own advertising (Alexander, 1967:179-180).

8. No instances of FTC intervention in such cases have been documented (Alexander 1967 22, n 131).

9 In fact, as Alexander (1967, passim) persuasively argues, many past FTC rulings in which deception has been found have had the effect of preventing disclosure of information.

REFERENCES

Alexander, George J. 1967. *Honesty and Competition· False-Advertising Law and Policy under FTC Administration.* Syracuse· Syracuse University Press.

Cox, Edward F., Robert C. Fellmeth, and John E Schulz. 1969. *Nader's Raiders Report on the Federal Trade Commission* New York Grove Press

Kirkpatrick, Miles W, chairman. 1969 *Report of the A[merican] B[ar] A[ssociation] Commission to Study the Federal Trade Commission.* Chicago American Bar Association.

ANNOUNCEMENT

At their April 19-20 meeting, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Center for Applied Linguistics appointed Albert H. Marckwardt as Acting Director and President of the Center, with all powers of the President. Mr. Marckwardt, currently Chairman of the Executive Committee, assumed his duties May 25, 1971, and will serve until a new director is appointed and in office. Mr. Marckwardt will also continue as Professor of English and Linguistics at Princeton University.

A Note to the Language Teaching Profession

by Albert H. Marckwardt

It has been my good fortune to have been involved with foreign-language instruction, particularly in the role of a spokesman for it, for the past two decades—this despite the fact that my departmental allegiance has always been English. In extenuation of this, I may point out that English is a foreign language in many countries of the world, sharing some of the problems which beset the teaching of foreign languages in this country. It is my familiarity with the English-language teaching situation in countries as diverse as Italy and Japan, Thailand and Peru, which will account in part for some of the observations I am about to make.

At the same time, in order to assess our own situation properly, we must review some of the events of the recent past. Twenty years ago we were in much the same state that we are today: falling enrollments, disappearing language requirements, a shrinking market for our services, and a seeming lack of interest in them. Then suddenly we entered upon an era of hope, promise, and expansion. The dynamism of William R. Parker, the concerns generated by Sputnik, the impetus of the National Defense Education Act all combined to give us a renewed lease on life which carried us along for a decade and a half. Now, by a curious twist of fate we seem to be reliving the agonies of the late 40's and early 50's. This leads one to wonder whether, by examining and reflecting upon the events of the past two decades, we might first of all account for what has happened, and on the basis of this, develop a plan of action—even more than a plan, possibly a philosophy for the future.

First of all, let us note briefly the changes in language instruction which did occur roughly between 1950 and 1965. Language study was introduced at an earlier point in the curriculum making possible a longer period of time to be devoted to it. Course offerings were extended beyond the commonly taught languages. Emphasis upon an audio-lingual method, combined with a linguistically oriented teaching strategy replaced, to a degree at least, the earlier reading objective. There was some recognition as well of the desirability of developing a sense of cultural relativity and understanding to the end that the knowledge of a foreign language might serve as a key to another culture. All of these changes were predicated on the premise that for every individual, an extension of his horizons beyond the confines of a single language barrier is somehow an intellectually liberating force. It is only natural, therefore, to ask where we are now, after some twenty years of pious resolution and a performance confessedly somewhat short of our optimistic hopes.

Before we attempt this, however, certain broader matters must be taken into account, because they place certain conditions and limits upon what we may soberly hope to accomplish Unfortunately, our somewhat fumbling involvement on the international scene —which might have been less fumbling had we been able to take full advantage of the cultural ideal we originally had in mind—has resulted in a climate of neo-isolationism, which is less favorable to our professional goals than that which prevailed in the immediate postwar period. I mention this not in a spirit of partisanship but merely as a fact to be reckoned with.

Moreover, the continued spread of English as a foreign language in virtually every country in the world, in some cases even to a point beyond the national interest, has undercut, to a degree, our argument for the necessity of foreign language competence as a means of communicating with other peoples. This is a specious argument, in part, but it has a strong surface appeal

Finally, the student demands for relevance on the one hand and for the abolition of course requirements on the other, which are making themselves felt, have created a series of issues, or rather questions, to be answered

which have not existed heretofore. All three of these factors create a new context which cannot be dismissed from our calculations. On the positive side, however, it may be noted that the claims advanced for machine translation are now somewhat less strident than they have been in the past. It seems less likely that we may with any confidence look to the computers to solve any but the most rudimentary of our interlingual needs, if even those.

At this point let us return to a consideration of what we hoped might be innovative in the 1950's and the 1960's. What precisely have we achieved?

Unquestionably there has been a slight but nonetheless significant measure of success in extending the amount of time given to foreign-language study, for at least some students. This is partly true because of the elementary school programs, some of which have been well conducted, and partly because of strengthened offerings in the secondary schools. As a consequence, institutions such as Yale and Brown have experienced a decline in elementary course enrollments but an increase in the intermediate and upper level courses. The major problem has been that of maintaining continuity; it remains an important consideration. Certainly the arguments in favor of an early language-learning experience are as strong as they ever were.

There has been achievement as well in increasing the language offerings beyond the commonly taught trio of French, Spanish and German. Even in the last two years, Italian has shown a gain, partly perhaps because of ethnic interest; so have Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese Nevertheless, the problem posed some years ago by Mortimer Graves still remains. Stated in its simplest terms it is: assuming in the next decades a greater need for foreign language on the part of increasing numbers of people, what do we do with the student who has dutifully learned Swahili, and who, some fifteen years later, finds what he really needs is Finnish? Currently our approach is the somewhat parochial one of developing skills in a particular language rather than in the ability to learn languages. We may need a marked change in our thinking and attitudes here.

With respect to the audio-lingual method, part of the profession at least fell victim to the pendulum syndrome so characteristic of American education For some years we had been teaching languages as if they were only to be read and that no one would speak them. Then we turned about and acted as if they were only to be spoken and heard, and that no one would ever read them. The structural differences between written and spoken forms of the same language have rarely been set forth in a systematic fashion, nor have we sufficiently developed the instructional strategy of an effective transition from speech to writing.

Our record with respect to achieving a more profound cultural understanding through foreign-language instruction is disappointing. The bulk of the profession, I fear, still thinks of culture in belletristic terms and regards any attempt at broadening this horizon as a devious design of the social scientists. We have not even been willing to undertake the basic cultural contrasts as an initial step in defining our objectives.

We have had some success with the language laboratory and some failures, but have neglected to pursue many challenging problems of technique. Virtually no controlled experiments on monitoring have been conducted, to mention only one area Similarly, as a profession we have left the area of programmed instruction to a few enthusiasts and have failed to inform and involve ourselves to the extent that the matter deserves. There have been few changes either in the general pattern of college teaching or in teacher preparation programs. In short, it must be confessed that much of the profession looked upon the development of the 50's and early 60's as a well-merited reprieve rather than as a challenge for boldness and innovation

This leads to the question of what to do in the present situation It is, as I have indicated, primarily a matter of adjusting to a different context our operations, considered in the light of our successes and failures of the past decade and a half Essentially, the case for language instruction as an important, one might almost say an indispensible element in a liberal education has not changed Language is still a uniquely human activity. The monolingual still operates under constraints which limit his experience, and his understanding and appreciation of that experience; constraints which confine and do not liberate A language is still a key to and a reflection of the culture

of the people who speak it. The gap between the speed of communication and the ability to communicate is actually widening. There is nothing new here, and except for the last point, little has changed.

What has changed is the educational milieu in which we must operate, but it has its bright as well as its dark side. We may well have lost the captive audience which was once ours, but this may make it easier to deal with those who come to us voluntarily. If we have fewer students, we should be able to teach them more effectively. We may have an excess of manpower for the moment, but this gives us an opportunity to tackle, possibly even in some organized fashion, the unsolved and partially solved pedagogical problems of the past fifteen years, and even more important, to explore the dozens of languages which have been neglected in the past and to develop the means of instruction in them.

These suggestions may violate some of the neatly delimited areas of expertise which color our thinking at the present time, but they will have the salutary effect of forcing us to see ourselves as a unified profession rather than as members of a Balkan confederation. Let language, not languages, be our primary concern. It is precisely this sense of professional unity in which organizations like this must play a leading role, a role which I consider paramount in maintaining the steadfastness of purpose and the forcefulness of attack calculated to yield results which are of utmost importance to the educational well-being of this country.

meetings and conferences

July 2–August 13. Canadian Summer Institute of Linguistics.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

July 19–24. International Congress of Teachers of German, 3rd. Salzburg, Austria.

July 24–25, Linguistic Society of America Summer Meeting. Buffalo, New York.

August 22–28. International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 7th.
Montreal, P.Q., Canada. [Write: The Secretary General,
7th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences,
1390 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal 109, P.Q., Canada.]

August 23–28. International Congress on Neo-Latin Language and
Literature. Louvain, Belgium.

October 15–16. Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association.
Las Vegas, Nevada. [Write: James K. Folsum, Hellems Annex 218,
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.]

October 21–23. Southern Conference on Language Teaching.
Spartanburg, S. Carolina. [Write: Elizabeth G. Epting,
Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C. 29301.]

November 12–13. Mid-America Regional Linguistics Conference.
Columbia, Missouri. [Write: Dan Hays, Chairman, Conference
Program Committee, Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201.]

November 18–21. American Anthropological Association, 70th. New York, N.Y.

November 25–27. National Council of Teachers of English, 61st.
Las Vegas, Nevada.

December 26–30. Modern Language Association of America, 86th.
Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. Linguistic Society of America, 46th.
St. Louis, Missouri.

TESOL Conference in New Orleans

The Fifth Annual Convention of TESOL, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, was held March 3-7, 1971, in New Orleans, Louisiana. The conference in other years has lasted four days but this year it was extended to five days so that the schedule might be spread out over a longer time, making it unnecessary to decide among more than a few topics in any one program session.

As in past years, the first two days were devoted to Pre-convention Study Groups. These workshops were aimed at teachers of three specific groups—American Indians, Spanish speakers, and mixed language groups —at three levels: the elementary school, the secondary school, and the adult. The groups dealt with practical problems of teaching and administering programs of these types on these levels.

The main session of the conference began with an address by the Louisiana State Superintendent of Public Education, Dr. William J. Dodd. Papers thereafter were divided into General Sessions and Programs. Speakers at the general sessions included John B. Carroll of Educational Testing Service, who gave one of the conference's most interesting papers, "Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching." Kenneth Mildenberger of the Modern Language Association gave another of the general session papers, entitled "Another Part of the Forest: TESOL's Turn." When Armando Rodriguez of the United States Office of Education was unable to attend, he was represented by Mr. Dean Bistline of the same office who read Rodriguez' paper and added comments of his own on the role of TESOL in support of bilingual education. Michael F. Shugrue of the Modern Language Association spoke at the Saturday morning general session on "Accountability in English." At the last general session, on Sunday morning, Kenneth Johnson of the University of California at Berkeley reported on "Research to Determine if Black Children Can Read Dialect with Fewer Errors and Greater Comprehension than Standard English Dialect." Francis A. Cartier, of the English Language School of the Defense Language Institute, gave a paper entitled "What's

the Matter? Don't You *Want* to Learn English?"

The program sessions were devoted to a wide variety of aspects of TESOL and bilingual education: English for Spanish Speakers and American Indians, TESOL Abroad, TESOL in the Peace Corps, Language Skills, Articulation, Writing, Transition to Advanced Skills, Motivation, Testing and Evaluation, Linguistic Theory and Language Learning, Research, Curriculum Planning, Teacher Training, Use of Paraprofessionals, What TESOL can Learn from the Foreign Language Teachers, and English as a Second Dialect. Program sessions on bilingual education dealt with Materials and Curriculum, Franco-American Bilingual Programs, and Program Progress and Innovation. There were special sessions for the presentation of selected papers on linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural aspects of TESOL, and on measurement and instruction in TESOL.

One of the last program sessions was called "What's Your Problem?" where a panel of experts fielded random questions on any and all problems in TESOL, second dialect teaching, and bilingual education Answers came from the audience as well. It was one of the most interesting and useful sessions, and the hope was expressed that it will be repeated at future conferences.

The interest of TESOL in bilingual education was reflected in papers and discussions throughout the Conference. This interest led to a great deal of discussion at the Business Meeting, and the following resolution was passed·

"Whereas we recognize that any human being's language constitutes his link with the real world, and whereas we are collectively engaged in teaching another language to human beings who already possess a fully articulated and developed linguistic system, therefore be it resolved that TESOL affirms (1) that bilingual education must be assumed to mean education in two languages; (2) that this in turn presupposes full recognition by every available means of the validity of the first language; (3) that such recognition includes positive attitudes of all teachers and

administrators toward the student's language; (4) that the validity of that language not only as a communication system but as a viable vehicle for the transfer and reinforcement of any subject content in the classroom must be central in curricular policy, and (5) that, where numbers of individuals justify such concern, the student's own language must specifically constitute a segment of the curriculum."

The other major item of business at the meeting was the election of officers for the years 1971-72. The officers include Russell N. Campbell of UCLA as President; Alfonso Ramirez of the Texas Region One Education Service Center as First Vice-President, to succeed Campbell as President next year, Christine Bratt Paulston of the University of Pittsburgh as Second Vice-President. The Executive Committee is now made up of Beryl M. Bailey of Hunter College; Beatrice Estrada of the Gallup, New Mexico Public Schools, Mary Finocchiaro of Hunter College (ex officio as departing President); Mary Galvan of the Texas Education Agency; David P. Harris of Georgetown University (ex officio as past President); Henry Pascual of the New Mexico State Department of Education, Clifford H. Prator of UCLA; and Ronald Wardhaugh of the University of Michigan. Appointive officers of TESOL are James E. Alatis, Executive Secretary; Betty W. Robinett, Editor of the *TESOL Quarterly*, and Richard L. Light of the State University of New York at Albany, Editor of the *TESOL Newsletter* Chairman of Local Arrangements for the 1972 Convention, which will be held in Washington, D.C., is Philip E. Arsenault of the Montgomery County Public Schools.

On Saturday noon the traditional "President's Luncheon" was held. Highlight of the luncheon was the address by the outgoing President. In her speech Dr. Mary Finocchiaro reminisced about her experiences during the year and her career in TESOL, and indicated some directions in which she would like to see the field of TESOL and the organization move. In addition to introductions and the President's address, two past presidents who are retiring this year, Mary Finocchiaro from Hunter College and Harold B Allen from the University of Minnesota, were presented with gavels in recognition of their service and interest in TESOL.

Child Language Conference

A Conference on Child Language will be held in Chicago, November 22-24, 1971, under the joint sponsorship of the International Association of Applied Linguistics, the Center for Applied Linguistics, and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. The subject will be: The learning of two or more languages or dialects by young children, especially between the ages of three and eight, with particular attention to the social setting. For further information write to. Theodore Andersson, 1006 Lund St., Austin, Texas 78704.

Fulbright-Hays Grants for 1972–73

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons has announced senior Fulbright Hays grants for University Lecturing and Advanced Research for 1972-73. The majority of the grants are for the academic year of the host institution, and the minimum period is generally one semester. Teaching opportunities exist in virtually all subject matter fields, at all college and university levels and at all types of institutions of higher learning, for young as well as mature teachers, and for women as well as men. Applications in the research category will be accepted only for certain countries for which research grants are listed, because of a reduction in program funds. The basic requirements are: U.S. citizenship at the time of application; for lecturing, college or university teaching experience at the level for which application is made; and for research, a doctoral degree or, in some fields, recognized professional standing; proficiency in a foreign language, as indicated. Registration forms and information are available from the Faculty Fulbright Adviser at each university and four-year college in the United States, and from the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418

book notices

English Stress: *Its Form, Its Growth and Its Role in Verse,* by Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser. New York, Evanston, and London, Harper & Row, 1971. xvii, 206 pp $12.95.

This work is two books in one. The first two chapters treat respectively the stress system of modern English, and its historical development; the third proposes a theory of meter with illustrations drawn from Old English alliterative verse and English iambic pentameter. The distinguishing characteristic of the work is the authors' conviction that stress in English is predictable.

The intent of Chapters 1 and 2 is to provide the assiduous student of English with information about the nature and history of English stress, and to prepare him "to read with some ease and understanding the important new literature on linguistic matters." The treatment is drawn largely from Chomsky and Halle, *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968), to which it can serve as an introduction. *English Stress* omits much of the theoretical considerations of the more technical work, presenting essentially the same facts concerning English stress rules in a less demanding manner.

It is yet of interest to the non-linguist concerned with the question of the nature of theories in general, since the authors give steady attention to the "relationship between the formal constraints one imposes on a theory and the empirical consequences which those constraints entail". The lay reader will be able to follow the treatment according to which the imposition of formal constraints increases the set of empirical data which a particular set of rules accounts for. By requiring, for example, that certain stress rules be ordered disjunctively (i.e. if one rule applies, subsequent rules in the set do not, even if they satisfy the other structural conditions required for their application) a simplification of the given rules is possible which allows them to account for facts not accounted for by the original rules. In this way otherwise "odd and unconnected properties" of English stress acquire meaning and provide a measure of corroboration of the proposed theoretical framework.

Similarly, in the discussion of the historical evolution of English stress, the reordering of stress rules required to capture specific generalizations has the additional effect of making particular stress contours—such as *confiscáte* and *réfectòry*—impossible. Their disappearance from English usage in the nineteenth century is claimed as corroboration of the theoretical framework of the proposed rules.

The theory of meter proposed in Chapter 3 is intended: (1) to provide a characterization of the poet's or the experienced reader's ability to distinguish metrical from unmetrical lines and to categorize lines of verse in terms of their relative metrical complexity; and (2) to "illuminate the relationship between a speaker's everyday linguistic competence and his ability to judge verses as metrical or unmetrical and as complex or simple". The first problem is treated explicitly. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions with respect to the second.

The theory of meter presented proposes a set of correspondence rules which constrain the encoding of abstract patterns into actual lines of verse consisting of sequences of words The correspondence rules are ordered in terms of increasing generality so that later rules subsume earlier ones.

The notion underlying this convention is that a metrical pattern embodied by means of narrowly stated rules is more readily perceivable than a pattern which is implemented by more general rules. The metrical tension or complexity of a line is then represented as the sum of the depth of the correspondence rules used to encode the underlying metrical pattern. The study examines the relationship between relative frequency of line types and their complexity.

The treatment of English iambic pentameter dispenses with the traditional notion of foot as a means for characterizing the meter. Rather a set of correspondence rules is proposed which operates on an abstract metrical pattern. Several advantages are claimed for the treatment: (1) the rules provide a characterization of metrical lines without reference to an ad hoc list of metrical exceptions (pyrrhic, spondee, trochee, etc.); (2) it accounts for Jespersen's observation that an iambic line accepts a trochee in the first two syllables,

whereas a trochaic line does not accept a comparable iambic substitution; (3) the rules reflect the effect of the syntax of the sentence; (4) the theory provides an explanation for the fact that iambic verse allows the deletion of an initial slack syllable, while trochaic verse, conversely, allows the addition of an initial slack syllable; (5) the iambic line and the trochaic line are characterized by the same correspondence rules applied to different underlying metrical patterns; (6) the theory distinguishes metrical from unmetrical lines in a greater number of cases; and finally, (7) the theory provides a way of accounting for metrical complexity based on the assumption that "the degree of pattern in a line [is] . . . directly related to the richness and variety of the means that can be employed in actualizing the pattern."

The justification for treating the several aspects of English stress in a single work go beyond the fact that English stress is at issue in all cases. The deeper rationale seems to lie in the authors' preface: "A few things about . . . a theory need to be stressed. First, it is of necessity made up of hypotheses that go beyond the data. Such hypotheses, furthermore, cannot be derived in a mechanical or self-evident way from the evidence. They require a mixture of guesswork and good judgment. Confidence in them grows and is justified when they enable one to predict facts beyond those initially available and to construct interesting and plausible explanations of these facts".

John Francis

The Poet's Tongues: *Multilingualism in Literature, by Leonard Forster. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970. xii, 101 pp. $4.50.*

Presents a sketch of the different ways poets have used languages other than their own for poetry from the Middle Ages to the early part of this century. In his introduction, the author discusses bilingualism and multilingualism generally and makes the point that for many people different languages are tools appropriate to certain definite purposes like the different stylistic levels within any one language. This is followed by a survey in Chapter 2 of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. The third chapter is concerned with the Renaissance and

Baroque periods and emphasizes the poetic use of an established literary language as practice prior to new departures in the vernacular. Chapter 4 presents a critical study of Stefan George and R. M. Rilke. The last chapter is devoted to James Joyce and other poets of the modern era, and includes a detailed examination of Joyce's use of the bilingual pun in *Finnegan's Wake*. The book should be of interest to sociolinguists. It is, however, mainly confined to a study of Western European poetry, and it would be interesting to see another study that would deal with multilingual poetry in other areas in greater detail.

Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education, *Vol. 2, edited by Dale L. Lange. (Britannica Reviews in Education). Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1970. xi, 369 pp. $17.50.*

This is the second volume in a series which analyzes and presents in compressed form information needed to improve foreign language instruction in American education. The Review treats critical elements of foreign language instruction at all levels, examines materials development and selection, and explores the theoretical bases of foreign language instruction. The main theme of the present volume is 'Individualization of Instruction', and the first article by Lorraine A. Strasheim gives the rationale for this choice. The second article by Florence Steiner is concerned with the three areas of behavioral objectives, testing, and evaluation. The next two articles by Gilbert A. Jarvis and Alfred N. Smith treat strategies of instruction for listening and reading, speaking and writing. Gerald E. Logan reviews the curricula for individualized instruction. The next two articles by Jermaine D. Arendt and W. Flint Smith are concerned with media and the language learning laboratory. An article by Howard B. Altman and Louis Weiss evaluates the training and certification of the foreign language teacher. Two articles on the Classics and on TESOL by Gerald M. Erickson and Bernard Spolsky reveal the present scope of foreign language instruction today, as well as problems connected with the growth of the field. The final article by Richard I. Brod discusses implications of recent foreign language enrollment trends.

Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: *Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania, edited by George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald, and Alfred Senn. (Haney Foundation Series, University of Pennsylvania, 9.) Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970. viii, 440pp. $35.00*

In the first article in this volume, "Linguistic Structure as Diacritic Evidence on Proto-Culture," Winfred P. Lehmann points out that linguistic paleontology, or the study of languages for the light they shed on the culture, social structure, and beliefs of their speakers, has been out of favor in recent years. This is owing in part, he says, to the fact that language was assigned a primary role in the reconstruction of Indo-European culture. He discusses in his essay a general principle for paleontology: that language be used only as a diacritic, not as a primary source. The basic sources of the paleontologist, Lehmann says, should be texts and archaeological data. Deductions from language must be examined as commentaries on them but not used as primary sources. The essays in the present volume, contributed by linguists, archaeologists and anthropologists, reflect the current renewed interest in Indo-European studies in the United States, and the application to these studies of improved methods resulting from new material and insights. They cover a wide variety of subjects, from an examination of legal language, institutions, and mythology to the Austronesian-Indo-European hypothesis. The volume should be valuable not only to the specialist in Indo-European studies, but interested persons in other fields as well

The English Language in West Africa, *by John Spencer, ed. (English Language Series.) London, Longmans, 1971. x, 190 pp. $6.00. [Distributed in the United States by Humanities Press, Inc., 303 Park Avenue South, New York, N. Y. 10010.]*

A varied collection of essays describing the English language in West Africa from a sociolinguistic viewpoint. This book is the first in the series to treat English as it is being used and developed outside native English-speaking environments, and is the product of a collaborative effort by British and West African scholars. The initial chapter by John Spencer provides a general review of the history of English in West Africa, its functions and roles, and contacts with other languages. Ayọ Bambose discusses the nature and function of English in Nigeria, and L. A. Boadi treats education and the role of English in Ghana. Three of the articles are concerned with pidgins and creoles. Eldred Jones gives an account of the history of Krio and a brief descriptive sketch of the language. Bernard Mafeni gives a similar description of Nigerian pidgin. The interaction between West Africa and the Atlantic creoles is the subject of the essay by Ian F. Hancock. Two chapters by Anthony Kirk-Greene and Gilbert Ansre deal with questions of language contact between English and the West African languages. Peter Young describes the varieties of English used in West African literature, including Amos Tutuola's translation from Yoruba to English. As the editor points out, very little work has been done on the history, sociology, and description of English in West Africa. The major defect of the present volume is the brevity of the essays, and it is to be hoped that the collection will stimulate needed research in this area.

