Case grammar and generative semantics are compared. Familiar arguments are repeated to show that both models aim to derive surface structures from semantic deep structures and both assume a prelexical syntax. But generative semantics represents propositions as ordered relations between arguments whereas case grammar represents them as relations of arguments labelled as Agent, Object, Benefactive, Locative, etc. In generative semantics lexical verbs may be mapped onto branches of abstract (non-surfacing) predicates whereas in case grammar they are mapped onto frames of labelled arguments (i.e. case frames), some of which may be abstract (non-surfacing) too. Relations between state, process and action predicates are stated in both models, but are unidirectional in generative semantics and bidirectional in case grammar. The conclusion is that the two models should be fused into one which postulates logical structures to express the meaning of propositions and a set of rules for transforming these logical structures into surface structures. [References.]


Systemic grammar is a cognitive model of language in which the networks of options realisable in syntax provide a semantic basis for syntactic analysis. Units of structure are defined by their structural components; elements of structure are defined by distribution and semantic function; classes are defined by semantic criteria and not structural conditions. Structure is represented by trees, and delicacy determined by relative distance down the tree. Adverbial and adjectival groups are analysed into 5 elements of structure: temperer 1, apex, temperer 2, scope, limiter. Temperers 1 and 2 are distributionally distinct and may not co-occur; nor may any other element of structure occur twice as sisters within the same group. Scope and limiter are typically filled by embedded groups and clauses. [References.]
Systemic grammar is generative; it distinguishes natural from non-natural languages; and it explicitly models competence as adequately as a transformational grammar. It deals only with surface structure which can be represented by trees whose unlabelled nodes are assigned sets of features from system networks. These sets of features entail that each node has a grammatical function; the latter are no longer labelled (e.g. Subject, Complement, etc.) because this makes the theory too powerful. The features are assigned from system networks by realisation rules which are likened to transformations although they do not permute, substitute or delete anything (it is