The Growth of Word Meaning, *by Jeremy M. Anglin. (Research Monograph No. 63.) Cambridge, Mass, The M.I.T. Press, 1970. xiii, 108 pp.*

The emphasis in this study of word development is empirical and descriptive. The author analyzes 20 words in a series of experiments designed to investigate how the child learns to appreciate the relations existing among these words. The experimental techniques used were Miller's sorting procedure and Bousfield's free recall task. The author states four biases: (1) that words contain meaning; (2) that hierarchical relations exist between words, (3) that sentences are a source of verbal concepts; and (4) that the word is a social tool The crucial concept in this work is the degree of abstractness in the equivalence relation between two words (equivalence exists between two words which share a feature or set of features). The results for the most part support the generalization hypothesis. Young children organize words idiosyncratically, on the basis of a thematic principle. The transition to the adults' more homogeneous organization, based on conceptual categories, is very slow compared to the speed with which grammar is acquired.

A Transformational Grammar of Igbo, *by Patricia L. Carrell. (West African Language Monograph Series, 8.) Cambridge, The University Press, 1970. 123 pp. $10.50.*

Provides a descriptive introduction to the abstract transformational study of Igbo syntax and phonology The introduction is in two parts. The first part contains a brief sketch of Igbo, which the author describes as characteristic of West African tone languages in many ways. The second part explains the transformational model used, which is an extended version of that proposed by Noam Chomsky in *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* The material for the book was obtained mainly from native speakers. Where data from sources other than the informants was used, it was checked with them and utterances not compatible with their dialects has been excluded. Chapters 2-4 treat the base component, lexicon, and transformational component. Chapter 5 deals with tone, and Chapter 6 discusses segmental phonology. An appendix contains conventions, base rules, and an index of transformations There is a concise bibliography of sources used.

On the Verb in Modern Greek, *by Irene P. Warburton. (Language Science Monographs, 4.) Bloomington, Indiana University Publications, 1970. 169 pp. $9.00.*

Presents a linguistic description of the verb forms in Standard Modern Greek. The underlying theory, particularly the phonological theory, is the one recently developed by Chomsky and Halle, and is described in Part 1. Part 2 discusses phonology, with special attention to the problems of palatalization and voicing. Part 3 treats morphology, with an analysis of prefixation, voice and mood. The morphophonemics of the verb paradigm is discussed in Part 4, and special problems are considered in Part 5.

Psycholinguistics: *An Introduction to Research and Theory, by Hans Hörmann. New York, Springer-Verlag, 1971. xii, 377 pp. $16.00.*

This English translation by H. H. Stern is a revised version of the German "Psychologie der Sprache," which first appeared in 1967, and contains additions and modifications by the author. It provides an introductory review of the new psycholinguistic thought and research. In the Translator's Foreword, Stern points out that while the orientation of the work is be-

haviorist, the author discusses the strengths and weaknesses of that position fully and constructively. At the same time, the book views the psychological study of language in its philosophical context and a sketch of the philosophical background of psycholinguistics is included. The author has not included recent work in psychopathology, however this is a minor drawback in a work which presents a *detailed systematic introduction to such classical* questions in psycholinguistics as the problem of meaning, the relationship between language and thought, and language acquisition.

Cahuilla Texts with an Introduction, *by Hansjakob Seiler. (Language Science Monographs, 6.) Bloomington, Indiana University Publications, 1970. 204 pp. $7.50.*

The first in a series of monographs on the language of the Cahuilla Indians, this is part of a wider study which will eventually include a grammar and dictionary by the same author. The field work was done under the auspices of the Survey of California Indian Languages, Department of Linguistics, University of California. The prevalent dialect is Desert Cahuilla, although one' narrator uses the Mountain Cahuilla dialect. The third dialect—Pass Cahuilla or Wánikik— is represented by only a few features in the texts. The author's introduction includes a detailed discussion of the theoretical problems involved in translation, as well as the question of what should be included in a linguistic description.

A Linguistic Study of Cairene Proverbs, *by Fatma M. Mahgoub. (Language Science Monographs, 1.) Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University; The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1968. 141 pp. $8.00.*

This book presents a linguistic study of a literary form, the proverb. The Cairene proverb is examined from the point of view of its external and formal characteristics. The corpus consists of 900 proverbs current in contemporary Cairene colloquial Arabic, phonemically transcribed in the author's idiolect, which is that spoken by educated Cairenes. The author first describes the stylistic and phonological characteristics of the proverbs, and then treats the morphological and syntactic characteristics. Statistical information is provided in some instances on the frequency of a particular device or element and its density in the corpus.

Social Class, Language and Communication, by W. Brandis and D. Henderson. (Primary Socialization, Language and Education, 1.) London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970. viii, 153 pp. $7.50. [Distributed in the U.S. by Fernhill House, Ltd., 303 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010.]

This is the first in a series issued by the Sociological Research Unit of the University of London Institute of Education, edited by Basil Bernstein. Contains two linked research reports. The first, by Henderson, investigates the effects of parental social class, the ability and sex of the child, and a measure of the mother's reported communication to her child upon the speech of five-year-old children. The relationship is shown between a measure of linguistic flexibility in children and their family's social class position. In the second report, Brandis and Bernstein set out the construction and application of an index of material communication and control derived from the first questionnaire, which was based on the first interview with the mother before the childrens' entrance into school.

Explanation in the Behavioural Sciences: Confrontations, Robert Borger and Frank Cioffi, eds. London/New York, Cambridge University Press, 1970. xii, 520 pp. $15.00.

The purpose of this collection is to clarify disagreements over explanatory programs in the behavioral and social sciences. A number of psychologists, sociologists, philosophers, and others were asked to contribute expositions of their theories. Each chapter consists of an exposition, a comment by another scientist, and a final reply by the first author. The book as a whole should be of considerable interest to linguists concerned with theoretical questions not just in their own field but in the behavioral sciences as well. It contains two discussions of particular interest to linguistics. One is a discussion of the "Skinnerian Analysis of Behavior," by R. A. Boakes, M. S. Halliday and Karl H. Pribram. There is also a discussion of "Problems of Explanation in Linguistics" by Noam Chomsky and Max Black.

Mauthner's Critique of Language, by Gershon Weiler. Cambridge, The University Press, 1971, xiii, 346 pp. $16.00.

It is the author's view that a contemporary discussion of Mauthner's critique of language is basic to an understanding of Wittgenstein's concept of philosophy. Mauthner's basic contribution is seen as a philosophy of language which carries principles of empiricism to what he believed to be their ultimate conclusions. He concentrated on ordinary language as against the formalized languages and idealized structures other philosophers sought. Many of his theories belong to the science of linguistics, and in fact Mauthner did not clearly distinguish between this science and the philosophy of language. Weiler examines Mauthner's ideas within a historical frame and discusses the relationship between his theories and those of other linguistic philosophers. A brief biography of Mauthner is appended.

new CAL publication

Dakar Wolof: A Basic Course, by Loren V. Nussbaum, William W. Gage and Daniel Varre. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971. xv, 455 pp. $10.00.

This course consists of 74 lessons, plus classroom phrases, pronunciation exercises, grammar notes and a Wolof-English vocabulary. Each lesson typically contains one or more "cycles" (a small amount of new material followed by a brief practice and a conversational fragment),-or a dialog, or a combination of cycles and dialogs. Exercises are included in some of the lessons. The present text was developed under a contract with the United States Office of Education, and is based in part on Introductory Course in Dakar Wolof, by William A. Stewart, et al, which was published by the Center in 1966.

INDEX to the LINGUISTIC REPORTER: Volume 12, 1970

References are to month and page. Abbreviations: F February; Ap April;
Je June; Ag August; O-D October-December, Supp Supplement.

A. authors and articles

Bratton, Neil J.Q. *TEFL Programs at the American University of Beirut.* JE 6
Francis, W. Nelson. *Harpers Ferry Conference on the English Verb* F 1
Grimes, Joseph E. *Computing in Lexicography.* O-D 1
Lewis, Kathleen. *CAL Conference on English Bilingual Dictionaries.* Ap 1
Nemser, William. *Contrastive Linguistics at the Center for Applied Linguistics.* Je 1
Nickel, Gerhard. *The Applied Contrastive Linguistics Project of the University of Stuttgart.* F 4
Roberts, A. Hood. *Cooperation in the Language Sciences.* Ag 1
Stokoe, William C., Jr. *CAL Conference on Sign Languages.* Ap 5

B. publications noted

Academic Courses in Great Britain, 1969/70, Relevant to the Teaching of English as a Second Language. F 9
Academic Courses in Great Britain, 1970/71, Relevant to the Teaching of English as a Second Language. Je 8
Al-Ani, Salman H. and Jacob Y. Shammas. *A Basic Course of Literary Arabic.* Ap 9
Alatis, James E., ed. *Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages or Dialects.* Je 9
Alyeshmerni, Mansoor and Paul Taubr. *Working with Aspects of Language.* O-D 8
Andean Linguistics Newsletter. Je 8

Barker, Muhammad Abd-al-Rahman and Aquil Khan Mengal. *A Course in Baluchi.* Je 10

Barker, Muhammad Abd-al-Rahman and others. *An Urdu Newspaper Word Count.* F 10

Bills, Garland D. and others *An Introduction to Spoken Bolivian Quechua.* Ag 7

Blass, Birgit A. and others. *A Provisional Survey of Materials for the Study of Neglected Languages.* Ap 11

Bolton, W. F. and D. Crystal, eds. *The English Language, Volume 2· Essays by Linguists and Men of Letters, 1858–1964.* Ap 9

Brengelman, Fred. *The English Language. An Introduction for Teachers.* O-D 7

CHINOPERL News F 8

Chomsky, Carol. *The Acquisition of Syntax in Children from 5 to 10.* Ap 11

DeFrancis, John. *Index Volume. Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced Texts in Spoken and Written Chinese.* O-D 8

DeFrancis, John and others. *Advanced Chinese Reader.* F 11

Diamond, Robert E. *Old English Grammar and Reader.* O-D 6

English Language and Orientation Programs in the United States, Including a List of Programs for Training Teachers of English as a Second Language. Je 8

Erwin, Wallace M. *A Basic Course in Iraqi Arabic.* Ap 10

Fasold, Ralph W. and Roger W. Shuy, eds. *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City.* Je 11

Feigenbaum, Irwin. *English Now: A Self-Correcting Workbook With Write and See.* O-D 5

Fishman, Joshua A. *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction.* Ag 7

Foreign Language Testing. Ap 9

Gerbner, George and others, eds. *The Analysis of Communication Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques.* Je 10

Griffith, Jerry and L. E. Miner. *The First Lincolnland Conference on Dialectology.* O-D 8

Grognet, Allene Guss and Judith Brown, eds. *University Resources in the United States and Canada for the Study of Linguistics: 1969–1970.* Ap 11

Gross, Maurice and André Lentin. *Introduction to Formal Grammars.* O-D 7

Gunderson, Doris V. *Language & Reading: An Interdisciplinary Approach.* Je 11

Hall, Robert A., Jr. *Essentials of English Phrase- and Clause-Structure· In Diagrams, With Commentary.* Ap 10

Harris, David P. *Testing English as a Second Language.* F 10

Harris, James W. *Spanish Phonology* Ap 11

Harris, Richard M. and Rama Nath Sharma. *A Basic Hindi Reader.* O-D 9

Huffman, Franklin E. *Cambodian System of Writing and Beginning Reader* O-D 9

——. *Modern Spoken Cambodian.* O-D 9

Jakobovits, Leon A. *Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the Issues.* O-D 6

Kachru, Braj B. *A Reference Grammar of Kashmiri.* F 10

Kahananui, Dorothy M. and Alberta P. Anthony. *Let's Speak Hawaiian* O-D 10

La Monda Lingvo-Problemo. F 8

Language and Automation: An International Reference Publication. Ag 4

Leech, Geoffrey N. *Towards a Semantic Description of English.* Ag 7

Lehiste, Ilse. *Suprasegmentals.* O–D 7

Lehmann, W. P. and Yakov Malkiel, eds *Directions for Historical Linguistics: A Symposium.* O–D 7

Léon, Pierre R. and Phillippe Martin *Prolégomènes à étude des structures intonatives.* O–D 7

Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education. O–D 6

Linguistics: Present Frontiers. O–D 7

MacKay, Donald M. *Information, Mechanism and Meaning.* Je 9

Magner, Thomas F. and William R. Schmalstieg. *Baltic Linguistics*. O–D 8

Martin, Samuel E. and Young-Sook C. Lee and others. *Beginning Korean*. Ap 10

Middle East Area Study Programs at American Universities and Colleges, 1970: An Outline Guide. Je 8

Mildenberger, Kenneth, W., ed. *MLA Guide to Federal Programs: An Analysis of Current Government Financial Assistance Programs for Students, Teachers, Researchers, and Scholars in the Fields of English and Foreign Languages*. F 9

Montgomery, David C. *Mongolian Newspaper Reader*. O–D 9

Murphy, John D. and Harry Goff. *A Bibliography of African Languages and Linguistics*. Ap 9

Newsletter of the Department of Linguistics, Published by the Department of Linguistics [University of Illinois] Je 8

Nguyen-Hy-Quang, Eleanor H. Jorden and others. *Vietnamese Familiarization Course*. Je 9

Papers in Linguistics. F 8

Poppe, Nicholas. *Mongolian Language Handbook*. Je 11

Puhvel, Jaan, ed. *Substance and Structure of Language*. Ap 9

Qafisheh, Hamdi, A. *Gulf Arabic, Based on Colloquial Abu Dhabi Arabic*. O–D 10

Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata. F 8

Raun, Alo. *Basic Course in Uzbek*. Je 10

Reibel, David A. and Sanford A. Schane *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*. F 11

Reinecke, John E. and Stanley M. Tsuzaki. *Language and Dialect in Hawaii: A Sociolinguistic History to 1935*. Je 9

Savard, Jean-Guy. *Bibliographie Analytique de Tests de Langue/ Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests*. F 11

Sebeok, Thomas A. and Alexandra Ramsey. *Approaches to Animal Communication*. F 10

A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for Foreign Nationals. F 9

A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for United States Citizens. F 9

Sgall, Petr and others. *A Functional Approach to Syntax in Generative Description of Language*. AP 9

Sharma, D. N. and James W. Stone. *Hindi: An Active Introduction*. O–D 8

Studies in African Linguistics. Je 8

Trubetzkoy, N.S. *Principles of Phonology*. O–D 8

Uitti, Karl D. *Linguistics and Literary Theory* Je 9

Ullman, Berthold Louis. *Ancient Writing and Its Influence*. O–D 8

Williams, Frederick, ed. *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme* O–D 6

Wilson, Alan. *Breakthrough Navajo: An Introductory Course*. O–D 6

Yates, Warren G. and Souksomboun Sayasithsena. *Lao Basic Course*. O–D 9

Yates, Warren G. and Absorn Tryon. *Thai Basic Course*. O–D 9

SEE ALSO: Article by Roberts , Ag 1.

The Linguistic Reporter

Newsletter of the
Center for Applied Linguistics
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

- - -   -   -   - -

THE LIMITS OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION

by Bernard Spolsky

[*Bernard Spolsky is Associate Professor of Linguistics
and Elementary Education and Chairman of the Pro-
gram in Linguistics and Language Pedagogy at the
University of New Mexico.*]

When a scholar finds his field becoming rele-
vant to the society in which he lives, he is eas-
ily tempted to assume he can cure all the ills
he sees. Applied linguists are no exception;
many have jumped from seeing how language
education might help those who do not speak
the standard language, to a belief that lan-
guage problems are basic. Thus, in a recent

BERNARD SPOLSKY

article Garland Cannon (1971) speaks of the
"original linguistic causes" of discrimination,
and seems to argue that the solution of "bilin-
gual problems" will lead to a new millenium.
Reading an article like this, one is reminded
of the enthusiasm with which the new meth-
ods of language teaching were propounded in
the 50's and early 60's: give us the money and
the machines, we said, and the linguists will
show you how to teach everyone a foreign
language.

This belief in the existence of linguistic so-
lutions explains linguists' disappointment when
they find programs in English as a second lan-
guage, or as a second dialect, or in bilingual
education, being greeted with suspicion by the
community for which they are intended. Seri-
ous-minded, honest, and well-intentioned ap-
plied linguists are discouraged when the
NAACP condemns programs using Black Eng-
lish as part of an "insidious conspiracy" to
cripple the black children ("Black Nonsense",
editorial in *The Crisis* (1971)) or when ESL
programs are characterized as arrogant linguis-
tic imperialism (editorial in *El Grito* (1968)).
How can we be wrong, we ask, both when we
try to recognize and preserve the child's lan-
guage (as in bilingual or "bidialectal" pro-
grams) and when we try to teach the standard
one (as in ESL or ESOD programs)?

The difficulty has arisen, I suspect, because

linguists and language teachers have seen their task as teaching language: they have not realized that it is teaching students to use language. Thus, they have often ignored the place of language in the wider curriculum of school and in society as a whole. Take the example of literacy. We argue for adult literacy in English as a means of getting jobs, ignoring (or probably not knowing) that unemployment patterns are not controlled by linguistic but by racial factors. A Mexican-American is out of work not because he can't read, but because there is no work, or because the employers don't hire Mexicans.

It is important to distinguish between language as a reason and language as an excuse for discrimination. There are clearly cases in which someone's inability to use a language is a reason not to hire him; in such cases, teaching him the language will solve the problem. But there are many other cases in which language is used as an excuse, like race or skin color or sex, for not hiring someone. No amount of language training will change this, for the discrimination exists in the hearer and not the speaker. Blacks and Spanish-Americans know this, but applied linguists and language teachers have often not noticed.

Exaggerated claims, then, are a part of the difficulty. But I do not suggest that applied linguists should, like some theoretical linguists, simply decide that their field has no immediate social relevance. It is important to see applied linguistics as one of the fields with a contribution to make, but, at the same time to recognize clearly its limitations. For linguistic problems are a reflection of social problems rather than a cause. There is a linguistic barrier to the education of many children, but it is not the only barrier to social and economic acceptance.

The potential relevance of educational linguistics becomes more apparent if we look at language and language learning as part of the general school curriculum. There can be many views of the purpose of an educational system but a central aim must be to make it possible for its graduates to take their place in society. To do this, they need to be able to control effectively the language of that society.

The society in which people live today is not a single entity. We all live in a great number of worlds: the world of our home, of our neighborhood, of our church group, of our occupations, of the culture that interests us. And it is often the case that these worlds or societies each have different languages or speech varieties. With the rapid expansion of scientific knowledge for example, whatever other language requirements an individual may have, he must have good control of one of the world's major languages if he wishes to keep up to date with modern physics. Again, however well he knows English, a child living in a New Mexican pueblo must be able to use the language of his people if he is to participate in the cultural and religious life of the Kiva.

There are indeed people who live in a true monolingual situation and can attain complete self-realization in that language. Someone born in middle-class suburban America who, if he travels at all, does so as a tourist without un-understanding the culture he is visiting, and who is satisfied with the culture provided by the television set and the newspaper, will no doubt be able to conduct his whole life in one language. Whatever his limitations, the advantages such a person has from life are denied to those who do not from the beginning master middle-class American English. To the extent that we believe that all people should have access to these opportunities, teaching English to those who speak other languages becomes a central responsibility of the American educational system; and not just to those who speak other languages, but also as is becoming increasingly clear, to those whose dialect is not acceptable.

This is not the time to enter into the question of the fundamental advantages or disadvantages of nonstandard dialects. Linguists seem reasonably convinced that no language or dialect is inherently inferior to any other, with the possible exception of pidgins. But we must also recognize political reality: there is no doubt that middle-class American culture assumes that its members will speak the standard language, and that it penalizes in various ways those who do not (Leibowitz 1971). One of the first tasks of the educational system is to make it possible to overcome this disadvantage. This means that any American school must be aware of the language or dialect background of its students, and make it possible for them to acquire the standard language as quickly as possible. There is good evidence to suggest that during this acquisition period other learning can take place in the child's first language. There is reason to believe for example that it is a wise

strategy to teach a Spanish-speaking child to read in Spanish while he is busy acquiring English, or to teach a Navajo-speaking child to read in his own language first (Spolsky and Holm 1971). This type of strategy leads to the sort of educational structure that William Mackey (1970), in his excellent typology, would classify as dual-medium bilingual education, which aims at acculturation and at shifting the students to the standard language gradually but as soon as possible.

But this so far assumes that everyone wishes, and should wish, to belong to a single monolithic English-speaking culture. This melting-pot hypothesis has now happily been replaced by an acceptance of cultural pluralism. In this case, the languages of the minorities must be recognized not just as something to be used during the transitional period, but as an integral part of the school curriculum.

But exactly what this part should be is still a matter for investigation. There are two basic strategies: to decide that each of the two languages concerned should have equal status throughout the curriculum, or to give them different status. The former strategy might well be considered in those cases where one is dealing with two languages each of which has a standard literature and each of which provides access to all aspects of culture, commerce, and science, e.g. French, English, Spanish In the United States, this model has been proposed as the ideal by Gaarder (1970)

and by other foreign language teachers, and its implementation is the goal for the Dade County experiment in Florida. It has a number of special qualities. It assumes entry to the school system by two sets of students, each controlling a different language. During the initial period, English for the speakers of the X language is paralleled by teaching the other language to the speakers of English. The natural advantages that speakers of English would have over speakers of X is thus taken away: all students need to spend a large portion of their time acquiring a second language. The curricular cost is clearly large: the time spent on the second language is not available for other activities, but the presumed reward is a generation of educated bilinguals, equally at ease in two languages and cultures.

A great deal of attention has been paid to this model and particularly to the Dade County program. In Dade County, Florida, the bilingual program began in 1961 to deal with the influx of Cuban refugees. In its first approach, the program was transitional, paralleling teaching English as a second language with the use of Spanish-speaking Cuban teacher aides. In 1963, Coral Way Elementary School began a program in which all pupils, whether English or Spanish speaking, were taught half the day in each language. Since then, three more Dade County schools have followed the Coral Way pattern. Evaluation of Coral Way has been favorable, with data sup-

porting the general conclusion that Cuban children are, by sixth grade, equally proficient in reading two languages. But no detailed evaluation has yet appeared. The major question that will need to be answered is the generalizability of the Coral Way experiment, with its Cuban middle-class children, its national spotlight, and its generous support, to situations where Spanish-speakers are less advantaged.

One of the most thoroughly documented studies in bilingual education is another middle-class experiment. In the St. Lambert, Montreal experiment (Lambert, Just and Segalowitz 1970; Tucker 1971), a group of English-speaking parents asked for their children to be taught in French. After four years of the experiment, it is clear that the children have not suffered in educational achievement: their English measures are no worse than their peers taught only in English, and while they are not yet as good in French as native speakers, they do very well in it. Somewhat disappointingly however, these children taught in French have no more favorable attitude to French-Canadians than do other Montreal English-Canadians, suggesting that neither language teaching nor teaching in a language leads to a basic change in social attitude

The second strategy for bilingual education is to regard the X language as a limited culture-carrying medium, and treat English as the main language of instruction. In this approach, the X language speakers use their own language for learning about their culture. In the first grades, X is used in the transfer classes, as a medium for concept development, and for learning to read. But even when the English as a second language program has reached its goal and the student can carry on with the main part of the curriculum in English, the X language remains the medium for cultural studies. In this model, then, we might have Spanish-speaking children learning to read in Spanish while learning English: when they move to a regular curriculum in English, they will still take a subject called Hispanic studies, taught in Spanish. It must be noted that this strategy is in fact one that maintains culture at the cost of maintaining isolation: the X speakers are the only ones capable of learning in the X language. This can presumably be overcome at the cost of having English-speaking children learn X. But note that we are then left with a monolithic "melting-pot" bilingual community, rather than two

separate communities. The difficulties with this become clear when we consider a school with English and several X languages: if it is decided that *all* students must learn *all* languages, there will be little time for anything else.

Almost all the programs funded under the Bilingual Education Program follow this strategy, as a result of the fact that they are almost all aimed at the first one or two grades of elementary school. Many proposals assume that the program will follow the present children through the system, but time will tell what comes of this. For it to happen, there will need to be major changes in teacher training and the preparation of a great deal of new instructional material.

Given present official concern for accountability, a great amount of evaluative data has been collected in the course of new programs. But so far, there has been no published work that permits objective assessment of the techniques and approaches. The two main studies of bilingual programs (Andersson and Boyer 1970, John and Horner 1971) were written too early to do much more than quote from evaluation proposals. It may be some time then before we have any clear evidence of the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching and using a language other than English in school.

What I have been saying about X languages also provides a model for dealing with X dialects. Even though a dialect may be nonstandard, it will still need recognition as a potentially viable medium during the phase when the standard dialect is being taught. The possibility of maintenance for cultural purposes is presumably available, but it is unlikely to be chosen simply because the nonstandard dialect is generally not regarded as a valuable culture transmitter.

The American situation then calls both for English as a second language and bilingual education. A child coming to school must be taught the standard language if he is to have access to the general culture and economy. At the same time, he has a right to be taught in his own language while he is learning enough English to handle the rest of the curriculum. Communities that wish to maintain their own cultures and language may opt for this, recognizing the values and costs: separateness, and less time for "marketable" education. Communities that wish for a new blend of cultures

4

may choose this, paralleling the teaching of English as a second language with the teaching of the second language to the English speakers. Establishing a language education policy like this will not solve society's ills: it won't overcome racial prejudice, or do away with economic and social injustice. But it will be a valuable step in this direction and a contribution of linguistics to society.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer. 1970. Bilingual schooling in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cannon, Garland. 1971. Bilingual problems and developments in the United States. PMLA 86.452-8.

Fishman, Joshua and John Lovas 1970. Bilingual education in raciolinguistic perspective. TESOL Quarterly 4.215-222.

Gaarder, A. Bruce. 1970. The first seventy-six bilingual education projects. Report of the Twenty-First Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 23.) Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

John, Vera P. and Vivian M. Horner. 1971. Early childhood bilingual education. New York: Modern Language Association.

Lambert, W.E., M. Just and N. Segalowitz. 1970. Some cognitive consequences of following the curricula of the early school grades in a foreign language. Report of the Twenty-First Annual Round Table on Linguistics and Language Studies. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 23.) Washington, D.C : Georgetown University Press.

Leibowitz, Arnold H. 1971. Educational policy and political acceptance. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.

Mackey, William F. 1970. A typology of bilingual education. Foreign Language Annals 3 596-608.

Spolsky, Bernard and Wayne Holm. 1971. Literacy in the vernacular: The case of the Navajo. Studies in Language and Linguistics 1970-71, ed. by Jacob Ornstein and Ralph W. Ewton, Jr. El Paso: Texas Western Press.

Tucker, Richard C. 1971. Cognitive and attitudinal consequences of following the curricula of the first few grades in a second language. Paper read at the Fifth Annual Convention of TESOL, New Orleans, Louisiana, March, 1971.

Bilingual Education Project

The United States Office of Education has awarded a preliminary grant of $64,000 to the School of Education, State University of New York at Albany to initiate a three-year bilingual education program. The purpose of the project is to provide educators with the knowledge and skills to work and to train others to work more effectively in bilingual education in the schools. Director of the project is Richard Light, Assistant Professor in the School of Education.

An estimated 400,000 children of school age in New York State and the New England communities speak Spanish as their first language. The initial emphasis of the project will be on training educators for work in Spanish with Spanish-speaking students. Native Spanish-speaking teachers will be given instruction in educational methods to help such children enter the English-speaking society easily but at the same time maintain competency and pride in their first language and culture. A bilingual education program will be established at SUNYA to provide information in elementary education, linguistics, language arts, and Puerto Rican history and culture. The participants will also be given information on special methods and materials for teaching English as a second language.

During the first phase (1971-72), a small-scale Spanish-English project will be established in an elementary school near Albany. There will be workshops in Brooklyn and Albany during the summer of 1971, and a fellowship program during the academic year 1971-72 for educators who are or will be working in the Spanish side of bilingual education programs. An advisory group of educators and laymen will be established to provide continuing evaluation and recommendations concerning the project.

A long-term objective of the project is to develop the ability to prepare educators to help other language groups which are prominent in the Northeast, such as the various Indian-language groups in New York State, Portuguese speakers in Massachusetts, and French speakers in Vermont and Maine. The project is of necessity interdisciplinary and involves the cooperation of the departments of Anthropology and Romance Languages, the Puerto Rican Studies Program, and the School of Education.

A Survey of Linguistic Science

A conference devoted to a comprehensive survey of the language sciences was held on May 8-9, 1971 at the University of Maryland. It was organized by William Orr Dingwall, Director of the Linguistics Program at Maryland in the hope that it would establish a tradition of periodic reviews of the field in the future similar to those in anthropology, psychology, and biology. Grants from the University of Maryland and the U.S. Office of Education, provided partial conference funding.

The reviewers were selected on the basis of three criteria: (1) recognized scholarship in the subdiscipline involved; (2) the degree of distance needed to provide a reasonably objective view; and (3) clarity of prose style. Each reviewer was asked to present, with as little bias as possible, his opinions on the current state of the subdiscipline assigned to him and the direction future progress would take.

There were four sessions in all. The first, chaired by Robert Scholes of the University of Florida, was devoted to Experimental Phonetics and Neurolinguistics. In his paper, Chin-Wu Kim (University of Illinois) discussed how the attention of phoneticians shifted from physiological to acoustic phonetics and back again to physiological phonetics during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He stressed that these changes in research interests do not constitute a circle, however, but a spiral because the new trend is "more than physiological; it is neurophysiological". Kim went on to talk about speech production and recognition, with particular emphasis on the basic units involved. He briefly reviewed early studies by Sweet and Jones which were devoted to phonetic segments and pointed out the static nature of such research. He went on to emphasize the dynamicity of present research, where speech is viewed as a fast-moving complex activity. As a result of the work done by Martin Joos in 1948, and with the improvement in instruments, the interest of phoneticians shifted to acoustic phonetics. Most recently, there has been a search for neurophysiological mechanisms involved in speech, and some recent studies have effectively utilized electromyography to examine neuronal activity. He pointed to the need for more data, and quicker processing of it.

Harry A Whitaker (University of Roches-

ter) gave a paper on the major trends of research in the relatively new discipline of neurolinguistics. Researchers in this area are interested in what connection can be made between the brain and linguistic models. They employ surgery, drugs, electrical stimulation, and electroencephalography to study language disorders arising from birth defects, traumatic lesions, tumors, etc. for purposes of comparison with normal language activity. Whitaker himself adopts the view of Fodor "that linguistic, psychological, and neurological models of language organization will be equivalent to each other at similar levels of abstraction". He emphasized his own view that the relation between central and peripheral mechanisms is very important, and that the single function theory is not feasible.

David L. Horton, from the University of Maryland, was chairman of a session on Experimental Psycholinguistics, Developmental Psycholinguistics, and the Methodology of Linguistic Science Philip Gough (University of Texas) pointed out that early studies by Brown, Osgood, and Jenkins were concerned mainly with the word as the unit of investigation. Chomsky and Miller went on to analyze the sentence, which they claim contributes as much as its elements. Recent studies have stressed the influence of structure on memory, the psychological reality of linguistic variables, and the validity of the correspondence between transformations and real psychological processes Gough said the central problems are when and how a sentence is understood, and what happens after it is understood.

Dan Slobin (University of California, Berkeley) set forth certain cognitive and language processing variables as operating principles in the ontogenesis of grammar. He stressed the value of crosslinguistic samples and listed some universals in language development.

William Labov (University of Pennsylvania) spoke on the Methodology of Linguistic Science, and described what linguists do. He defined linguistics as the study of the structure and evolution of language, and went on to discuss some of the methods he uses himself in what he described as "street" linguistics, or language in context.

James Fidelholtz, University of Maryland,

chaired the session on Phonology and Histori-
cal Linguistics. Theodore Lightner (University
of Texas) confined himself to generative phon-
ology. He described a series of methods which
emend phonology to account for various phe-
nomena, and called them ad hoc devices to
patch up a theory which needs drastic
changes. He mentioned as areas for further re-
search the question of what forms are really
related, and the effects of paradigms which
have their own regularity despite general rules.

Paul Kiparsky (Massachusetts Institute of
Technology) discussed Labov's variable rules,
as well as his own "abstractness" constraint,
which prohibits the postulation of forms that
never occur in the surface structure. In rela-
tion to work on Maori at M.I.T., he made
some interesting comments about redundancy,
pointing out that a good description would tra-
ditionally eliminate this but that such a de-
scription did not necessarily reflect the native
speaker's own intuition. He also talked about
borrowing and canonical forms.

The chairman of the final session was Har-
old Edmundson, University of Maryland. Pa-
pers were given on Linguistic Metatheory,
Mathematical Linguistics, and Computational
Linguistics. The first speaker, Barbara Partee
(University of California, Los Angeles) gave
an account of the two schools of syntactic
theory which have developed within transfor-
mational theory, interpretive and generative se-
mantics. She also indicated some key problems
in syntax. One of these is a problem in logical
form and includes the questions of quantifiers,
negation, and conjunction. Another problem
involves pronominal ellipsis and equi-noun
phrases in discourse. A third problem is that
of lexical unity versus lexical decomposition.

After a brief survey of past accomplish-
ments in mathematical linguistics, Robert Wall
(University of Texas) devoted the bulk of his
paper to a discussion of some implications of
recent work by Peters and Richie. In their for-
malization of transformational grammar, they
have succeeded in proving that the generative
power of the standard theory exceeds that nec-
essary to describe known natural languages—
in fact, that it is equivalent to an unrestricted
rewriting system. Concomitant to this proof is
the finding that the so-called "universal base
hypothesis" cannot be falsified. As a result, the
grammar permits a wide range of alternatives
with no way of choosing the best. Further con-
straints on the standard theory of transforma-

tional grammar, or expansion of the data base,
or both, are therefore needed.

Joyce Friedman discussed two specific areas
of research within computational linguistics.
She first described the results of applying lin-
guistics to an artificial intelligence problem,
particularly the work of William Woods on
Augmented Transition Networks. She then
went into her own work which is basically
concerned with testing transformational gram-
mars by means of computers.

Some specific conclusions emerged from the
conference. While Chomsky's work has led to
increased knowledge of the nature of lan-
guage, transformational grammar fails to ac-
count for many aspects of natural language
and the current theory exceeds the generative
capacity necessary to describe natural lan-
guage. Many current proposals for revising the
theory are ad hoc, and increase rather than
limit the power of the theory. The data base
of linguistics should be expanded to include
results from allied disciplines like psychology,
experimental phonetics, neurology, etc. There
is recognition of the problem of alternative de-
cisions within the present powerful theoretical
model. Finally, there is a distinction between
formalization and explanation in linguistics,
and a need for increased use of experimental
method. The proceedings of this conference
will be published under the auspices of the
University of Maryland.

International Congress of Linguists

The Eleventh International Congress of Lingu-
ists will be held in Bologna, Italy, August 28-
September 2, 1972, with a final session in
Florence, September 2. A limited number of
travel awards to the Congress will be available
through the Linguistic Society of America.
Any scholar resident in the United States may
apply for a travel award by writing to:
Thomas A. Sebeok, Secretary-Treasurer, Lin-
guistic Society of America, 1717 Massachu-
setts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036,
outlining why he or she wishes to attend. If a
paper is to be presented, six copies of the ab-
stract should accompany the letter. The dead-
line for application is October 29, 1971. Infor-
mation about the Congress itself can be
obtained from: Secretariat of the Congress, Is-
tituto di Glottologia, Via Zamboni n. 38,
40126-Bologna, Italy.

NDEA Title VI Projects for Fiscal Year 1971

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971, twenty-nine contracts were negotiated by the Institute of International Studies, U.S Office of Education, in support of new projects designed to improve instruction in modern foreign languages and area studies in the three general categories authorized by Title VI, Section 602, of the National Defense Education Act: surveys and studies, research and experi-mentation, and the development of specialized text materials. Sixteen additional contracts were negotiated to supplement on-going projects.

For each project the following information is presented: (1) contractor, (2) principal investigator or project director, (3) title, (4) term of the contract, (5) cost of the contract. (An asterisk indicates total support from P.L. 480 U.S. owned foreign currency funds.)

SURVEYS AND STUDIES

Modern Language Association of America, New York, New York. C. Edward Scebold Survey of foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, Fall 1970. April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972. $21,207.

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. William O. Dingwall. A survey of linguistic science (conference). March 1, 1971 to September 1, 1971. $3,500.

Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. John Lotz. International program to describe the languages of the world. June 1, 1971 to December 31, 1972. $18,240.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Thomas Naff International research colloquium on the near and middle east in the eighteenth century. March 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972. $7,908.

International Studies Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota. James N. Rosenau and John E. Turner. Survey of the status of international/comparative studies and recommendations concerning national needs and priorities. October 1, 1970 to March 15, 1971. $12,955.

The Institute on Man & Science, Rensselaerville, New York. Daniel J. Fennell and Everett R. Clinchy. New curricula in Asian and Chinese studies in the secondary schools (conference). April 15, 1971 to September 30, 1971 $2,500.

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Eleanor H. Jorden. Joint Japanese-American conference on sociolinguistics. August 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970. $4,985.

George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Charles A. Moser Conference on twentieth century Bulgarian literature. June 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971. $3,418.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Frank M. Koen. Language and language behavior abstracts. February 1, 1971 to January 31, 1972. $25,000.

Research Foundation of State University of New York, Albany, New York. Paul Pimsleur Modality endowment in foreign language learning. June 15, 1971 to December 15, 1971. $25,816.

San Jose State College, San Jose, California. James J. Asber. A learning strategy to accelerate the acquisition of listening and speaking a second language. July 1, 1971 to August 31, 1972. $39,849.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

Stanford University, Stanford, California. Robert L. Politzer. Conference on individualizing foreign language instruction. March 1, 1971 to July 31, 1971. $11,072.

Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, Washington, D.C. Earl Stevick. Guidelines for language materials development: 1) The adaptation of existing materials; 2) The construction of new courses. June 1, 1970 to June 31, 1971. $17,841.

LANGUAGE MATERIALS

Indiana University Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana. Salih J. Altoma An introduction to modern Arabic literature: 1800-1970. September 1, 1971 to August 31, 1972. $9,995.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Ernest N. McCarus. Intermediate level textbook of Modern Standard Arabic. May 27, 1971 to December 30, 1971. $26,759.

University of California, Los Angeles, California. Wolf Leslau. Intermediate Amharic cultural reader. March 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972. $20,000.

Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, Washington, D.C. Warren G. Yates and Souksomboun Sayasithsena. Preparation for publication of *Lao Basic Course*. July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971. $15,044.

Indiana University Foundation, Bloomington. Indiana. Timothy Shopen. Preparation of a Sonrai Basic Course. September 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971 $7,076

Stanford University, Stanford, California. Joseph H. Greenberg. Materials for African language and area studies. January 1, 1971 to December 31, 1972. $6,670.

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Eleanor H. Jorden. Development of introductory Japanese reading materials to accompany the spoken text June 15, 1971 to August 1, 1972. $34,879.

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Oswald P. Backus. Preparation of Polish language teaching materials. June 1, 1971 to December 1, 1972. $47,184.*

Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D C. William J. Nemser and John Lotz. Project for a contrastive analysis of the sound systems, grammars and lexicons of Polish and English. June 1, 1971 to November 30, 1972. $17,080.*

Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. William J. Nemser and John Lotz. Project for a contrastive analysis of the sound systems, grammars and lexicons of Serbo-Croatian and English June 1, 1971 to November 30, 1972. $31,455.*

Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. Dean S Worth. East European Linguistic Studies Project, Project No. 1: The development of a Czech reference grammar June 1, 1971 to May 31, 1972. $9,522.

American Council of Learned Societies, New York, New York. Gordon B. Turner. Handbook of research resources on East Central and Southeastern Europe. April 1, 1971 to June 30, 1973 $49,100, suppl. by $3,131 of P.L. 480 funds.

Stanford University, Stanford, California. Albert E. Dien. Compilation of a research guide and manual for traditional China. January 1, 1971 to August 31, 1972. $9,970.

The Association for Asian Studies, New York, New York. L. Carrington Goodrich. Ming biographical history project May 1, 1971 to April 30, 1972. $25,254.

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. Jack C. Wells and J.F. Richards. Medieval India bibliographical project. September 1, 1971 to March 31, 1973. $18,685.*

Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. Marie J. Curtiss. Social patterns of current Indian society: The place of the indigenous performing arts. September 15, 1970 to April 1, 1972 $975, suppl by $4,350 of P.L. 480 funds.

Ford Grant to CAL

The Ford Foundation has announced that it has granted a total of $210,000 to the Center for Applied Linguistics for contrastive studies of English and the Hungarian and Polish languages. The research will be carried out in cooperation with the Linguistics Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and the Institute of English at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan in cooperation with other Polish universities. The grants will support the salaries and travel expenses of Hungarian, Polish, and American scholars, as well as the publication of reports and teaching materials. The governments of Hungary and Poland will contribute released time for professors, housing and living expenses for American researchers, and other costs.

Contrastive linguistics has been a major activity of the Center for Applied Linguistics, and it has applied this method to French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. The recent emphasis has been on East European language studies, and previous Foundation grants have been given for contrastive studies of Serbo-Croatian and Rumanian. This is partly in response to a growing recognition in Eastern Europe that English is an indispensable tool of international communication. The need also exists for English speakers trained in the languages of that area.

The American Council of Learned Societies has announced competitions for fellowships and grants for 1971-72. The fields of specialization include philology, languages, literature, and linguistics. With the exception of Study Fellowships and Study of East European Languages, the Council's programs of fellowships and grants are designed to advance research. Competitions are not restricted to members of academic faculties; however, in all of the programs except that in Study of East European Languages, applicants must have the doctorate or its equivalent as of the deadline that has been set. In all studies except American Studies, applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada. General inquiries and requests for application forms should be addressed to: Office of Fellowships and Grants, ACLS, 345 East 46th Street, New York, New York 10017.

meetings and conferences

October 21–23. Southern Conference on Language Teaching. Atlanta, Georgia.

November 3–6. African Studies Association. Denver, Colorado.

November 12–13. Mid-America Regional Linguistics Conference.
Columbia, Missouri. [Write: Dan Hays, Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201.]

November 18–21 American Anthropological Association, 70th. New York, New York.

November 22–24. Conference on Child Language. Chicago, Illinois.
[Write: C. Edward Scebold, ACTFL, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York
10011.]

November 25–27 National Council of Teachers of English, 61st. Las Vegas, Nevada.

November 25–28. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 5th.
Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of Arabic Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of French. Washington, D.C.

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of German. Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of Japanese. Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28. Chinese Language Teachers Association. Chicago, Illinois.

November 26–27. Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, Riverside, California.
[Write: R.S. Meyerstein, Dept of Foreign Languages, San Fernando Valley
State College, Northridge, California 91324.]

December 26–31. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 138th.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

December 27–30. Modern Language Association of America, 86th Chicago, Illinois

December 28. American Association of Teachers of Italian. Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European
Languages. Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.
Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. Linguistic Society of America, 46th. St. Louis, Missouri.

New Department of Linguistics at Leeds

The University of Leeds has announced the creation of a Department of Linguistics staffed by Professor T.F. Mitchell and five colleagues from the School of English. At the graduate level, in addition to the facilities it provides for research leading to the M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees in Linguistics, the Department retains responsibility for the M.A. in Linguistics and English Language Teaching. It is expected that proposals will soon be made for the institution of an M.A. in Linguistics and of a Diploma in Linguistics and Language Teaching. In addition, new undergraduate courses involving the combination of Linguistics and Phonetics, on the one hand, with French or Spanish, on the other, will begin in October, 1971. A Depart-

ment of Phonetics already exists in Leeds and discussions are proceeding with a view to establishing a suitable form of association between the two departments.

The Third Annual Conference on African Linguistics will be held at Indiana University on April 7 and 8, 1972, under the joint sponsorship of the African Studies Program, the Department of Linguistics and the Research Center for the Language Sciences. Anyone interested in attending or presenting a paper should write to : Third Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Department of Linguistics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

book notices

The Russian Language: *A Brief History, by G.O. Vinokur. Cambridge, The University Press, 1971. x, 146 pp. $12.00.*

This first English translation by Mary Forsyth is based on the second 1959 edition of Vinokur's book, originally published in 1943. The first two chapters of the book discuss the Slavonic languages and contemporary Russian dialects. Chapters 3,4, and 5 treat the origin of the Russian literary language, written texts in Church Slavonic and Old Russian, and the structure of Old Russian. The remaining chapters are devoted to the stages in the history of the language from the 10th century to the present century. There are numerous quotations, in addition to samples of the early scripts. Chapter 10, "The Creation of the National Standard Language," discusses in some detail the contributions of writers like Karamzin and Pushkin to the development of the new standard language. The book is useful as an introductory history of the Russian language for readers with some background in linguistics.

An Experimental Study of Phonological Interference in the English of Hungarians, *by William Nemser. Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University, 1971. vii, 191 pp. $8.50. [Available from the Center for Applied Linguistics.]*

This is a revision of a dissertation submitted to Columbia University in 1961. It describes an instance of language contact between Hungarian and American English, with English as the target language. The study is limited to restricted areas of phonological structures, specifically the perception and production of English interdental fricatives and English stops by native speakers of Hungarian. In spite of the fact that a decade has passed since the original experimental research was completed, there have not been marked theoretical advances in the field, and the author considers the formulations by Weinreich and Haugen to be still basic. Recently, exclusive reliance on comparison of the base and target systems has yielded to a more dynamic concept concentrated on the learning process itself. The revised text incorporates references to later experimental results, and to the recent Chomsky-Halle modification of Jakobsonian phonology. The results show that the type and magnitude of interference phenomena in a given contact situation are not predictable from a comparison of the paradigmatic patterning or phonetic structure and the occurrence options of the phonemes of the languages in question. The findings seem to favor the view, moreover, that the bilingual's use of a secondary language is characterized by code-extending, that is that the two phonological systems are merged rather than separately maintained.

Brain Function, Volume 3: *Speech, Language, and Communication, edited by Edward C. Carterette. (UCLA Forum in Medical Sciences, 4.) Berkeley, University of California Press, 1966. xiii, 279 pp. $15.00.*

The present volume contains the proceedings of the third in a series of conferences on brain function sponsored by the Brain Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. Scholars and scientists from diverse fields, including linguistics and speech, met to explore how the methods and knowledge of each field are or could be related to the others in understanding human speech, language, and communication. The summation and review by Paul L. Garvin discusses what linguists in particular have contributed to studies of brain function and what they can further contribute.

The Articles in English: *A Structural Analysis of Usage, by Sayo Yotsukura. The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1970. 113 pp. Gld. 21.—*

This work is based on the assumption that if articles are the only variables, nouns must first be classified into groups between which there are no fluctuations. Two major classes of nouns, countables and uncountables, are further subdivided to obtain the basic patterns of article usage. Some 9000 occurrences of the use or non-use of articles with nouns were examined. Twenty-five of the thirty-eight formulae developed were found to apply to any noun of the group specified. The author concludes that there is a pattern or system in the usage of articles which is structurally controlled, and that the method illustrated can be applied to an unlimited corpus.

Cognition: *A Multiple View, edited by Paul L. Garvin. New York/Washington, D.C., Spartan Books, 1970. xiv, 428 pp. $20.00.*

The papers in this volume were originally presented at the symposium on "Cognitive Studies and Artificial Intelligence Research", held March 2-8, 1969, at the University of Chicago Center for Continuing Education, sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. They represent a cross section of current thinking in the various disciplines concerned with the study and simulation of cognitive systems and processes. Three areas are treated in the discussions: the nature of cognition, problems in the study of cognition, and the simulation of cognitive processes. Part 1 is concerned with cognition and the organism, and includes a clear, informative article on the neurophysiology of cognition by Humberto Maturana. Part 2 is concerned mainly with cognition, culture, and language. Part 3 deals with cognition and meaning, and Part 4 is concerned with cognition and automata. This last section includes an essay by Michael A. Arbib on the cybernetic approach to cognition that brings out problems connected with simulation. In particular, it treats short-term and long-term memory, the development of cognition, and what the author calls the secondary role of syntax. This essay and others in the collection provide insights into language that should be of considerable interest to linguists.

Noam Chomsky, *by John Lyons. (Modern Masters.) New York, Viking Press, 1970. xii, 143 pp. $1 85.*

This is one of a series devoted to discussion of men who, in the words of the Editor, Frank Kermode, "have changed and are changing the life and thought of our age". The author's main purpose has been to provide sufficient historical and technical background for the reader to go on to Chomsky's own works. The chapters which deal with the formal system for the description of language are somewhat technical, but present no real difficulty for the careful reader. Two chapters are devoted to Chomsky's current views on psychological and philosophical issues. The author presents these views, as well as Chomsky's technical contributions to linguistics, clearly and concisely, and the book should be useful to students as well as interested nonlinguists.

Gujarati Language Course, *by H.M. Lambert. Cambridge, The University Press, 1971. xvi, 309 pp. $10.50.*

The course is designed to teach colloquial spoken Gujarati. Section 1 presents conversational texts in which the basic grammar is introduced in logical progression. Section 2 contains material for reading and intensive study of more advanced usage and idiom. These first two sections are written in All-India Roman, a system of notation devised by J.R. Firth for the transcription of Indian languages. Section 3 gives graded training in the use of the Gujarati script. The material of the course has been prepared in such a way as to be used to great advantage accompanied by tape recordings of the spoken material given and grammatical drills based on this material.

Language Conflict and National Development: *Group Politics and National Language Policy in India, by Jyotirindra Das Gupta. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1970. viii, 293 pp. $6.75.*

It is the author's contention that the conflict generated by subnational loyalties is not necessarily inconsistent with national loyalty and that even when political cleavages are translated into open conflicts, these conflicts may promote integration rather than disintegration. The empirical data to support this view is derived from a study of language politics in India, with particular emphasis on the evolution of language loyalty in India and its political expression through voluntary associations devoted to the promotion of the interests of the respective language groups. The author describes linguistic diversity in India in detail, and the rise of associations to promote linguistic identity. He goes on to discuss the impact of these associations on national politics, the formulation and implementation of a national language policy, and the policies of nationalist and separatist groups before and after Independence. The author concludes that language politics has shown that a viable political community can be built in India on the basis of the recognition of the separate yet related language communities. This study is an important contribution to understanding the language conflicts which have arisen not only in India, but in other developing nations as well.

The Acquisition and Development of Language, *by Paula Menyuk. (Current Research in Developmental Psychology Series.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1971, xv, 285 pp. $6.95.*

This book deals primarily with the experimental results of studies undertaken to examine the structure of children's comprehension and production of language. Much of the research described is concerned with questions of why some structures are used before others and the possible relationships between early and late development. The focus is on the child's acquisition of the linguistic system and what this can tell us about his physiological and intellectual development. The experimental approach uses structural descriptions of the language used at various stages of development, and is based on the transformational generative model. Chapter 9 discusses current explanatory theories of language acquisition. The author concludes that the basic processes and relations which give verbal behavior its special characteristics are not clearly specified for the acquisition and development of language or its mature use. The research discussed in the book exemplifies directions taken and experimental procedures being used to obtain an adequate explanation of the language acquisition process.

Linguistics and the New English Teacher, *by Burt Liebert. New York, Macmillan, 1971. 293 pp. $6.95*

This text was conceived as an attempt to remedy some of the ills that beset the teaching of English today in the United States. In particular, it attempts to deal with the lack of sequence in English programs, and the difficulty teachers face in trying to justify the pronouncements on language regularly found in textbooks. The present volume explores a number of areas: the traditional approach to teaching English, linguistic analysis and its use in the classroom, and the value of traditional and new approaches to the public school student. The book is, therefore, as much about teaching as language. Section 1 discusses historical background. Section 2 takes up the new linguistic approaches. Section 3 is concerned with alternative approaches. There is a useful annotated bibliography. This is a clear and reasonable presentation of the linguistic approach to teaching English.

Paraphrase Grammars, *by Richard M. Smaby. (Formal Linguistics Series, 2.) New York, Humanities Press, 1971. viii, 145 pp. $11.00.*

The present work is concerned with transformational grammars of the paraphrase relation defined as a system of rules accounting for the generalizable relationships among strings of a language which preserve the paraphrase relation. The author's concept of a transformation (as a syntactic operation which preserves co-occurrence relations), follows that of Zellig Harris, while the paraphrastic orientation derives from Henry Hiż. An appendix describes recursive enumeration, or the definition of a production system, using the technique developed by Raymond Smullyan (1961) under the name of "elementary formal systems."

new CAL document

Sociolinguistics: *A Crossdisciplinary Perspective. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971. iv, 151 pp. $4.00.*

This volume contains the proceedings of a conference on social dialects held by the Center for Applied Linguistics in October, 1969. Ten scholars were invited from the five fields of speech/communication, psychology, education, sociolinguistics, and linguistics/anthropology. In each field one scholar prepared a paper describing current research in his own discipline, its major assumptions, and trends. Each paper was evaluated before the conference by a second representative of the same field, who developed a short response. These replies are included in the proceedings. The papers in the collection are: "Social Dialects and the Field of Speech", by Frederick Williams (reply by Orlando L. Taylor); "Developmental Studies of Communicative Competence", by Harry Osser (reply by Vera John), "Social Dialects in Developmental Sociolinguistics", by Susan M. Ervin-Tripp (reply by Claudia Mitchell Kernan); "Approaches to Social Dialects in Early Childhood Education", by Courtney Cazden (reply by Robert D. Hess); "Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective", by Walt Wolfram (reply by William J. Samarin). Because the papers by Cazden and Wolfram specifically discuss the Bereiter-Engelmann approach, Siegfried Engelmann was invited to comment on them. His response is also included in the proceedings.

Year of World Minority Language Groups

By The President of The United States of America

A Proclamation

Among the people of today's world, there are more than two thousand distinct vernacular tongues without an alphabet or written form. Millions of people remain in cultural and linguistic isolation, unable to experience the benefits of modern civilization or to become full participants in the world community.

Thousands of skilled linguists of diverse nationalities are working in some of the most remote areas of the world in cooperation with foreign governments and institutions of higher learning. Living with a single tribe or ethnic grouping, for years in some cases, the linguistic scholar must gradually gain the confidence of a people. He immerses himself in the culture and learns their patterns of thought and styles of expression. Only then can the pioneer of literacy begin to produce an alphabet and to undertake a thorough grammatical analysis of the language. Out of these efforts comes basic literacy, and the end of isolation.

The Congress, by a joint resolution approved August 16, 1971, has requested the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to recognize the international effort to provide written languages for minority language groups, and designating 1971 as the "Year of World Minority Language Groups".

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RICHARD NIXON, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate 1971 the Year of World Minority Language Groups.

I urge Americans to honor those dedicated linguists who work throughout the world for literacy, and I invite foreign governments, the governments of our States and communities, and all people to observe the year by continuing appropriate scientific and educational activities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-one; and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred ninety-sixth.

Richard Nixon

THE AFRICAN LANGUAGE PICTURE

by William W. Gage

[*William W Gage is a member of the Senior Research
and Program Staff at the Center for Applied Lin-
guistics*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Three official languages, English, Arabic, and French, serve for most of the nations of Africa. One of these three is either the sole official language, or the principal functioning official language both for external relations and many internal purposes in 41 of the 49 primary political divisions of the continent, and in six of the ten neighboring insular political units The territory where these three languages predominate includes 88% of the population of the entire region.

The largest share of the population is in areas where English is actively used for national official purposes. English is dominant in Nigeria, the most populous African country. It has equal status with Afrikaans in the Republic of South Africa Adding in the 17 other political units where English is the major official language gives a total of about 140,000,000 in what may be called the English-language service area. That amounts to around 40% of the total regional population.

Northern Africa includes seven Arab nations: the United Arab Republic, the Sudan, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, and Mauritania. These have a combined population of nearly 90,000,000, about a quarter of that of the continent as a whole.

French is the privileged language for a greater number of countries than either of the other leading languages, but has a service area with a smaller population: approximately 75,000,000 in 20 political units, so that 22% of the populace can be classed as "d'expression française".

In Ethiopia—with 25,000,000 people—a native language, Amharic, serves for official purposes. English also has official status in Ethiopia, and is used as a medium of education above the sixth grade, but the affairs of the country are conducted primarily in Amharic. In some other African countries, as will be discussed shortly, it seems appropriate to say that an indigenous language is official in addition to a major world language; only in Ethiopia does the present situation seem best described as use of an international language supplementary to a local one.

Portuguese possessions in or around Africa are Mozambique, Angola, Portuguese Guinea, the Madeira and Cape Verde Islands, and those of São Tomé and Príncipe; altogether there are over 14,000,000 people in these territories for whom Portuguese serves as the official language.

Besides being the language of the Canary Islands, Spanish is an official language of the independent state of Equatorial Guinea, of the

Spanish enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla on the Moroccan coast, and of the fairly large but sparsely inhabited territory of the Spanish Sahara. All told, this adds up to only about 1,250,000 persons for the officially Spanish zone.

The most anomalous official-language situation in the world is that of the Somali Republic. It is one of the most linguistically homogeneous states in Africa; 96% of its population are speakers of Somali. The Somali language, however, is not one of the three official languages of the country, which are Italian, English, and Arabic. The country was formerly administered partly by Italy and partly by Great Britain, while Arabic was adopted principally for religious reasons. (Since, in practice, by all reports, Italian is the language most widely used for official purposes, Somalia was not counted in either the English or Arabic service areas.)

Countries which make official use of an indigenous language—other than Arabic—clearly fall into two groups. One set includes most of the linguistically homogeneous countries of the area. The Malagasy Republic (Madagascar) uses both French and Malagasy as official languages; Rwanda uses French and kinyaRuanda; Burundi—French and kiRundi; Lesotho—English and Sesotho; Botswana—English and seTswana, and Swaziland—English and siSwati. The other set includes those linguistically diverse nations where there is a single widely recognized lingua franca used throughout the country. Ethiopia, already mentioned, is, in fact, one such country. In Tanzania, Swahili is officially recognized as the national language of the country and promoted by the government—although the extent to which it ought to replace English remains a matter for discussion. In Kenya, Swahili is used for many purposes, though only in the Coast Province does it have an importance comparable to that which it has in Tanzania. The Kenyan government has proposed, recently, steps to move closer to the Tanzanian model. The Central African Republic has adopted Sango, the lingua franca of that region, as its second official language (with French) and uses it as a symbol of its national identity.

When Nigeria was made up of three regions, Hausa was a second official language of the Northern Region. Subsequently, although no official policy has yet been announced by the national government, the administrative language in the states into which Nigeria is now divided has, it would seem, become almost exclusively English. This is the case even in the largely Hausa-speaking North-Western, North-Central, and Kano States.

Mauritania alone recognizes a second world language, French, as official besides Arabic. French is, though, still extensively used in government and educational circles in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia. The Cameroon, as a result of division after the First World War, has a large French-using section and a small English-using section, with both designated as official languages of the republic. Mauritius and the Seychelles Islands were originally French settlements later taken over by the British, and in these insular territories French continues to have official status with English.

Where a country makes official use of both a language widely spoken within its borders and an international language of wider communication, the balance between the two varies. The small kingdom of Lesotho, shortly after the period of early missionary contacts, developed a strong tradition of literacy in the native language. Consequently, the use of Sesotho there corresponds approximately to the position of the native language in an independent Asian country such as Cambodia where a world language—in that case French—is extensively used for education. Swahili is increasingly becoming the true national language of Tanzania in fact as well as in theory, although the educational means to fully implement this development are still in short supply. Madagascar is the only former colony of the region which made extensive official written use of a native language prior to French occupation. Malagasy continues to have a position in the island as important as that of French, although French is of primary importance in education, and, of course, for international relations. Of all the African countries that make official use of French, Rwanda carries the use of the native language furthest in the educational system, using it as the medium of instruction to the end of the sixth grade. The relative strengths of the native official languages are somewhat less in Burundi, Botswana, and Swaziland—in the last case partly because of previous competition between isiZulu and siSwati for use in education.

The position of Swahili in Kenya is somewhat ambiguous. It functions as a de facto na-

16

tional language, yet there is some opposition to further extension of the purposes for which it is used. So far, the official use of Sango in the Central African Republic seems to be largely symbolic. Although Sango is the trade language used throughout the country, French continues to fill most of the functions of an official language. (An enactment of one government of Togo made Ewe an official language for that country, but no steps were ever taken to implement that decision.)

VERNACULAR LANGUAGE GROUPINGS

The languages which are spoken natively in Africa belong, for the most part, to either of two vast assemblages of related languages, the Niger-Congo family and the Afro-Asiatic family. Roughly, the Afro-Asiatic family covers the north and northeast of the continent, while the Niger-Congo family is found in the south, and in the southern half of Western Africa. The rather irregular line dividing these two domains reaches the Atlantic at the border between Mauritania and Senegal and has its Indian Ocean terminus approximately at the Somalia-Kenya boundary.

Of the approximately 115,000,000 speakers of Afro-Asiatic—or Hamito-Semitic—languages, over 70,000,000 are speakers of Arabic. Other Semitic languages are found in Ethiopia; Amharic and Tigrinya are the most important languages of this group. (For the number of primary speakers of Amharic, as opposed to those who use it as a second language, one may find estimates in various sources that differ by quite a few million; 8,000,000 seems a reasonable estimate. The Semitic languages of Ethiopia other than Amharic probably account for close to 4,500,000.) Also in the Horn of Africa are concentrated most of the perhaps 16,000,000 speakers of the Cushitic group of Afro-Asiatic languages, of which Galla (of Southern Ethiopia) and Somali (of Somaliland) are the most important. The other two Afro-Asiatic groups are the approximately 7,000,000 speakers of Berber languages in North Africa and the Chadic group around Lake Chad. This last group contains a large number of languages, but the Hausa language of Northern Nigeria and neighboring countries accounts for 14,000,000 of the 17,000,000 speakers in the group. (As a second language it numbers at least another 6,000,000 users.)

The Niger-Congo family contains languages spoken by nearly 180,000,000 native speakers. Of these, 95,000,000 are speakers of Bantu languages. In 22 of Africa's countries or dependent territories, Bantu-language speakers constitute a majority of the population. The most important Bantu language is Swahili, not because of its number of native speakers, but on account of its extensive use as a language of wider communication. The southernmost Bantu are the speakers of isiXhosa and isiZulu in the South African Republic, which, together with siSwati of Swaziland, siNdebele of Rhodesia, and some other dialects, comprise the Nguni language with a total of 10,000,000 speakers. Nearly as large is the language spoken in two forms as kinyaRuanda and kiRundi. In the two countries of Rwanda and Burundi together there are somewhat over 7,000,000 native speakers, but others in adjacent countries bring the total speech community to around 9,000,000. The Suthu language has three standard forms, Southern, Northern, and Western, or seSotho, siPedi, and seTswana. The total for the group, in the Republic of South Africa together with independent Lesotho and Botswana, approaches 5,400,000. Nyanja (spoken in Malawi, Mozambique, and Zambia) and Shona (spoken in Rhodesia and Mozambique) are important languages with about 4,000,000 and 3,500,000 speakers respectively. Kikuyu in Kenya and luGanda in Uganda are not as large, but are two of the Bantu languages whose names are most widely known outside Africa.

The other Niger-Congo languages most closely related to Bantu are those in the Benue group, among which Tiv in Nigeria is the most important. The total number of speakers of such languages—sometimes called semi-Bantu—is about 6,000,000. The Voltaic (or Gur) languages, with about 11,000,000 speakers, also show clear resemblances to Bantu. The principal languages of this group are Moré in Upper Volta and Dagombe in neighboring northern Ghana. Certain basic similarities to Bantu are also discernible in the Atlantic group of Niger-Congo languages. The language of the Fulani—who are found in a belt stretching from near the Atlantic in Portuguese Guinea to the Northern Cameroon—accounts for about 11,000,000 of the 16,000,000 speakers of Atlantic languages. The next largest language of this group is Wolof in Senegal.

The other three groups of Niger-Congo languages appear to bear a much more remote resemblance to Bantu. The Eastern group numbers only about 4,000,000 native speakers altogether. The most important members are Sango in the Central African Republic and Zande in the north of the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Sudan. The Guinean (or Kwa) languages cover the coast of West Africa from Liberia to Nigeria, serving a total of 38,000,000 native speakers. Yoruba in southwestern Nigeria, and Ibo in the East-Central State, have roughly 10,000,000 and 9,000,000 speakers respectively. The Akan language, in the forms known as Twi and Fante, numbers over 3,000,000 speakers in Ghana. Fon in Dahomey is closely enough related to the Ewe of Ghana and Togo for these to be considered a single language, spoken by roughly 4,000,000. The last Niger-Congo group is the Mande languages. The principal Mande language is, once again, a set of dialects with quite diverse names: Bambara in Mali; Malinke, principally in Guinea; Dyula in the Ivory Coast and Upper Volta. The language as a whole is perhaps best called Mandekan. The number of native speakers exceeds 4,000,000. Mende of Sierra Leone is another significant Mande language.

All other language families excepting Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic are left with 35,000,000 speakers, 10% of the African-area total. Nine million speakers of Nilotic languages include, for instance, the 1,500,000 Nubians of Egypt and the Sudan, the 1,800,000 Dinka of the Sudan, the 1,300,000 Acholis of Uganda, and the 1,500,000 Luo of Kenya. Kanuri's 3,300,000 speakers are joined by an additional 500,000 from other languages in the Central Saharan family. Songhai, along the Niger River from central Mali to beyond the Nigerian border, is a language of over 1,000,000 with no close relatives. (Linguists investigating the remote relationships of languages have advocated joining all these and others in a Nilo-Saharan family of 18,000,000 speakers, and have even posited an ultimate relationship between all of this loose assemblage and the Niger-Congo family.)

Ten million speakers of Indo-European languages are found in the African region. Four million speakers of Afrikaans are the largest such language group. Among native speakers of English, the Anglo-South-Africans are the most numerous component. The African re-

gion as here delineated on a purely geographical basis includes two insular possessions that are almost purely European from a cultural point of view, the Spanish Canary Islands and Portuguese Madeira. There are other English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian settlers and their descendents in various parts of Africa Speakers of Bhojpuri from the state of Bihar in India form a large constituent in the population of the island of Mauritius, while Hindu, Urdu, Gujarati, Panjabi, and Marathi speakers are common among the Asian business community in East Africa.

A single Malayo-Polynesian language, Malagasy, is found in the African region on the island of Madagascar, where it is the vernacular of 6,700,000 people.

LANGUAGE ZONES

For a closer look at how languages function on the African scene, it is convenient to consider countries and groups of countries that exhibit reasonably coherent patterns in their language situations and have other ecological factors in common. This division has to be somewhat arbitrary in its finer details; several countries could be assigned partly to one and partly to another of the listed language zones. Only for Africa's most populous state, Nigeria, has such a division been made in the discussion (Major zones appear in bold face type; smaller areas within them appear in italics, with colonial areas bracketed.)

North Africa (the Maghreb). *Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya [Spanish Sahara, Ceuta, Mellila].*

This area as a whole is more than three-quarters Arabic speaking. In all these countries, the local Arabic dialects are of the same general Western or Maghrebi type. Arabic is the language in general use for most cultural purposes In the independent countries except Libya, French is important for education, for some administrative purposes, and as an international language of wider communication (with official status in Mauritania). The minority languages are largely of the Berber group, which includes about 18% of the population of the zone as a whole; the principal Berber languages are Shilha, Tamazight, and Rif in Morocco, and Kabyle and Shawiya in Algeria. These, and such other minority languages as are found in the area, occupy a somewhat submerged social position, much

less significant than that which groups of the same size have in many other parts of Africa Both the general linguistic solidarity of the area and the religious prestige of Arabic tend to limit the functions for which other languages are used.

Egypt. *United Arab Republic.*

For close to five thousand years, Egypt has had a dual orientation, partly across the Sinai peninsula and the Red Sea towards Southwest Asia and partly up the Nile valley towards the rest of Africa. Cairo is not only the largest city in Africa but also the principal metropolis of the Arab-speaking world. It has the only local variety of Arabic that is gaining appreciable familiarity outside its own territory. The country is almost entirely Arabic using, and is, in fact, by a considerable margin, the most populous Arab country. The largest linguistic minority, amounting to less than 1% of the population, are the Nubians who live in the Nile valley near the Egyptian-Sudanese border —formerly largely in areas now flooded by the Aswan dam

Upper Nile Valley. *Republic of the Sudan.*

The Sudan is approximately half Arabic speaking. In the central to western part of the country there are areas where the diversity of languages is as great as anywhere in the world, including whole families of languages found only in these provinces. Also found within the country are an important Cushitic language, Beja, in the northeast, and a portion of the speakers of Zande, the largest in the Eastern group of Niger-Congo languages, in the southwest. The largest component in the non-Arabic population are the Nilotic-language speakers (21%). There are Nubians interspersed with Arabs in the Nile valley for about the first 400 miles above the Egyptian border. The greatest concentration of these languages, however, is in the three southern provinces (Bahr el Ghazal, Upper Nile, and Equatoria) where the principal language groups are the Dinka, Nuer, Shilluk, and Bari. A rather stringently interpreted government policy of Arabicization has not yet resulted in producing a general sense of national unity, or in overcoming the sharp cultural division between north and south

Horn of Africa. *Ethiopia, Somali Republic [French Territory of the Afars and Issas].*

The languages of this zone are nearly all Cushitic or Semitic. The two independent countries present in some ways a striking contrast in that Ethiopia is a land of great linguistic diversity whereas the Somali Republic has only a single important native language. In both states the written use of languages other than the official ones is definitely played down at present.

Somalia's avoidance of Somali as a national language is partly a consequence of lack of agreement on how it should be written. There are two systems for writing it in the Roman alphabet, one using the Arabic script, and yet another of purely local invention. There has also been contention as to what dialect would be followed in government publications if Somali were made an official language.

Amharic is written using the Ethiopic alphabet, which stems from ancient South-Arabic Semitic sources. Insofar as other languages of the empire are used for written purposes, they also use similar alphabets. Tigrinya, with a considerable history of use as a literary language, enjoys a relatively privileged position among the nonofficial languages. Galla, the largest nonofficial language, with about twice as many speakers as Tigrinya (approximately 7,000,000 to 3,500,000) has hardly any use as a written medium of communication. Italian, a holdover from the days of occupation—which lasted from 1885 to 1945 in Eritrea—is the most widely known European language today in Ethiopia as well as in Somalia.

The French Territory of the Afars and Issas is almost equally divided between the Issas, who are Somalis, in the southeast, and the speakers of Afar, or Danakil, to the northwest. It is largely the unwillingness of the latter to be incorporated into the Somali Republic that has kept this a French possession.

The sizeable Somali minority in Ethiopia has proved a constant source of friction with the Somali Republic, and has prevented any furtherance of the many long-term interests the two countries would seem to have in common.

West African Savannah. *Senegal, Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Upper Volta, Niger, Northern Nigeria, Chad [Cabo Verde Islands, Portuguese Guinea].*

These are the countries of the easily traversable regions south of the Sahara Desert. It is within this region that the great West African empires of Ghana, Mali, and Songhai held

sway. In modern times this zone is the domain of a number of languages used for wider communication beyond their own native speech communities, and often crossing present national borders. From west to east, these include Wolof in Senegal and the Gambia, Fulani in northern Guinea, Mandekan centering in Mali, Moré in Upper Volta, Songhai in Niger, Hausa in the western two-thirds of northern Nigeria, Kanuri near Lake Chad, and a dialect of Arabic in the Republic of Chad.

Speakers of Fulani are found the whole length of this zone. They are not only one of the most widespread language groups in Africa, but, with 11,000,000 native speakers, are surpassed only by Arabic and Hausa in first-language use. This language is, however, of major social significance only at the two ends of its territory, in northern Guinea and in the North Cameroon, together with adjacent regions of Nigeria. The largest groups of Fulani live in parts of Northern Nigeria where Hausa is the dominant language

The important languages of this zone are all associated with some of the major Sudanic states of one period or another. In particular, the expansion of Mandekan can be related to the dominance of the empire of Mali from 1230 to 1435. The extent to which Songhai still serves as a lingua franca (as also its far wider use a hundred years ago) stems from the period when the Songhai empire flourished, 1464–1591. Both Hausa and eastern Fulani owe much of their social significance to the rise of the empire of Sokoto after 1811. The descendants of the rulers of the ancient empire of Ghana from 700 to 1076 are, it is believed, the modern Soninké (or Sarakhollé), a relatively minor language group of about 750,000 concentrated in western Mali.

Northern Coast of the Gulf of Guinea. *Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togo, Dahomey, Southern Nigeria.*

There are great differences in West Africa between the regions bordering the Gulf of Guinea and the generally inland regions further north. In its fundamental geographic aspect, the southern region contains extensive areas of tropical rain forest difficult to traverse, while the northern region consists largely of open savannahs. The coastal South became the region of major European contact after 1500. Consequently, the societies of this zone became increasingly coast oriented, first trad-

ing to the Europeans, gold, ivory, and other rare commodities, and then slaves. Later trade became legitimate again, with a tendency eventually toward cash-crop economies.

In areas that came under British domination, a considerable development in language use was associated with the spread of education on a European model. In the French colonies of Ivory Coast and Dahomey, and to nearly the same extent in independent Liberia, official educational policies tended to work in the opposite direction, towards limiting the African languages to their basic function as the popular spoken vernaculars. During the German period in Togo, Ewe achieved a somewhat higher position, which it never entirely lost under the French mandate and trusteeship administrations of the eastern half of the former German colony that was to become the modern republic of Togo.

Except at the western end of this zone, the principal languages of the various coastal subregions belong to the Guinean, or Kwa, group of Niger-Congo languages. The predominant language of northern Sierra Leone is Temne, of the Atlantic group of the Niger-Congo family, and, in the southern part of the same country, Mende of the Mande group is preponderant. The major coastal Kwa peoples, in order from west to east are: Kru—with Bassa—in Liberia and parts of the adjacent Ivory Coast (estimated total, 900,000 speakers); Baulé—with Agni and Nzima—in the eastern Ivory Coast and western Ghana (estimated at 1,400,000); Akan—including Ashanti, Fante, and Akwapim Twi—in Ghana (3,400,000); Ewe in eastern Ghana and Togo—with Fon in Dahomey—(4,000,000); Yoruba in southwestern Nigeria (10,000,000); Bini or Edo in the Mid-Western State of Nigeria (840,000); and the Ibo of the East-Central State of Nigeria, of whom there were almost certainly well over 9,000,000 before the tragic Biafran rebellion in which considerable population losses, as yet impossible to assess, occurred in Ibo-speaking territories. Lastly, in this zone the southeastern corner of Nigeria is occupied by the language of the Efik and Ibibio. In the past this language was usually classified in the Benue, or Semi-Bantu group of Niger-Congo languages; in fact, numbering not far below 3,000,000 native speakers, it was considered the largest language of the group. Recently, however, Efik-Ibibio has been alleged to be another Guinean language so that

these eight Kwa tongues together account for nearly two-thirds of the total population of this zone.

Freetown in Sierra Leone was founded as a settlement for captives of the slave trade who had been set free by the British. Among some of the "Sierra Leone Creoles", the descendants of these early settlers, there developed a variety of English considerably modified in the direction of West African linguistic structure. This dialect, known as Krio, has become the most widely used lingua franca in Sierra Leone. In Liberia, where ex-slaves from the United States settled Monrovia and other coastal towns, English also is the native language of an important segment of the population. African influenced trade-language varieties of English also exist in Liberia, but seem never to have become the native language of a sizeable element of the population as Krio did in Sierra Leone.

Congo Basin and Environs. *Democratic Republic of the Congo, Congo Peoples Republic, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Cameroon, Central African Republic [São Tomé and Príncipe].*

This zone is, as a whole, predominantly Bantu-speaking (77%) The principal exception to this pattern occurs in the Central African Republic, where nearly 90% of the population are native speakers of languages that belong in the Eastern group of the Niger-Congo family. With minor exceptions, French is the official language in these territories.

Apart from the use of Sango as the general lingua franca of the Central African Republic, African languages are currently accorded less status in this zone than in most other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa. Until 1960, four languages of the former Belgian Congo had official recognition for administrative and educational purposes. These were kiKongo, liNgala, chiLuba, and Congo kiSwahili. Two of these, kiKongo and chiLuba are languages with large numbers of native speakers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; liNgala and kiSwahili are important principally for their use between speakers of other languages. liNgala has, by all reports, been generally continued as the language of the Congolese army.

The language with the greatest actual use as a medium of wider communication in the Cameroon is a form of Pidgin English, known as Wescos (originally the language used on the west coast.) This dialect is much like the Krio

of Sierra Leone, but it has been adopted as a mother tongue only by an insignificant group of speakers—mostly, it would appear, on the island of Fernando Po in Equitorial Guinea. The use of Duala, once spread as a written language by German missions in the Cameroon, has been discouraged ever since World War I.

Two African languages with broad social significance in this zone are kiKongo (which is spoken in northern Angola as well as in the western part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the Congo Peoples Republic) and Fang-Bulu (the largest language of the Cameroon, Gabon, and Equatorial Guinea.) At present, major shifts in national language policies appear somewhat improbable, and any greater emphasis on these languages would seem likely to come only through their use in education in ways instrumental to promoting better eventual mastery of French

East Africa. *Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi.*

This is the zone of Sub-Saharan Africa in which the strongest feelings of political attachment to language have developed. One of the major events in the modern history of languages in Africa has been the spread of Swahili from its original home in coastal trading centers to the entire zone in at least some degree of use as a lingua franca. It has also gained a considerable foothold in certain neighboring areas, particularly the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

In Tanzania, the tradition of using Swahili was firmly established many years before it came to be advocated as a unifying force for the new nation. At present, all the other vernacular languages receive very little attention for any purpose beyond face-to-face communication in the areas in which they are spoken natively. Even for the largest language group in the country, the 19% of Tanzanians who speak kiNyamwezi together with kiSukuma, the former use of the language for education and the promotion of literacy has been diminished recently.

Only some of the factors that helped Swahili take root so thoroughly in Tanzanian life are clearly discernible. Before the era of European colonization, there were trade routes across the country, and inland trading stations where Swahili must have become widely

known as a trade language. In the colonial period, Swahili was utilized as the normal administrative language in German East Africa. The British regime in Tanganyika continued the widespread use of the language.

In Kenya, too, considerable efforts were made to promote Swahili during the period of British rule, but with much less far-reaching results. To a considerable extent, some Kenyans have identified the spread of Swahili with the promotion of the interests of the coastal region, and even of colonial interests. For one important group, the 1,500,000 Luo of western Kenya near Lake Victoria, the fact that they speak a Nilotic language has served as one basis for resisting greater use of Swahili and favoring a wider literary use of their own language. The rise of kiKikuyu as a written language for the largest linguistic group in Kenya seems to have been favored principally by a strong sense of group cohesion—at times almost a feeling of tribal mission in East Africa. The size of the group, currently around 2,900,000, and a reasonably broad spread of formal education have made language development socially feasible. Utilization of the closely related kiKamba language, with 1,200,000 speakers, has tended to follow the example set by kiKikuyu. Another literary language has been established for 1,400,000 Bantu speakers of western Kenya. Its standard form, luLuhya, is one of the few really successful instances in Africa of interdialect compromise in the creation of a new standardized language. The status that Luo and kiKikuyu had already achieved in Kenya no doubt helped to spur the development of luLuhya.

In Uganda, Swahili has attained a definite, but so far minor, place for itself. The use of Swahili has from time to time met opposition both from the northern Uganda speakers of Nilotic languages (26% of the population) to whom it is linguistically quite foreign, and also from the populace in southern Uganda precolonial states such as Buganda and Bunyoro, who felt they already had a national language. In spite of demurrers, Swahili has had an obvious usefulness as the sole practical means of intergroup communication in the country. It became, and continues to be, the working language of the Uganda police force. In recent years it has gained support from some speakers of Nilotic languages somewhat as a counterweight to the nation's largest Bantu group, the 2,300,000 speakers of luGanda.

This last mentioned language has developed one of the most deeply rooted literary traditions to be found among the Bantu group. It has been extensively used for newspapers and modern books for quite some time, and has achieved an acceptance as a standard language that is unusual in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is the vernacular language most widely used in primary education in Uganda, serving for some other groups in addition to its native speakers. Two other Bantu languages, oruNyoro and orunyaNkore, likewise serve as educational media in parts of Uganda, as do three Nilotic languages, Acholi, Teso, and Lugbara.

The countries of Rwanda and Burundi were, like some kingdoms in Uganda, states with a strong central organization in precolonial times. Each makes official and educational use of its own language, kinyaRuanda and kiRundi respectively. (As was mentioned previously, these are so closely related that from a purely linguistic standpoint they are considered two varieties of the same language.) In spite of a strong identification of nationality with language in these two countries, Swahili has gained considerable currency, at least in the towns, as a useful language for communicating with traders and others from neighboring African countries.

While national policies have, in recent years, restricted the activities of the Asian communities in East Africa, people who are native speakers of Indic languages—among which Gujarati is particularly conspicuous—continue to play an important part in the economic life of the region.

Southern Africa. *Republic of South Africa (Southwest Africa), Rhodesia, Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland [Mozambique, Angola]*

This large portion of the continent has few overall unifying characteristics, apart from the fact that its modern economic activity tends to be oriented toward the Republic of South Africa.

In relation to the position of vernacular languages, there is sharp division between the Portuguese-controlled territories and those with a history of British administration. Portugal's colonial policy has in general been to pay as little attention as possible to the existence of local languages. Only missionaries have made any substantial efforts to promote written use of African vernaculars. Neither the

3,650,000 speakers of iMakua in northern Mozambique nor the 2,000,000 Angolans whose native language is uMbundu are of as great sociolinguistic significance as many other groups of comparable size or smaller in other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa.

In contrast, in British-administered territories, both the isiXhosa and isiZulu dialects of the Nguni language developed into significant literary media, as did [Southern] seSotho. Shona in Rhodesia has moved in the same direction. In Malawi and eastern Zambia, chi-Nyanja, in spite of a long history of disagreements about the dialect to be used in publications, has become a fairly widely read as well as widely spoken language. Before independence, four Zambian languages were used for educational and administrative purposes—ici-Bemba, ciTonga, chiNyanja, and siLozi—and they continue to have considerable regional importance. Three other languages have also been accorded official recognition for educational purposes: ciLunda, ciLwena, and the ki-Kaonde dialect of chiLuba. The most widely understood language in Zambia is a dialect of iciBemba—most frequently called "Town Bemba"—that has evolved as a means of intercommunication in the mining districts of Zambia's copper belt. While this pidgin form of iciBemba is at present not considered very chic among the educated, it seems likely to play an increasing role in the Zambian scene.

The apartheid policies of the Republic of South Africa, and present tendencies in the same direction in Rhodesia, leave the promotion of the vernacular African languages as one of the relatively few areas where "separate development" encourages local initiative. Southwest Africa, administered as part of the Republic of South Africa, is for the most part very sparsely settled. Population is densest in the extreme north, along the Angolan border, where the Ovambo are concentrated.

Bantu languages—among which are included all groups so far mentioned in this section—account for by far the largest proportion among languages spoken natively in this zone, 84%. The linguistically and culturally interesting Bushman and Hottentot groups speak a rather large number of quite small languages in the Khoisan, or Click, family; these altogether amount to about 300,000 speakers.

Of the two major Indo-European languages in South Africa, Afrikaans and English, Afrikaans is spoken natively by far the larger pop-

ulation, being, it must be remembered, the first language of nearly all the "Cape Colored" (of racially mixed ancestry) as well as of the "European" group descended from Dutch colonizers. Naturally, a considerable portion of the Bantu population become second-language speakers of one or both of the official languages of the Republic of South Africa.

Indian Ocean. *Malagasy Republic, Mauritius [Réunion, Comoros Islands, Seychelles, British Indian Ocean Territory].*

One is, of course, at liberty not to consider these islands as part of Africa at all, and linguistically as well as geographically, they are not typical of the region. The principal language spoken in this zone, Malagasy, the native language of 97% of the inhabitants of the island of Madagascar, is of considerable importance, though, compared to most in Africa. As first languages of Africans, only nine tongues are numerically ahead of it: Arabic, Hausa, Fulani, Nguni, Yoruba, Ibo, kinyaRuanda-ki-Rundi, Amharic, and Galla. The position of Malagasy as an official language with rather extensive use for educational and literary purposes was mentioned earlier.

The next most important linguistic component of this zone consists of several varieties of creole French. One dialect of this group is the principal language of the island of Mauritius, and others are spoken on Réunion and in the Seychelles, and probably by a majority of the mere 2,000 or so permanent inhabitants of the British Indian Ocean Territory. Several Indian and Chinese languages are spoken on Mauritius, but seem to be giving way to the local creole French which serves as a general means of communication among the diverse communities of the island. The prevailing idiom of the Comoros is a dialect of kiSwahili.

TRADE LANGUAGES

In Africa a special degree of importance attaches to languages used as trade languages and for other purposes of communication across language boundaries. The principal international languages of the region, English and French, can as yet serve this function only for more educated Africans, although knowledge of them is becoming more widespread through the school systems. Indigenous national languages spoken by a majority of the population, such as are found in many Euro-

pean and Asian countries, are the exception rather than the rule in Africa. As a result, whatever languages are known over a fairly wide area fulfill an extremely important function in many parts of the continent (see Table 1, page 27.) In particular, the extensive spread of Swahili as a trade language formed the basis for its present position as the national language of Tanzania, and its considerable importance in several neighboring countries.

In West Africa, Hausa not only stands first in number of native speakers but is the principal trade language for most neighboring groups. It is widely understood in northern Dahomey and Togo, parts of northern Ghana, and in eastern Upper Volta and Mali, as well as among most of the non-Hausa groups in the middle part of Nigeria. West of this Hausa-speaking area of Sudanic Africa, the most important trade language is Mandekan. Users of some variety of this language are found in ten West African countries: Mali, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Ghana, Senegal, the Gambia, Portuguese Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Mauritania. It is, thus, the most widely understood language of a large segment of West Africa. The rather dramatic expansion of Wolof as the generally understood means of communication in Senegal (and the Gambia) renders it also worthy of note in this area. Farther east, on the smaller stage of the Central African Republic, Sango has received remarkable acceptance as a language of wider communication.

African-influenced varieties of English are the most important means of intercommunication in coastal West Africa. The Krio of Sierra Leone is the best established dialect of this sort. The pidgin English of the Cameroon (Wescos) has also become a major factor in the language situation in that nation and in Equatorial Guinea. Nigerian pidgin English, while apparently not used in as wide a variety of situations, serves as a second language for a tremendous number of people.

Large segments of the non-Arab population in the Arabic-speaking countries generally learn the local variety of Arabic as a trade language. In Chad, the local Arabic dialect known as Turku has spread extensively as the principal vehicle of inter-group communication in sections of the country where there are a large number of languages, none with very many speakers. (Standard Arabic serves as a second language to some degree in all Islamic

communities; the extent to which it is available as a means of wider communication is extremely difficult to estimate.)

In Southern Africa, chiNyanja has an extended domain as a trade language, not only in Malawi, but in a considerable area of Eastern Zambia and in neighboring parts of Mozambique as well. The use of the Nguni language, predominantly the isiZulu dialect, as a means of wider communication is manifestly important in Southern Africa, but the magnitude of this use is difficult to assess. One major complicating factor is the wide dissemination in South Africa of Fanagalo, a pidgin form of Zulu. This dialect is now believed to have been developed as a contact language in interaction between speakers of Indian languages and Zulus in Natal. It is the usual working language of the mines of the Witwatersrand, and of other large-scale enterprises employing Bantu-speaking laborers of mixed tribal origin. It has seen considerable use in Rhodesia, and—more formerly than now—in Zambia. The linguistic distance between Fanagalo and isiZulu is a matter of some dispute. If we consider it a variety of Zulu rather than a distinct language, a large portion of those who speak this pidgin would learn it as a second dialect, being already speakers of isiZulu, isiXhosa, siSwati, or siNdebele. These represent no extension of the Nguni speech community, but the users of Fanagalo who speak siSuthu, chiShona, shiThonga and other Bantu languages would (as would also, of course, those native speakers of Afrikaans, English, German, or Indian languages who use Fanagalo in dealing with Africans). The social background of Fanagalo, which has been most widely used where indigenous Africans have been most subordinated, has led to a considerable distaste for its wider use on the part of many speakers of African languages—whatever efficiency for communication it might provide. The future of this dialect as a language of intercommunication appears even more problematical than most other language situations on the continent. While not nearly as wide-spread as Fanagalo, a more normal form of isiZulu is also learned by appreciable numbers of non-Nguni speaking Africans. The figure of 1,000,000 given in the Table as the second-language extension of the Nguni speech community is the wildest

guess among a list of scantily substantiated estimates.

The language situation in Ethiopia is in many ways unique, continuing the use of a precolonial official state language. Amharic is also of importance as a means of communication among speakers of various languages in the country. (It is in practice impossible to make a sharp distinction between the spread of the language as a lingua franca and its spread as a national language, but both factors appear to be important.)

PROSPECTS

Linguistic Pan-Africanism. One of the most commonly raised questions about the importance of African languages concerns the possibilities for the development of a pan-African means of communication that would be used, at least as a second language, all over the continent. Currently, the prospects for such a development appear dim indeed. In the first place, a Pan-African language that was truly continental in scope and served for the whole of this region could only be Arabic. While that might conceivably gain the eventual acceptance of all largely Islamic groups, many, even of these, have shown a reluctance to make use of it beyond the religious sphere, and pagans and Christians seem most unlikely to accept its use voluntarily. More significantly, this does not represent the answer to the question most who ask really have in mind; they are more likely, rather, to wonder about the possibilities for a general Sub-Saharan language. Another bar to the further spread of Arabic is that Contemporary Standard Arabic has some disadvantages even as a Pan-Arabic language. The difference between the standard language as taught in the schools and written by the press, and the local forms of Arabic spoken in everyday life are so great that Arabic-speaking pupils are presented with problems akin to those occurring in learning a second language. Such remoteness of the literary dialect from the spoken form of the language raises complications for mass education and widespread literacy.

No major technical difficulties would stand in the way of Swahili's being widely adopted as a second language throughout most of Bantu-speaking Africa, but in West Africa it would not present any marked learning advantages over any other outside language. Other

conceivable contenders such as Amharic, Yoruba, or Mandekan have even less apparent reason for adoption outside a rather circumscribed area. While one can often cite problems concerning a given language that might provide inhibiting factors for its spread, e.g. the Amharic writing system or the functioning of tone in Yoruba, the basic limiting conditions are social. There is, in fact, no center in Africa that gives the appearance of being such a cultural focus that its language might naturally seem appropriate for wider adoption on a truly grand scale. The increasing development and spread of regional lingua francas seems well within the realm of possibility, but neither an African language nor any other seems likely to become a genuinely Pan-African medium for intergroup communication in the forseeable future.

Spreading Languages. For an adequate description of even the present importance of languages in Africa, the facts are not sufficiently well-known, let alone the bases for charting their future courses. Nor can it be claimed that we can really explain why languages have spread in various parts of the world in the past. Nevertheless, we can hope to discern at least certain trends. Most recent cases—in any part of the world—of extensive expansion and development included the presence of a major urban center in which the language was spoken; therefore, one significant factor which we must surely take into account is the patterns of language use in Africa's cities. Another cause of expansion can be an association with some culturally important system. In Africa we need to look at language use in trading networks and as working languages in armies, police forces, or industries, and try to assess the influence of these in extending the knowledge of certain languages.

Any indicators we might choose would probably give us the impression that Swahili will continue to expand the functions for which it is used and to attract sizeable numbers of additional second-language speakers for some time to come. The expansion of Arabic in Africa also seems to have a degree of momentum that will carry it forward, although its prospects are probably quite different in different localities. The use of pidgin English supplies such an obvious need for intergroup communication, particularly in urban areas of Nigeria, and at the cost of learning difficulties far fewer than those posed by standard Eng-

lish, that its use seems bound to spread, even if it is never considered very elegant.

The importance of Mandekan as a trade language in West Africa appears to be still on the upswing (Its long-term future seems to depend on the extent to which Bamako, the capital of Mali, may come to be thought of as a sort of regional cultural center.) The chi-Nyanja language may be in a strategic position for expansion, in part because it is the first major language one finds as one moves south that is not to a considerable extent under the shadow of Swahili. While primarily a Malawian language, it can be considered as having an urban base only in Lusaka, Zambia. Both its use as a de facto national language in Malawi, and its already achieved place as a trading language seem to augur well for its further dissemination. The language situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is particularly complicated, and different observers of the social scene in Kinshasa make differing reports. Some of the evidence, at any rate, suggests that kiKongo is the language with the fastest increase in use, and if such a trend is indeed underway, it seems likely to continue, or even accelerate.

Although it is not clear just how much further Wolof can spread, it has become entrenched as the normal language of Dakar, a large urban center, which continues in many ways to function as the metropolis of French-using West Africa. As the natural focus for communication between Africa and the Western Hemisphere in the age of air transportation, the cultural position of Dakar could well continue to climb. Other languages with a well-established position and good bases for some expansion are kinyaRuanda-kiRundi (territories adjoining Rwanda and Burundi), Hausa (Nigeria), Amharic (Ethiopia), uMbundu (Angola), Nguni (Southern Africa), Akan (Ghana), Shona (Rhodesia), and iciBemba (Zambia).

Historical Considerations. In addition to present conditions, outside interest in a given modern language may also be heightened because of its history. The history of Arab civilization in relation to Arabic or that of the Empire of Ethiopia in relation to Amharic are obvious examples. The case of kiKongo also invites attention because of the existence of the kingdom of Kongo which flourished in that region from before 1400 to 1568. The connection of modern languages with the for-

mer empires of the West African Savannahs was mentioned earlier.

Another type of historical question involves the place of African languages in the background of Americans of African ancestry. Much more historical and ethnohistoric research will have to be undertaken before we thoroughly grasp even the basic outlines of these developments. For one thing, even if the numbers of various language groups transported as slaves to the New World could be estimated with fair accuracy, this would not be the same as assessing cultural influences. Other matters than numbers can be determining in the course of social interactions. Even in a slave community, those earliest to arrive may establish a tradition to which those who came later largely adapt. There is some evidence that this may have been the case with the strong Akan influences that can be found in Jamaican folk culture. On the other hand, the later arrivals may be overwhelmingly more numerous, as was probably the case of the Yoruba in Cuba, most of whom were brought in as slaves after 1800. The extent to which one group may have been viewed by others as somewhat more prestigious and worthy of a certain amount of imitation is an even more elusive factor in such a contact situation. About the best that can be done at this point is to offer a list of languages which are at present important in Africa, and for which the existence of some historical connection with populations coming to the Americas can be clearly shown. Eight such languages, taken in geographic order from Northwest to Southeast are: Wolof, Mandekan, Akan, Ewe-Fon, Yoruba, Ibo, kiKongo, and uMbundu.

Priorities. If it is agreed that the United States needs to take an interest in all of Africa, then there are several African languages which ought to be studied by an appreciable number of Americans. Just how many languages qualify as meriting major attention would be a matter of some dispute. Examining quite a few statements regarding the importance of various languages leaves one with the impression that about 16 would generally be agreed on as those that deserve most attention in programs of African studies. This prominence stems from their considerable numbers of speakers and general social importance in the zones in which they are spoken. These are listed in what seems to be their overall order of importance for learning by Americans; this

TABLE 1

TRADE LANGUAGES

Language	General Use as Second Language (Millions)	Approximate Ratio Total Users to Native Speakers
Swahili	13.5	9
Krio and Pidgin English	12	80
Hausa	6.5	1.5
Amharic	4.5	1.6
Maghrebi Arabic	3.5	1.12
Sudan, Chad, and Nigerian Arabic	3	1.25
Mandekan	2.2	1.5
Afrikaans	1.7	1.4
chiNyanja	1.7	1.4
Wolof	1.5	1.8
Sango	1.5	8
kiKongo	1.3	1.4
Nguni	1	1.1
Fulani	1	1.09
Songhai	.8	1.7
uMbundu	.8	1.4
liNgala	.8	1.7
luGanda	.6	1.25

Except for Wolof, none of these figures depend on any thorough studies. It seems likely, however, that the above list includes all languages that have been learned as a means of wider communication by over half a million speakers. Most of these are at least partially understood by a considerably larger number than the one indicated above.

ranking, however, could not possible meet with anywhere near the general acceptance that might be found for the total membership of the list: Contemporary Standard Arabic; Coloquial Cairo Arabic; Swahili; Hausa; Amharic; Afrikaans; Nguni; Yoruba; kinyaRuanda-kiRundi; Malagasy; Maghrebi Arabic; Akan; Somali; Mandekan; Ibo; Fulani.

Next beyond these, it seems worth paying a degree of attention to four other languages that occupy peculiarly strategic positions for a gain in importance beyond what they now have. These "growth stock" language invest-

ments would be: Krio and West African Pidgin English; chiNyanja; kiKongo; Wolof.

Obviously, citizens of the United States are likely at a given time to take a greater interest in some parts of Africa than in others. Particular programs, such as those of the Peace Corps, require the mastery of languages that would rate far down on anyone's list that tried to assess the importance of languages on a continent-wide basis. The above list was put forward only as a sort of base-line: the score of languages most worth paying attention to, other things being equal.

A SUMMARY OF THE CENTER'S "BALA" PROJECT

by Alfred S. Hayes and Orlando L. Taylor

[Alfred S Hayes and Orlando L Taylor are members of the Senior Research and Program Staff, Center for Applied Linguistics Mr Hayes planned the "BALA" project and Mr Taylor was Project Director]

The Center for Applied Linguistics has just completed a three year, Ford Foundation supported investigation of the effects of language and dialect differences on school learning The investigation was conducted in the form of several interrelated studies, with the acronym "BALA" (Bases for Applying Linguistics and Anthropology) being used locally to refer to the entire collection of studies

Primarily, BALA focused on· 1) determining the professed attitudes of teachers, parents, and students toward standard and nonstandard varieties of English and toward how the school handles, or might handle, related instructional problems; and 2) observing classes, both live and through videotapes and films, in order to document relationships between professed attitudes and actual practice, as well as specific instances of classroom interaction which could contribute to the alienation of students As a result of this project, a quantitative base has been established that supports or refutes some widely held beliefs and vague impressions about what teachers or parents or students "think" or "do" in respect to language. This article pres-

ents a summary of the BALA Project under three headings. INVESTIGATIONS, MATERIALS, ACTIVITIES; FINDINGS AND INFERENCES; and MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS A more detailed summary is forthcoming and a comprehensive Technical Report has been prepared

INVESTIGATIONS, MATERIALS, ACTIVITIES

The main data base for BALA consisted of classroom observations collected in 163 classes in various city schools in the United States. From these classes, 125 sets of usable data were obtained, observers using a specially constructed checklist The classes varied in geographical location, socioeconomic class of students, racial composition of classes and grade in school. Subsequent analysis related the observed items to these and other variables, and to interactions among them.

In addition to classroom observations, a Language Attitude Scale was developed, standardized, and administered to 1074 persons, most of whom were in-service teachers and undergraduate education majors. Also, 128 teachers, 183 parents, and 188 pupils were interviewed to determine their perceptions of classroom language problems and how they might be resolved.

Over 200 teachers participated in eight proj-

ect-sponsored workshops. In three of these workshops, teachers were especially selected with a view to their potential as local "mediators" in language-related problems BALA staff also developed a five part, pilot teacher-training course, *Dialect Variety in American English*, which treats the historical development of American English dialects, cultural differences in the United States, and methods of handling classroom problems

Nearly fifty "Dialogues" were prepared in a one-page format. They were designed as a supplement to teacher-training courses or for self study. Each Dialogue is based on an actual teacher-student exchange felt by observers to have been ineffective or alienating. Discussion of the linguistic and pedagogical bases for more effective handling of the situation is included for each Dialogue

Finally, a 24 minute sound film, in color, has been produced. It is entitled, *When Language Doesn't Work*, and discusses attitudes toward language differences and the implications of such attitudes. The film is nearing completion for national distribution.

FINDINGS AND INFERENCES

The major findings and inferences of the BALA research are summarized below.

Teacher

● Professed attitudes of teachers toward various aspects of language variation vary considerably. A substantial core of positive, i.e. favorable, attitudes, toward Nonstandard English exist, although negativism must be reckoned with Teachers' attitudes do not differ significantly along racial or geographical lines

● Teachers with three to five years of experience have significantly more positive attitudes toward language variation than others, and, thus, constitute a receptive population for new educational programs consistent with current thinking about language and culture.

● Teachers in predominantly white schools, including teachers in training, have more negative attitudes toward language variation than those in racially integrated schools. This finding has direct implications for issues such as busing, where black children are more likely to be brought into direct contact with teachers who, at least initially, tend to have negative attitudes toward their dialect.

● Most teachers have a negative attitude toward the grammar of nonstandard speech, but a positive attitude toward the use of various dialects as a classroom teaching tool. Also, their philosophies do not always include acceptance of the consequences of their professed beliefs, e g they are likely to agree more strongly with the statement "When teachers reject the native language of a student they do him great harm" than with the statement "Teachers should allow black students to use Black English in the classroom."

● Negative attitudes toward Nonstandard English can be significantly changed following a course in social dialects.

● Teachers in training exhibit much more positive attitudes toward language variation than practicing teachers Black trainees are more positive than white trainees.

● Half of the kindergarten teachers interviewed indicate that the child's language should be left alone, while half feel that it should be replaced, i.e. eradicated. In sharp contradistinction to the opinions of other teachers, none of the kindergarten teachers feel that correction is indicated for their pupils. Because they deal with very young children, kindergarten teachers should constitute a receptive and potentially productive population for intensive training in language development, language variety, and the educational implications of both

● The majority of teachers rate the speech of their students as poor to fair, and inappropriate for the classroom. This critical attitude remains fairly constant throughout the grades and was true regardless of race or socioeconomic class.

● A majority of teachers recommend that their students' speech be corrected, though a substantial minority recommend leaving it alone. A majority feels that the use of dialects other than Standard English in the classroom is commendable for such purposes as maintaining interest and providing effective contrast with other forms of English, they also feel that special materials written in dialect are needed. A contrary view is held by half of all black teachers interviewed.

● Teachers who reject minority group culture, language, and people outright are estimated to number approximately 10% of the total teaching force.

● Slightly over half of all teachers interviewed indicate that they are unaware of cur-

2

rent controversies relating to dialect, particularly Black English. This suggests that current methods of keeping teachers informed and of involving them in matters of professional interest are ineffective

Parents

• An overwhelming majority of parents (mostly black and Spanish-speaking) see the teaching of Standard English as an important responsibility of the school and consider Standard English to be one prerequisite for moving up the socioeconomic ladder. They hold this view despite the opinion of many and nonstandard speech is not inferior, is appropriate at times, and can express some things better than Standard English. This traditional conservative stance toward Standard English is virtually uncompromising among parents who have only elementary school educations and perform unskilled labor. A minority view (especially among blacks) was revealed, however, which, while sharing the majority view, admits various elements of compromise These elements of compromise center around receptivity for new ideas and innovations in schools, especially those that see the young learner as an individual, with hopes and needs, and above all, feelings, dignity and pride. This receptivity toward innovation increases with increasing education.

Students

• A majority of elementary students indi-

cated that they liked the way they spoke. However, one-fourth of the speakers of Nonstandard English have a poor image of their own way of speaking, and they seem to have acquired this image in school.

• Irrespective of self-image, half of all students want to speak differently. White students choose parents or entertainment figures or sports heroes ("stars") as models. Blacks, particularly Nonstandard speakers, choose teachers or peers, revealing the two main competitive influences to which young blacks are subject

• A strong majority thought the teacher liked the way they spoke, but could not state how they knew this. Some considered lack of overt criticism of their speech to be tacit approval

• The existence of a Black Standard English in the South is confirmed by the frequency of dialect switching (between Standard and Nonstandard) reported by many students in all-black high schools in that region. The language situation of many blacks in the South may thus be concentrated in a relatively uncomplicated Standard–Nonstandard continuum which follows class lines within the black community By inference, northern blacks, whose speech contains many southern features, may have more difficulty acquiring what is considered to be Standard English in the North. Switching requires that they learn to talk both "northerner" and "white."

Teaching and Learning

• Alienation from school cannot be positively demonstrated by what teachers or students do or say during instruction. The key to such demonstration seems to lie in what students *do not* say, i.e. in the silences that mark some 15% of the time devoted to students' recitations in class. Alienation can, however, be inferred from the way students respond to questions about their feelings toward correction, the dominant procedure used in language classes, and toward the occasional actual misunderstandings that could be observed Half of all students are concerned enough to feel some emotion when corrected in school, ranging from actual pleasure to embarrassment. The other half (and a majority of blacks, males, and Nonstandard speakers) does not have this concern, and indicates mere passive acceptance of whatever happens Observation of classes essentially confirms these student opinions. Procedures which evoke no interest from a substantial part of the school population are open to serious question. The data do not suggest, however, that the negative aspects of correction are more important than other school characteristics or procedures which seem to "turn off" many students, particularly black, Nonstandard speaking males Involving the uninvolved seems to be a major school problem—hardly a novel observation But language may be viewed less as a *cause* of the problem than as an important factor in its eventual solution.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Peer Group Involvement in School Present findings strongly support prior recommendations of William Labov and underscore the need to foster productive interaction between peer groups and school The development of properly trained mediating personnel is urgent In this developmental process, the role of language needs constant emphasis as a source, not only of mutual linguistic enrichment among representatives of different groups, but also of interest and excitement that could lead to productive involvement in the instructional process This

recommendation is made with particular reference to the school problems of Nonstandard speaking blacks in urban areas, but should be given serious consideration in connection with other elements in the school population as well

Teacher Training Attitudes toward language can be changed by courses that deal with language variation, particularly social dialects, and the establishment of such training efforts should be a major priority. If the readily communicable notion that "dialect is systematic" can be learned, then perhaps the more elusive implication that people who speak nonstandard varieties of any language are not people of dubious intelligence or potential, will follow. Pilot materials developed by the BALA staff offer suggestions toward this end

Professional Awareness Present data indicate that a majority of teachers are unaware of current controversy in language matters, despite much attention to these problems in professional journals, conferences, and in-service training workshops The latter apparently reach those who are already aware Two lines of development are suggested for increasing professional awareness fostering eventual involvement 1) The resources of State or large City Departments of Education could be strengthened by providing a roster of consultants to help teachers form local self-study groups to work on classroom language problems which they experience in their day-to-day work with students. 2) a complementary effort would place immediately usable material directly in the hands of teachers, perhaps in some kind of newsletter or in "nugget" form.

Involving the Community Language program planners and innovators must know their community, and the shades of opinion represented in it. Parents representing all segments should be involved in such planning, and as many as possible should be involved directly or indirectly in carrying out the programs Parents should be kept informed of what is happening and why, using methods that are adjusted to different individual backgrounds It is important to involve those not now involved, regardless of their level of education.

Conference on Foreign Language, Area Studies, and International Affairs

The "future federal funding of International Studies" was the announced purpose of the Conference on Foreign Language, Area Studies, and International Affairs, held in Philadelphia on September 9 and 10. The co-chairmen of the conference were Richard D Lambert of the South Asia Regional Studies Department, University of Pennsylvania, and Robert Leestma, Associate Commissioner for International Education, U S. Office of Education. Participants included the directors of the 106 NDEA-supported Language and Area Centers, representatives of area studies associations, and such more broadly based organizations as the International Studies Association, the American Council on Education, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, and the Ford Foundation—all of them with an interest in the future of language and area studies

Among the special topics for consideration, designed to contribute to the announced purpose of the conference were. (1) Development of qualitative and quantitative criteria for program evaluation (2) Assessment of the supply of specialists for geographical areas and disciplines. Where are there shortages and where is there an oversupply of manpower? (3) Consideration of the possibilities for program innovation in general orientation, organization, and teaching materials. (4) Reassessment of the list of critical languages, with revision of priorities as appropriate. (5) Identification of possible new roles for the federal government in assistance to international studies

Current trends in the federal funding of language and area studies was the topic of the initial session Dr. Leestma explained that at present the only legislation which provides such support is NDEA Title VI. Under the budget which is now being prepared, this support is expected to continue at approximately the fifteen million dollar level Nevertheless, there may well be some reallocation of funds. and for some centers, support under this budget will be terminal. Since, in times of financial stringency, there tends to be a heightened emphasis upon the specific and the practical, programs which address themselves to practical universal problems, such as world urbanization, world ecology, or the diffusion of language and area competence in applied disciplines are likely to be viewed as having high priority.

Moreover, specific international research or training programs with a definite product and a definite terminal date are more likely to be funded than are language and area centers as currently conceived. Dr Leestma concluded by noting that language and area studies will have to be justified to legislative bodies and executive agencies in terms of specific needs and objectives

Next, Professor Lambert reported on the results of the Language and Area Studies Survey, jointly sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and a consortium of area studies associations. The survey, in essence a state-of-the-discipline presentation, covers such topics as the analysis of area courses, analysis of language courses, and the characteristics of language and area programs

At this point the participants divided themselves into seven world area groups (Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe, etc.) for the consideration of such matters as the range of clientele, balance of language and area instruction, the "style" of centers and programs, the supply of and demand for specialists, and the ever-present problem of funding. The same topics were then taken up in cross-area meetings, each group dealing with a single problem.

The final afternoon of the two-day session was given over to the presentation of summary reports. These emerged in the form of problems or questions rather than conclusions.

1   How will instruction in the uncommonly taught languages be funded? It is quite evident that if NDEA Title VI support is withdrawn, instruction in these languages will be the first victim. The clientele is understandably small; the unit cost of instruction is high. Possible alternative funding arrangements seem even less favorable than what currently exists.

2.   How may existing funds be used more efficiently? There are several possibilities: (a) consortia; (b) greater language specialization by institutions; (c) more flexible arrangements for student mobility; (d) identifying or recruiting future area specialists at an earlier stage of their academic careers and beginning area-specific language instruction during the undergraduate years, (e) year-round intensive language institutes like those now operating on a summer-only basis.

3.   Can there be greater flexibility in the apportionment of NDEA Title VI scholarship

funds, since students often need less than full support in order to attend graduate school? The provision of such flexibility did emerge as one positive recommendation.

Although the conference was helpful in that it acquainted the participants with current thinking with respect to federal funding and with some of the problems relative to future support of language and area programs, it left for future consideration, not merely by this group but by the entire language-teaching profession, the following question stated as baldly as possible: What will be the elements of a well-reasoned, well-documented justification of the language component in language and area studies which will at the same time provide the kinds of innovation which the current insistence upon practicality and relevance demands?

The Fourth Triennial Conference on Symbolic Processes will be held in Washington, D C., April 27 and 28, 1972 This conference is co-sponsored by The International Association for Symbolic Processes and The Federal City College Communication Sciences Department. The Conference papers and discussions will focus on interdisciplinary aspects of language usage in an urban context Subdivisions of the general topic area include current research in sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, ghetto folklore and rhetoric, speech pathology and dialectal differences, educational strategies for dialectally different speakers, and community participation in language strategy. Persons interested in attending the conference, in presenting a paper, or participating in a discussion should contact the Conference Secretary. Walt Wolfram, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C 20036.

The University Press of Kentucky has announced the establishment of the Kentucky Foreign Language Conference Award to be given annually for the best manuscript dealing with some aspect of foreign language and/or literatures. The Award, $500 and acceptance of the manuscript for publication, is offered in conjunction with the Kentucky Foreign Language Conference. The deadline for submission of manuscripts for the 1972 Award is December 1, 1971. For further information write: Kentucky Foreign Language Conference Award, The University Press of Kentucky, 104 Lafferty Hall, Lexington, Kentucky 40506.

International Association of University Professors of English

The eighth triennial conference of the International Association of University Professors of English was held in Istanbul, Turkey, September 1-7, 1971 The University of Istanbul was the host institution. Participants numbered approximately 150, representing some twenty different countries.

The conference was organized into five sections, including one on language and, for the first time in the history of the organization, on University Teaching of English in non-English Speaking Countries. The Language section had as its chairman R W. Zandvoort of the University of Groningen and as its vice-chairman R. Derolez of the University of Ghent. The following papers were presented: R. Filipović (Zagreb): Some Problems in Studying the English Element in the Main European Languages, R. I. McDavid, Jr. (Chicago): New Directions in American Dialectology; T. F. Mustanoja (Helsinki): Notes on the Syntax of the Noun Group, with Special Reference to Middle English; J. Sledd (Texas): Standard English and the Education of the Minorities; J. Söderland (Uppsala): Infinitive Analysis: A Comparison between Different Analytical Approaches.

The section on the University Teaching of English had been organized by Gerhard Nickel of the University of Stuttgart, but he was unable to attend the conference, and Professor Eva Sivertsen of Oslo acted as chairman with O. Baskan of Istanbul serving as vice-chairman. Professors L. K. Engels of Louvain, P. Donchin of Nancy, J Fisiak of Poznan, and J. Svartvik of Lund each presented a paper dealing with the teaching of the English language at university level in their respective countries. The concluding paper in this section, presented by Professor S. A. Ashraf of Pakistan, dealt with the teaching of English in Asia At a final meeting of the participants in this section, it was announced that the papers would be published and that efforts would be made to conduct country surveys of the kinds presented at the conference.

At the business meeting of the Association, the invitation of the University of California at Los Angeles to hold the 1974 meeting at that institution was accepted, and Professor William Matthews of the U.C L.A. Department of English was elected president.

Conference on Sociolinguistically Oriented Language Surveys

by Sirarpi Ohannessian

[Sirarpi Ohannessian is a member of the Senior Research and Planning Staff, Center for Applied Linguistics During 1970-71 she directed the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Zambia]

In recent years a number of linguists have been turning their attention to the study of language in use in social systems. These studies may range in concern from broad multinational, multilingual regions to one small specific location or one small group of people within a social system Perhaps the most extensive survey the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, took place from 1968 to 1971 in five countries of the region. Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. The Survey was conducted under a grant from the Ford Foundation with cooperation from institutions of the countries concerned. Surveys of other areas have also been conducted, and more seem likely

The close of the field work on the Eastern Africa survey early in 1971 seemed an appropriate time to attempt an assessment of the aims, organization, and use of such surveys. To do this, the Center for Applied Linguistics, through a conference award from the Ford Foundation, brought together a small group of scholars most of whom had been directly involved in such surveys. The group met on September 6 and 7, 1971, and discussions were based on previously prepared and distributed papers.

The Conference was chaired by Charles A. Ferguson of Stanford University The initial part of the meeting was devoted to a review of completed or current surveys or research. These included the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, presented by Clifford H. Prator, first Field Director of the Survey; a report on sociolinguistic research in Latin America, by Mervyn C. Alleyne of the University of the West Indies, the Survey of Language Use and Attitudes Towards Language in the Philippines, by Bonifacio P. Sibayan of the Philippine Normal College, the Madina Survey in Ghana, by Gilbert Ansre of the University of Ghana; the Sociolinguistic Survey of Doukhobor Russian in Canada by Regna Darnell and Anthony L. Vanek of the University of Alberta; the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes by Joshua A. Fishman of Yeshiva University. and the Grierson Linguistic Survey of India, by Prabodh B Pandit of the USSR was presented by Anthony L. Vanek of the University of Alberta, and a report on Social-Psychological Surveys of Language Use and Function was presented by Wallace E Lambert of McGill University.

Methods, techniques and problems in the organizing and running of surveys were focused on by the papers prepared by J. Donald Bowen of UCLA and Edgard C Polomé of the University of Texas The discussions as a whole were concerned in considerable detail with procedural advice from practitioners, including the task of making such surveys more effective and more useful. Also discussed was the importance of keeping in touch with post-survey developments. The role of nationals and their advantageous position in both survey work and any activity that followed surveys was pointed out. The implications of surveys both for the countries where they were conducted, and for those from which expatriate scholars came were also discussed.

A statement by Melvin J. Fox of the Ford Fundation on the Foundation's interest in sociolinguistic surveys briefly outlined the involvement of the Foundation in language activities in the past and its present reexamination of its concerns in this field in the light of new developments and new demands.

The meeting concluded with a set of recommendations which included the following: the need for comparative studies of a number of country surveys; the importance of continued activity after the conclusion of a survey; the establishment of an international clearinghouse for such surveys; the need for diachronic as well as synchronic research related to surveys; the need for information on similar work in such an area as the USSR, the activities of such organizations as UNESCO in these fields, and the need to bring together those involved in language policy with those in a position to interpret the results of language surveys.

Buffalo Seminar on Child Language

A Seminar on Developmental Psycholinguistics, held at the State University of New York at Buffalo, August 2-6, brought together about 30 specialists in the psycholinguistic study of child language. During the Seminar which was sponsored by the National Science Foundation, participants read papers, gave lectures, and conducted discussions on child language acquisition and closely related topics The Summer Institute of the Linguistic Society of America was also in session at SUNY, Buffalo, and participants in the Seminar were called on to contribute to relevant courses and to give public lectures Timothy Moore of Temple University was coordinator of the Seminar.

Hermine Sinclair de Zwart of Geneva lectured on the implications of Piagetian theory for language acquisition and reported on experiments in the early syntax of children Dan I Slobin of Berkeley gave the Forum Lecture "Suggested Universals in the Ontogenesis of Grammar". Thomas Bever of New York spoke on the interactions of perception, production, and memory in language behavior, and David McNeil of Chicago presented some of his current views on developmental psycholinguistics. One evening was devoted to a three-hour public panel on the acquisition of phonology.

Lois Bloom discussed her studies of children's use of single-word utterances, and Susan Ervin-Tripp presented her views on strategies and prerequisites for the acquisition of grammar. Among the presentations which generated much interest were David Premack of Santa Barbara reporting on his work with chimpanzees and psychotic children of minimum language competence and Jean Berko-Gleason of Cambridge, Massachusetts speaking on the different registers and styles used by and to children

In the working sessions, participants heard some fifteen reports and papers. Two trends were evident in the papers: the development of generalizations and theory based on child language behavior itself rather than existing linguistic theory, and the inclusion of data from a wide variety of languages other than English. Participants felt that the exchange of data, insights, and approaches was of enormous value, and that the Seminar had helped to set the direction of developmental psycholinguistics during the next few years. Questions about the Seminar, including information about participants or specific papers, may be addressed to Dr. Timothy Moore, Department of Educational Psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

Phonetic Sciences Congress

The VII International Congress of Phonetic Sciences was held in Montréal August 22-28, 1971; the first three days at the Université de Montréal and the last three at McGill University The meeting provided an opportunity for a diverse assemblage of scholars interested in phonetics to meet together and exchange ideas. Approximately 170 ten-minute papers were given in the 40 different section meetings, covering most of the imaginable facets of the science. Research reports from workers in phonetics laboratories were in general particularly well attended. Ten longer reports were given in plenary sessions These dealt with speech production and perception, a summary of research on intonation, the relationship of phonetics and phonology, and individual voice characteristics. Philip Lieberman's presentation of his conclusions about the speech limitations of Neanderthal man replaced a plenary session that had to be cancelled. The VIII Congress will meet at the University of Leeds in 1975

new journals

Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: *Working Papers. Published by the Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois. Twice a year. First issue. Spring 1971 Subscription· free to departments of linguistics; individuals, $2.00. All correspondence to the Editor. Charles W Kisseberth, Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801*

Intended as a forum for the faculty and students of the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois in which current original research can be presented in prepublication form Scope covers the broad area referred to as "the language sciences". The first issue contains five papers dealing with clefts and pseudo-clefts, unmarked "bleeding" orders, *i*-insertion in pali, stress, and consonant gradation in Finnish. Future special issues may be devoted to restricted topics such as experimental phonetics, semantics, and area linguistics.

book notices

The Grammar of Case: *Towards a Localistic Theory,* by John M. Anderson. *(Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 4.)* Cambridge, The University Press, 1971. x, 244 pp. $16.50.

This book is concerned with the localist hypothesis, according to which all the roles played by nouns in the event or state expressed by the verb or adjective with which they are associated involve basically location or direction. The orientation is that of transformational-generative grammar and evidence is presented from different languages, primarily English, to suggest that a number of apparently distinct kinds of role are subtypes of the locational (or directional) relation. The author assumes that the underlying case relations are a universal of language. Part 1 includes a sketch of the grammar. Part 2 examines the status of the case elements nominative and ergative within such a grammar In Part 3, the case elements locative and ablative are introduced and their syntax examined. The author also attempts to show that sentences involving various non-spatial relations can plausibly be considered to involve locative or directional structures which differ from concrete locatives in the character of the nouns and the verbs that contract the relations. The author concludes that the concepts of location and direction are basic to the meaning of the different roles available to nouns.

The Student's Hindi-Urdu Reference Manual, by Franklin C. Southworth. Tucson, Arizona, The University of Arizona Press, 1971. xi, 238 pp. $4.95.

This manual attempts to describe the essential features of the colloquial language spoken in educated families in Delhi and western Uttar Pradesh. It is based on conversations recorded in the summer of 1969, as well as on previously published materials. The work is intended as a reference book for students, to be used in conjunction with course work in Hindi-Urdu, as an aid in continuing self-instruction, and for use in the field. The descriptive approach is traditional and uses "parts-of-speech." All materials are presented in the Devanagari (Sanskrit) script. The manual includes a glossary, translation exercises, and a bibliography

The Indispensable Foundation: *A Selection from the Writings of Henry Sweet,* edited by E. J. A. Henderson. *(Language and Language Learning, 28)* London, Oxford University Press, 1971. xii, 329 pp. $6.50.

This volume consists mainly of Sweet's works on phonetics, but includes also sections on spelling reform and sound notation. The arrangement is by topics and, within topics, the ordering is from the general to the specific as far as is possible Part 1 is a short introductory section on language and languages in general, and Part 2 discusses dialects, styles, and standards Part 3 is a long section on phonetics, and Part 4 contains extracts on writing, spelling, and phonetic notation, with considerable space given to Bell's Visible Speech, the revised Organic alphabet, and revised Romic. In her introduction to this collection, the editor considers the practical applicability of Sweet's work to the problems facing linguists and language teachers today. The current relevance of some of his observations may be seen in this statement, made in 1890: "Reflect that it is absurd to set up a standard of *how* English people *ought* to speak, before we know how they actually *do* speak .. "

From Deep to Surface Structure: *An Introduction to Transformational Syntax, by Marina K. Burt. New York, Harper & Row, 1971. xi, 256 pp. $7.50.*

The purpose of this book is to enable students to gain some facility in following a syntactic argument. The main text establishes the relative ordering of approximately thirty transformational rules of grammar regularly included in an introductory course in such grammar at M I.T.'s Department of Linguistics during the years 1967-70. The book is intended as a workbook to be used as a supplement to a course in introductory transformational syntax Part 1 deals with rules for the analysis of the auxiliary and rules illustrating the basic structures of independent simplex sentences. Part 2 is concerned with relative clauses and related structures. Part 3 gives the grammar of some complement structures Part 4 treats more complicated structures and gives motivations for the transformational cycle in English syntax

Acoustical Analysis and Perception of Tonemes in some Norwegian Dialects, *by Knut Fintoft. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1970 342 pp. $9.36*

Presents results of an acoustical analysis and investigation of toneme recognition in some Norwegian dialects (Oslo, Stavanger, Bergen, Alesund and Trondheim). The investigation was restricted to disyllabic words ending in an unstressed vowel. The purpose was to (1) study the intelligibility of the tonemes within and between dialects by using listening tests, and (2) study the acoustical parameters in the speech signal that may be correlated with the tonemic opposition The findings suggest that the listeners responded to the acoustical patterns with little or no reference to phonemes, syllables or words.

Introduction to the Principles of Language, *by Paul A. Gaeng. New York, Harper & Row, 1971. viii, 243 pp $4 50.*

An attempt to outline for the beginning student of linguistics the major principles of the science of language in as simple and concise terms as possible. It covers achievements in the field over the past 150 years or so No particular theory or method is espoused. The book is directed not only to students, but to teachers of English and foreign languages who, in the absence of formal training, need a brief introduction to linguistics The topics covered are the origin and prehistory of language, its definition, the structure of language, vocabulary, meaning and etymology, writing, speech variation, comparative studies, and Indo-european and non-Indo-european languages.

A Tamil Prose Reader: *Selection from Contemporary Tamil Prose with Notes and Glossary, by R. E. Asher and R. Radharkrishnan. Cambridge, The University Press, 1971 x, 237 pp. $8.50.*

Intended for intermediate and advanced students of Tamil, this selection was chosen from books published in India since 1947. The 32 extracts are arranged in order of difficulty and vary widely in style and subject matter. Only technical writing and journalistic prose are excluded. There are extensive grammatical and cultural notes, cross references, and a vocabulary. An elementary knowledge of Tamil and ability to read the Tamil script are assumed. Texts have not been simplified, however all idiomatic expressions are fully explained.

Literary Style: *A Symposium, edited by Seymour Chatman. New York, Oxford University Press, 1971. xv, 427 pp. cloth $12 50; paper $2 95*

The twenty-one essays which constitute this collection were written for and presented at a Symposium on Literary Style, held in August, 1969 at the Villa Serbolini under the auspices of the Ford Foundation The Symposium was originally conceived as a successor to the 1958 Style in Language Conference which met at Indiana University. Even so, there are marked differences between the two In contrast to the earlier meeting, the 1969 symposium was truly international, with ten European nations represented On the other hand, the Bloomington meeting was far more interdisciplinary, that in Italy was confined primarily to literary and linguistic scholars.

The papers tend to group themselves according to whether the predominant concern is with theory or practice Theoretical papers deal with such topics as the definition or the general role of style, its relation to other disciplines (linguistics, semantics, psychology), and with specific stylistic features. The practical papers tend to be based upon bodies of material. the literature of a period, of a genre, or of individual authors and works. Each paper is followed by a condensed version of the discussion which occurred at the symposium The editor has thoughtfully provided biographical sketches of the authors, which is particularly helpful in connection with the European scholars who contributed to the volume.

Toda Songs, *by M. B. Emeneau. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1971. xlvii, 1004 pp. $35.25.*

Contains the verbal texts, with translations, of 260 songs collected during the years 1935-38. The Todas are a small community in the Nilgiri mountains of South India who speak a Dravidian language and rely upon dairy farming for their subsistence. Their culture is sociologically unique in that all their activities are accompanied by extemporaneous oral poetry, based on thousands of formulaic units The song-units are organized around themes, so that the important themes of the culture are provided with clusters of song-units of varying size. Earlier works by the author describe the externals of the art (1937), its sociological interpretation (1958), and linguistic interpretation of its style and semantics (1958).

Advances in Psycholinguistics, *edited by G B. Flores D'Arcais and W J M. Levelt. Amsterdam, North Holland Publishing Co., 1970. x, 454 pp cloth $24.00; paper $13.75.*

This volume is the outcome of the Bressanone Conference on Psycholinguistics, organized by the Institute of Psychology of the University of Padua in July 1969 European and American psycholinguists participated in this conference, which included reports on recently completed research as well as comments on very preliminary data The book attempts to reflect the main trends in psycholinguistic research as they appeared at the conference. Papers which were mainly linguistic or exclusively theoretical in character are not included in this volume The papers have been classified, first of all, on the basis of whether linguistic structure is the dependent or the independent variable. It is considered more of a dependent variable where the emphasis is on cognitive processes, and an independent variable when the psycholinguist views the linguistic notions as primary. There are four parts. psychological studies of grammar, lexical structure and meaning, cognition and language, and neurology and language Each part has an introduction intended to provide background information on recent developments or particular problems discussed in the papers

Part 1 is concerned with the applicability of grammatical constructs to theories of actual language behavior. The basic question is whether certain linguistic notions designed to explain facts such as grammaticality, paraphrase, etc. can be used more extensively to explain other cognitive phenomena like the perception of speech sounds, short-term memory span, information retrieval from long-term memory, learnability, and many others. The foreword to Part 2 on lexical structure and meaning points to the lack of any community of opinion regarding the priority of "unknowns", the relevance or irrelevance of certain experimental procedures, or even the degree of importance of semantic theory for psychological experimentation at all The various chapters are concerned with construction of a theory of lexical competence, semantic variables which greatly affect linguistic performance, and developmental studies. There is an introduction by John C. Marshall to the first chapter on semantic theory, in which he stresses the need for a more general cognitive

framework for the interpretation of semantic variables Part 3 treats the relation of some cognitive processes to linguistic performance. The various chapters all deal with how general cognitive principles determine certain kinds of performance with linguistic material such as sentences. The introduction to Part 4 begins by commenting on the "upsurge of communication between students of language and of neurology" This part contains two reports word-finding difficulties in a dysphasic subject and verbal comprehension in aphasia.

A Computer Model of Transformational Grammar, *by Joyce Friedman. (Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Language Processing, 9.) New York, American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1971. 166 pp. $15.95.*

Describes a computer model of grammar, based on the linguistic theories of Noam Chomsky, as presented in *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965) The model is the outcome of a project entitled "Computer Aids to Linguistic Research" whose original goal was to construct a system of computer programs to help linguists write and test transformational grammars for natural language syntax Existing models of grammar were found to be inadequate as computer models, a fact which led to formalization of a precise notion of transformational grammar. The model consists of a format for grammar and algorithms for deriving sentences. The algorithms are described in both English and in a programming language for the computer. This book is useful both as an aid to linguists writing transformational grammars, and as a supplementary text for courses in computational linguistics.

Structural Analysis of Modern Japanese, *by B. Saint-Jacques Vancouver, B.C , University of British Columbia Publications Centre, 1971. xvii, 110 pp. $6.00.*

A functional linguistic study of Japanese, based on the principles of 'linguistic independence' and 'linguistic autonomy' developed by André Martinet The author does not attempt a complete description of Japanese syntax, but outlines the characteristic functions of Japanese It is his opinion that some important differences in languages occur in the deep structure, and that the dichotomy between deep and surface structure needs reexamining.

meetings and conferences

November 18–21 American Anthropological Association. 70th. New York, New York.

November 22–24. Conference on Child Language. Chicago, Illinois.
   [Write: C. Edward Scebold, ACTFL, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011.]

November 25–27 National Council of Teachers of English, 61st Las Vegas, Nevada.

November 25–28. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 5th. Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of Arabic. Chicago, Illinois

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of French Washington, D C

November 25–28. American Association of Teachers of German. Chicago, Illinois.

November 25–28 American Association of Teachers of Japanese. Chicago, Illinois

November 25–28. Chinese Language Teachers Association Chicago, Illinois

November 26–27. Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, Riverside, California.
   [Write: R.S. Meyerstein, Dept. of Foreign Languages, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California 91324.]

December 26–31. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 138th. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

December 27–30. Modern Language Association of America, 86th. Chicago, Illinois.

December 28. American Association of Teachers of Italian. Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. Chicago, Illinois.

December 28–30. Linguistic Society of America. 46th. St. Louis, Missouri.

January 3–6. International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, 5th. London, England. [Write: Overseas Students Centre of the British Council. 11 Portland Place, London, W.1., England.]

February 26–March 1. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. 6th Washington. D.C.

March 16–18. Georgetown University Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. 23rd Washington, D.C.

March 24–26. British Association for Applied Linguistics Seminar on German Applied Linguistics. Nottingham, England. [Write: R.R.K Hartmann, The Language Centre, University of Nottingham NG7 2RD. Nottingham. England.]

March 27–29 Association for Asian Studies. 24th. New York, New York.

SEMANTICS: AN OVERVIEW

by Adrienne Lehrer

[Adrienne Lehrer is Assistant Professor of Linguistics in the Department of Languages and Linguistics, University of Rochester]

There is a great deal of exciting and important research going on in semantics today, being done by linguists, philosophers, psychologists, and anthropologists working on a variety of topics in a variety of ways. This brief survey will concentrate on work in the United States, especially that which grew out of generative-transformational grammar, but I do not wish to suggest that semantic analyses elsewhere in the world or those based on other models are unimportant. For example, Leech's *Toward a Semantic Description of English* (1969) is a valuable contribution based on System and Structure grammar.

The change in thinking about meaning in American linguistics is more striking than elsewhere since for so long three assumptions were held which severely discouraged research in semantics: (1) Meaning is inaccessible to observation and hence it is unscientific to study it; (2) A sound semantic analysis must be based on a relatively complete syntactic analysis; and (3) Semantics in linguistics is an autonomous discipline, abstracted from matters of belief, custom, context, and other factors yet to be determined All three of these assumptions have been modified, if not abandoned.

With respect to the first point, speakers are much better at talking about the meaning of words and sentences than they are of any other aspect of language because meaning is more accessible to introspection than phonology and grammar.

> This unwillingness to recognize the reality of concepts, as well as the phonetic bias from which so much of linguistics has suffered, are both traceable to the very real problems which are inherent in attempts to approach concepts through observable data . . . The observation of meanings and the establishment of an adequate way of representing them cannot help but be more difficult by a considerable margin. To say that concepts exist, then, is not to say we are able to isolate them in our consciousness at a moment's notice or we have satisfactory ways of representing or discussing them. A proper concern for meanings should lead to a situation where, in the training of linguists, practice in the discrimination of concepts will be given at least as much time in the curriculum as practice in the discrimination of sounds. (Chafe, 1970, 75 ff.)

The second point, basing semantic analyses on syntax, was challenged when Katz and Postal (1964) suggested that if the base component of a grammar contains all the meaningful elements so that transformation will not change meaning, the whole

grammar will be simplified. Subsequent work, such as Carol and Paul Kiparsky's paper on factives (1970), shows that by taking into account semantic facts, the syntax is greatly simplified, and many diverse facts fall into place. McCawley (1968) pointed out further that many features that are being called syntactic (Animate, Human, Concrete) are really semantic features.

With respect to the autonomy of linguistics, probably no one denied the relevance of logic, beliefs, and context, but linguists refrained from tackling these very difficult problems until now, leaving them to philosophers and anthropologists to worry about. Presuppositions have turned out to be important at all levels of semantic analysis—words, sentences, and utterances in context, though the term 'presupposition' is not used in the same way by all writers. A sentence P is presupposed by S just in case S implies P and the sentence formed by negating the main verb of S also implies P. For example, both 1a) and 1b) presuppose 1c).

1a) John knows that the world is round.
1b) John doesn't know that the world is round
1c) The world is round.

WORD MEANING

The notion of *semantic fields*, widely referred to in the literature, is a concept developed by Trier and Porzig and further developed and combined with generative grammar by Lyons (1963, 1968). The field theory assumes that the way to understand what words mean is to study all the words in a field together and see how they divide up conceptual space—how the words in each field are related to each other. The field theory is most useful for sets of words with considerable content e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives, some prepositions and adverbs, and some derivational affixes; least useful for grammatical terms, like modals, inflexional affixes, and adverbs like *even* and *yet*. There are, however, problems in determining the domain of a field and deciding which lexical items are included in it.

One of the insights of field analyses is that we can better understand the ways in which words can be systematically extended in meaning. Sets of lexical items tend to bear the same relationship to each other in a variety of discourse contexts. Friedrich (1969) analyzes body-part suffixes in Tarascan and shows how they are also systematically used in other fields of discourse, for example, parts of houses and pottery The terms *hot, warm, cool,* and *cold* in English have many uses that are not concerned with temperature, but the antonymy of *hot* and *cold* as end points on a scale with the inner set of antonyms *warm* and *cool* remains. An athlete who is performing well is 'hot' and one who is doing badly is 'cold'. Therefore, one might describe an athlete performing moderately well as 'warm' and one doing moderately badly as 'cool' because of the relationship of *warm* and *cool* to *hot* and *cold*, even though dictionaries do not give *warm* and *cool* these glosses (Lehrer, 1970a). *Hot pants* has a variety of meanings, one being to refer to an article of clothing with very short legs. A fashion designer who designs some shorts with rather long legs (or slacks) might well choose to call them *cold pants*, because *hot* has been paired with *short*, and the antonymy of *hot* and *cold* and *short* and *long* result in pairing *cold* with *long* in this context.

Componential analysis, the technique of decomposing the meaning of words into semantic components stems in part from Hjelmslev and in part from studies in ethnoscience, especially in the study of kinship terms and pronouns Componential analysis presupposes aspects of the field theory in that the investigator looks at a set of words in a carefully delineated area which have basic semantic features in common "but whose meanings contrast with each other by virtue of one or more differences in respect to several other kinds of features" (Lounsbury, 1956, 193). The semantic theories of Katz and Fodor (1964), Katz and Postal (1964), and Weinreich (1966) are based on decomposing words into features or semantic markers.

It is not at all clear just what a semantic component is, however; that is, whether it is just a semantic primitive, a set of basic words, or a psychological prime, e g., a concept of some sort. Some components can be expressed by a word or two (Animate), (Male), (Married), while others require at least a whole sentence or a sentence-like component. For example, Bendix analyzed a set of verbs in English (*have, get, give, find,* etc) in which each component is sentential. *A gets B* is analyzed as 'A changes to (A has B)'. *C lends A B* is decomposed into 'C has B' and 'B not-is A's', and 'C causes ([A has B] and [B not-changes to (B is A's)])' (1966, 64-65).

By combining the field theory with componential analysis, that is, looking at the way in which a semantic field is divided up by the words in it, and using that as a basis for deciding what the semantic features of the words are, one can gain important insights into word meanings. In many cases a small number of components can characterize a large set of words Fillmore (1968) has described the semantic structure of verbs of judging (*accuse, blame, criticize, credit, praise, scold, confess, apologize, forgive, justify, and excuse*). Consider the following sentences:

2) John accused Harry of writing the letter
3) John criticized Harry for writing the letter.
4) John credited Harry with writing the letter.
5) John praised Harry for writing the letter.

In 2) John presupposes that Harry is bad and says that Harry is responsible. In 3) John presupposes that Harry is responsible and presupposes that the act is bad. In 4) John presupposes that writing the letter is good and says that Harry is responsible, while in 5) John presupposes that Harry is responsible and says that writing the letter is good.

Another important work in this area is Bierwisch's analysis of spatial adjectives in German (1967) and Teller's analysis of similar terms in English (1968). By positing features for length, width, and height, plus a few others, not only are adjectives characterized, but an explanation can be given for the oddity of *I saw a tall ant crawl by.* One of the semantic features of this field is the perspective of the viewer Since people look down at insects, ants cannot appear tall. However, an aphid in a children's story might use the expression *a tall ant* since he has a different perspective.

The use of binary features along with ± notation is widely used in semantic analysis. Distinctive feature analysis was so successful in phonology that one would expect that it would be applied to syntax and semantics as well. Animate–Inanimate, Count–Mass, Singular–Plural, Masculine–Feminine, Proper–Common distinctions have been symbolized as + or − by using only one term of each pair. The advantage of this notation is that it makes explicit the fact that both components, e.g., [Count] and [Mass] belong to the same system. In some instances the notation may seem somewhat strange, as in Langacker's specification of [Child] as [−Parent] (1969). As long as it is clear what positive feature is specified by a−, there is probably no harm in using this notation.

However, the minus is often ambiguous in semantic analysis; sometimes it refers to the contradictory, that is, the absence or lack of something and sometimes to the contrary, that is, to the presence of the opposite. [Feminine] is sometimes represented as [−Masculine] (or vice-versa) even though the concepts behind the features [Masculine] and [Feminine] must be explicated positively. When the minus is used with sets of features containing more than two members, it usually means 'absence of' rather than having some positive value. If something is marked [−Noun], it can be a verb, adverb, preposition, article, etc. In the case of gradable antonyms (polar opposites) the use of the minus for positive specifications can be misleading. *Small* might be represented as [−Big], but something that is not big is not necessarily small, and so to represent something middle-sized (neither large nor small) in binary

features would require something $\begin{bmatrix} -[\text{Big}] \\ -[-\text{Big}] \end{bmatrix}$. It is not at all clear how to represent polar lexical items in terms of features, but it certainly seems preferable for the sake of clarity and consistency to not use the minus for positive specification.

THE LEXICON AND THE GRAMMAR

The division of semantics into the meaning of words and the meaning of phrases is arbitrary and even of methodologically limited use, since many words are para-phrases of phrases or clauses. The major semantic theories have all stressed this point. *Dentist* is roughly equivalent to 'one who fixes teeth,' and *sadden* is analyzed as 'make (someone) sad.' A considerable amount of research has been done on the systematic relationships between certain classes of verbs and prepositions of location and motion (Gruber, 1965) and the relationship between stative, inchoative, and causative constructions, e.g., *be dead, -die-kill* (Lakoff, 1970, Binnick, 1970).

In addition to the problem of how to represent these facts (discussed below) there are genuine differences of substance concerning the equivalence of meaning Chafe, for example, is somewhat appalled by a "remarkable insensitivity to meaning differences exhibiting any degree of subtlety" (1971, 11). He argues that sentences like 6a) and 6b)

    6a) The old lady kicked the bucket
    6b) The old lady died

are paraphrases in only the grossest terms, and that the two sentences have a different semantic structure. Even in sentences that are transformationally related, such as actives and passives, the meaning is different. *Oculists eye blonds* is about what oculists do; *Blonds are eyed by oculists* tells us about what happens to blonds (ibid.) Postal's analysis of *remind* (1970) in which *remind* is derived from an underlying phrase like PERCEIVE as SIMILAR rests ultimately on whether the two are synony-mous, but not everyone agrees that they are Postal argues that

    7) Larry reminds me of Winston Churchill although I perceive that
       Larry is not similar to Winston Churchill

is contradictory. Bowers has challenged this, arguing that if 7) is changed to

    8) For some reason Larry reminds me of Winston Churchill although
       I perceive that Larry is not really similar to him at all

the sentence "expresses a meaningful and noncontradictory report on the part of the speaker of some subjective experience of his" (1970, 560). Of course, Postal could argue that the abstract (underlying) verb PERCEIVE is not equivalent to the surface verb *perceive* and SIMILAR is not equivalent to *similar*, so that sentence 8) might not be contradictory. Even if *remind* is synonymous with *perceive as similar* on one reading, there remain the leftover problems of trying to figure out what to do about other readings. There is also the problem of specifying the relationship between PERCEIVE and *perceive*.

Connected to the problem of the relationship between words and constructions, there is the problem of possible and impossible lexical items. Morgan (1968, 1969), Postal (1968), and McCawley (1970), all working from the generative semantics point of view, have done some interesting work on the sorts of things that can be incorporated into a lexical item and the things that cannot be. Morgan (1969) argues that only certain kinds of constituent structures may be encoded in a single word, though it is necessary to specify exactly what kinds of constituent structures are involved *Cut off the head of* can be replaced by *decapitated*, as 9),

    9) John cut off the head of Harry
    10) John decapitated Harry.

However, there is no verb *sneep* that can incorporate *saw* and *hippie*, changing

11) John saw Mary laying a wreath at the grave of the unknown hippie

to

12) *John sneeped Mary laying a wreath at the grave of the unknown.

However, might *sneep* be a possible lexical item meaning 'see $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{a hippie}\\\text{some hippies}\end{array}\right\}$',

13) John saw a hippie yesterday

14) John sneeped yesterday

since *saw a hippie* is a constituent, parallel to many verbs which incorporate their objects?

15) John drank booze all day yesterday →

16) John drank all day yesterday

If sneep meaning 'see $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{a hippie}\\\text{some hippies}\end{array}\right\}$', is not a possible lexical item, it must be

ruled out on grounds other than (or in addition to) those suggested by Morgan.

The notion 'lexical gap' is related to the problem of possible lexical items, but in all but the most obvious and clear-cut cases, such as the absence of a general term superordinate to *aunt* and *uncle* or the lack of a causative verb *to chartreuse*, analogous to *to whiten, yellow*, the concept of a lexical gap becomes somewhat incoherent (see Lehrer 1970b). Not every possible but nonexisting lexical item constitutes a gap Is there a gap for an English word *lactile* that works just like *drink* in 16) above, but which incorporates the object *milk* instead?

17) He lactiled milk all day yesterday →

18) He lactiled all day yesterday.

McCawley has distinguished between lexical items that are impossible in all languages and those that are impossible to a specific culture. For example, there cannot be a lexical item in English *dother* meaning 'female child of a female parent' such that *x* is the dother of *y* only if *y* is the mother of *x*. Other languages, such as Western Apache, have words for such concepts, however. "The absence of *dother* in English is a special case of a much more general phenomenon, namely that no English kinship term makes reference to the sex of the 'ego' or any of the 'linking relatives', e g, in '*x* is *y*'s uncle'. *x*'s sex is relevant to the choice of *uncle* rather than *aunt*, but *y*'s sex is not . . ." (1971, part 4, 13).

Central to McCawley's notion of 'possible lexical item in a culture' is a lexical field with a clearly delimited domain, preferably closed, that can be described by a small closed set of components, such as kinship terminology. However, in a domain like artifacts or motion or emotion in which the membership of words is open, in which the boundaries of the domain are amorphous, and in which it is not at all clear what to include or omit from lexical structure, the matter is muddy indeed.

LANGUAGE AND LOGIC

There are many words in every natural language that cannot be analyzed adequately by assigning components—these include the logical words, such as *not, and, or;* quantifiers, such as *all, some, only;* and other words like *even* and *yet*. These words affect the meaning of the whole sentence, often by bringing in entailments and presuppositions that would be lacking without them. Consider *even* in a sentence like 19).

19) Even Max tried on the pants.

Fraser (1971, 152) shows that 19) entails three other statements:

20a) Max tried on the pants.

This is the main assertion and would remain if *even* did not appear in 19).

20b) Other people tried on the pants.

20c) The speaker would not expect or would not expect the hearer to expect Max to try on the pants.

When *even* occurs in conditional sentences, it has the effect of neutralizing the conditional clause (Fraser, 1969, 68).

21) Mary will leave even if John stays

entails

22a) Mary will leave if John stays

22b) Mary will leave if other things happen

22c) One would not expect that Mary would leave if John stays.

Keenen has explored some of the logical properties of *only* (1971). Compare the following.

23) Only John shot himself.

24) Only John$_x$ shot John$_x$.

Sentences 23) and 24) do not have the same meaning, although in the standard transformational grammars, 23) would be derived from 24) by the obligatory rule of reflexivization. However, 23) means that no one other than John shot himself and would be falsified if, say, Peter shot himself. By contrast, 24) means that no one else shot John and would be falsified if Peter shot John, it would not be falsified if Peter shot himself.

G. Lakoff has done some interesting work on logic and natural language. He argues that "for many sentences it makes no sense to ask whether or not they are grammatical in any absolute sense, but only to ask whether they are grammatical relative to certain presuppositions" (1971, 63; see also G Lakoff, 1970). To understand a sentence like 25)

25) The mayor is a Republican and the used car dealer is honest, too

certain presuppositions are required for the sentence to be grammatical namely, that

26a) All Republicans are honest

26b) The mayor is the used car dealer.

However, in 27)

27) John is a Republican, but he is honest

the sentence is grammatical only if one expects that Republicans are not honest.

SPEECH ACTS AND LANGUAGE IN CONTEXT

Until very recently many linguists avoided dealing with the function of utterances, other than perhaps a few formulas like *How do you do* and *Good-by*. However, a number of philosophers were actively engaged in analyzing speech acts. Austin discusses performative sentences (or utterances), in which the "issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action" (1962, 6). Some performatives are explicit, such as *I promise to wash the dishes tomorrow*, which constitutes a promise, and *I'm inviting you to dinner tonight*, which is an invitation Most performatives, however are implicit. 28) *Go home now* is an order and 29) *What time is it?* is a question, and neither speech act is marked by a verb. Ross (1970) has incorporated performative verbs into the semantic structure of sentences, so that senence 28) would be derived from

30) I order you to go home now

and 29) from

31) I ask you (or I request that you tell me) what time it is.

Grice has worked out many of the conventions of conversation. He points out that

conversation does not consist of disconnected fragments of discourse, but rather that there are cooperative efforts which participants recognize. There are a number of conversational principles that can be expressed as maxims, such as "Make your contribution as informative as is required but not more informative than this"; "Try to make your contribution something that is true"; "Be relevant." At times these conversational principles or maxims are not observed—they may be violated or flouted by a speaker, with the result that the utterance implies something different from or something in addition to the assertion Grice calls these other meanings *conversational implicatures*. He gives, as an example, a situation in which A and B are talking about their friend C, now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on, to which B replies, "Oh, quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prison yet." Since the clause "and he hasn't been to prison yet" seems to violate the maxims "Do not say more than is required" and "Be relevant", the utterance has *implicatures* about what it asserts, for example, that C is a dishonest person.

Gordon and G. Lakoff have begun to formalize some of these notions, and R. Lakoff (1970) has analyzed sentences in the light of discourse conventions. She points out that appropriate answers to the question "What time is it?" might be

32a) Three o'clock
32b) I just told Bill it was noon
32c) The sun just came up
32d) None of your business
32e) Why?
32f) Ask the policeman

The following answers would be inappropriate:

32a) There are thirty-six inches in a yard
33b) In 1492

She then goes on to analyze the conversational principles and the logical deductions speakers make when confronted with indirect answers like those in 32b–f).

SEMANTIC UNIVERSALS

There is a widespread search for universals at all levels of linguistic analysis, but in semantics there are two contradictory assumptions made by different linguists. For one group, those primarily interested in the relationship between language and culture, the semantic structure is closely tied up with the mores, beliefs, and institutions of the culture, and these linguists and anthropologists tend to stress the relativity and non-universality of semantic structures. Another group is interested in the relationship of language and logic or language and perception, and this group, which includes linguists and psychologists, has stressed the universality of semantic structure and the connection with innate biological mechanisms.

Unfortunately 'universal' is used in a number of different ways, and writers do not always make clear what sense they are using One sense of 'universal' has to do with some property that a language must have to qualify as a human language, for instance productivity, in order to allow discourse about virtually any novel experience. Sometimes 'universal' is used in a weaker sense and merely means widespread Greenberg uses the term in this sense. For example, his *Universal 1* is "In declarative sentences with nominal subject and objects, the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object" (1963, 61).

Chomsky has distinguished between formal and substantive universals. A formal universal in semantics might be something like "Semantic structures can be expressed in terms of referential indices and predicates"; substantive universals would include things (features or components) that are found in languages, e g., components corresponding to the concepts of color, shape, texture; logical operators like negation, disjunction, conjunction, and implication. In the case of substantive universals Chomsky

(1965) and Katz (1966) have proposed that some features are universal only in the sense that they are drawn from a fixed set of universal features, although not every language will use them all, and it is conceivable, at least in semantics, that some components would be rather rare.

As for constructing a universal inventory of components of features or basic predicates or whatever, there is a fair chance of success for those domains which are related to perception and which permit very little variation. Body parts, for example, are likely to be describable universally There may be minor variations, of course; some languages may not have a term equivalent to *arm*, but may use one term for the part between the shoulder and elbow and a second term for that part between the elbow and wrist, but it would be very unlikely that a language would have a word meaning 'left large toe *and* right elbow' (that is, not a case of homonymy, but a term that covers both simultaneously).

In semantic fields like kinship and social institutions it will be extremely difficult to find universal components. It would seem that terms like *mother, father, sibling,* etc must have counterparts in all languages, but Goodenough shows that this is not the case (1970). 'Mother' is not so difficult to define universally, but 'father' is, since in some cultures the sire of a child is not particularly important and may not be known. A child in such a culture will still have a 'father', but 'father' is defined in terms of the rights and obligations he has to the child. Since this is the case, the possibility of treating [Parent] as a semantic primitive which underlies both 'mother' and 'father' becomes extremely difficult and therefore defining 'father' as [[Male] [Parent]] becomes unsatisfactory. Of course, one could arbitrarily select 'biological father' as the only aspect relevant to the primitive semantic unit, but in that case the semantic inventory would just be inadequate and misleading

Greenberg (1966) has made an important contribution with his use of *implicational universals.* An implicational universal is one of the forms such that if a language has feature A, then it also has feature B, but not vice versa. An example of such an implication would be "If a language has a word for 'younger brother', then it also has a word for 'older brother'." Implicational universals may be the only kind that can be found in those semantic domains that are closely tied to cultural institutions. One important application has been Berlin and Kay's *Basic Color Words* (1970). Although color words were long considered to be highly relevant to a culture, Berlin and Kay, after studing ninety-eight languages, found that if one knows how many color words a language has, one can predict what they will be and approximately what range of the color spectrum they will cover There are definite hierarchies in this field: if a language has a word for 'green', it will have one for 'red', but the converse does not necessarily hold.

CURRENT CONTROVERSIES

Before concluding, I wish to point out a few things concerning the dispute between the generative and interpretive semanticists. The terminology is unfortunate, because it suggests that there are just two views, but there are in fact at least three positions, and possibly four. Katz is included with Chomsky and Jackendoff as a proponent of interpretive semantics, whereas he differs from the latter two as much as he does from the generative semanticists. Chafe classifies himself as a generative semanticist, but in some ways his system is unique. The issues on which there is disagreement are directionality, the kinds of rules needed, the order of the rules, and whether transformations change meaning.

Chafe has argued that a language has directionality and that a grammar should reflect this. "There is, then, a kind of directionality in language which might be referred to as the DIRECTIONALITY OF WELL-FORMEDNESS. What this means is that the well-formedness of sentences is determined in one direction—from deep (or semantic) structure to surface structure to (eventually) phonetic structure—and not in the reverse direction" (1971, 7). Chomsky (1970), Katz (1970), and G Lakoff (1969)

treat the relationship between sound and meaning as one of mapping, in the mathematical sense, and they disagree with Chafe's claim that mapping from semantics to phoentics is more informative than some other possibility.

Since the generative semanticists start with semantic structure and get eventually to surface structure via transformations, projection rules relating deep structure to semantic structure are unnecessary. Katz agrees with the generative semanticists that all meaningful elements are in semantic or deep structure, hence transformations are not allowed to change meaning Chomsky and Jackendoff hold that surface structure contributes to meaning, and so surface structure interpretation rules are needed in addition to base rules, transformations, output conditions and (for Katz) projection rules The generative semanticists need, in addition to base rules, transformational rules, and output conditions, global rules (or constraints) that can look back at the derivational history of a sentence

There are a number of issues in the controversy that appear to be matters of terminology At the Texas Conference on the Goals of Linguistic Theory (1969) Postal argued that the best theory is one which has the fewest kinds of rules, hence generative semantics is better than interpretive semantics because it can do without projection rules and surface structure interpretation rules. However, it turns out that the generative semanticists need several new transformational rules (e g., rules that convert phrases into single lexical items) that the interpretive semanticists do not need, so that although fewer kinds of rules are needed, one kind of rule—transformations—must do more kinds of things McCawley (1970) says that "In such works as Katz and Fodor (1963) and Katz and Postal (1964) semantic structure was treated as something of a very different nature from syntactic structure, and it was only in the years following those works that it became possible for linguists to conceive of the possibility that they might really be the same" (1970, part 1, 2) At the 1970 LSA winter meeting Katz argued that in his own theory semantic and syntactic structure were not as different as McCawley suggested *Different* is of course a gradable term, and the grading is subjective Whether semantic and syntactic structures are *different* or not is really a pseudo issue

The major point over which the various groups of linguists differ is with respect to lexical insertion. For Chomsky, all lexical items, including terms like *respectively*, are inserted after all the base rules and before all the transformational rules For the generative semanticists, many lexical items will be inserted after some transformations. For example, CAUSE TO BECOME NOT ALIVE, after several transformations, will be replaced by the word *kill* Katz is in the middle on this He would allow a few lexical items like *respectively* or *the former* to be inserted after some transformations; e g.

34) John and Joe love Helen and Fran respectively

would be derived from

35) John loves Helen and Joe loves Fran.

Other lexical items, *kill* for instance, would precede transformations.

Finally, Chomsky and Katz have argued that the ideas of the generative semanticists are notational variants of their own theories. Theory A is a notational variant of theory B if there is an algorithm for getting from one to the other. Their claim may be true for a few bits and pieces here and there, as in replacing BECOME NOT ALIVE with *die* or interpreting *die* as (Become (Not Alive)) However, the current work of the generative semanticists, for example McCawley's work on reference, definite descriptions, and other aspects of logical structure are very fragmented and incomplete, and the interpretive semanticists have done considerably less on these topics So it is premature to argue that the two (or three or four) systems are notational variants. Moreover, it will probably be a while before the empirical consequences of the various theories are known.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, John (1962). *How to do Things with Words*, J. O. Urmson, ed., Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Bendix, William (1966). *Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press

Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay (1970). *Basic Color Words*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Binnick, Robert (1970). "Studies in the derivation of predicative structures," *Papers in Linguistics* 3. 33–64.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1967). "Some semantic universals of German adjectivals," *Foundations of Language* 3 1–36.

Bowers, John (1970). "A note on *Remind*," *Linguistic Inquiry* 1. 559–560.

Chafe, Wallace (1970) *Meaning and the Structure of Language*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press

———(1971) "Directionality and paraphrase," *Language* 47. 1–26

Chomsky, Noam (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass , MIT Press.

———(1970) "Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar," MS.

Fillmore, Charles (1968). "Verbs of judging," *Papers in Linguistics* 1. 91–117.

Fraser, Bruce (1969) "An analysis of concessive conditionals," *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Binnick, *et al.* eds.

———(1971) "An analysis of *Even* in English," in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, Fillmore and Langendoen, eds

Friedrich, Paul (1969) "On the meaning of the Tarascan suffixes of space," (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics, Memoir 23; *IJAL* 35, no 4, part II), 5–44.

Gordon, David and George Lakoff (1971) "Conversational postulates," MS.

Grice, Paul (1968). "Logic and conversation," MS.

Goodenough, Ward (1970) *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*, Chicago, Aldine

Greenberg, Joseph (1963). "Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements," in *Universals of Language*, Greenberg, ed., Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

———(1966). "Language universals," in *Current Trends in Linguistics III*, Sebeok, ed., The Hague, Mouton.

Gruber, Jeffrey (1965). *Studies in Lexical Relations*, Mimeo, Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Horn, Larry (1969) "A presuppositional analysis of *Only* and *Even*," *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.

Jackendoff, Ray (1968). "An interpretive theory of pronouns and reflexives," PEGS Paper No. 27.

———(1969). "An interpretive theory of negation," *Foundations of Language* 5. 218–241.

Katz, Jerrold and Jerry Fodor (1963). "The structure of a semantic theory," *Language* 39. 170–210.

Katz, Jerrold and Paul Postal (1964). *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Description*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Katz, Jerrold (1966). *The Philosophy of Language*, New York, Harper and Row.

———(1970). Interpretive semantics versus generative semantics," *Foundations of Language* 6. 220–259.

Keenen, Edward (1971). "Quantifier structure in English," *Foundations of Language* 7. 255–284.

Kiparsky, Carol and Paul Kiparsky (1970). "Fact," in *Progress in Linguistics*, Bierwisch and Heidolph, eds., The Hague, Mouton.

Lakoff, George (1969). "On generative semantics," in *Semantics—An Interdisciplinary Reader*, Steinberg and Jakobovitz, eds., London, Cambridge University Press.

——— (1970). *Linguistics and Natural Logic*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Phonetics Laboratory.

———(1971). "The role of deduction in grammar," in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, Fillmore and Langendoen, eds.

Lakoff, Robin (1971). "Questionable answers and answerable questions," to appear in *Papers in Linguistics in Honor of Henry and Renee Kahane*, Kachru, *et al*, eds.

Langacker, Ronald (1969). "Mirror image rules II: lexicon and phonology," *Language* 45. 844–862.

Leech, Geoffrey (1969). *Towards a Semantic Description of English*, London, Longmans

Lehrer, Adrienne (1970a). "Static and dynamic elements in semantics," *Papers in Linguistics* 3. 349–373.

————(1970b) "Notes on lexical gaps," *Journal of Linguistics* 6 257–261

————(in preparation). *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure.*

Lounsbury, Floyd (1956) "A semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage." *Language* 32. 158–194.

Lyons, John (1963). *Structural Semantics*, Oxford, Blackwells.

————(1968) *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

McCawley, James (1970). "Syntactic and logical arguments for semantic structures," Fifth International Seminar on Theoretical Linguistics, Tokyo To appear Tokyo, TEC Corporation.

Morgan, Jerry (1969). "On arguing about semantics," *Papers in Linguistics* 1. 49–70.

Postal, Paul (1969) "Anaphoric islands," Papers from the *Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society.*

————(1970) "On the surface verb *Remind,*" *Linguistic Inquiry* 1 37–120

Ross, John (1970) "On declarative sentences," in *Readings in English Transformational Grammar,* Jacobs and Rosenbaum. eds, Boston. Ginn.

Searle, John (1969) *Speech Acts,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Teller, Paul (1969). "Some discussion and extension of Manfred Bierwisch's work on German adjectivals," *Foundations of Language* 5. 185–217.

Weinreich, Uriel (1966) "Explorations in semantic theory," in *Current Trends in Linguistics III,* Sebeok, ed., The Hague, Mouton.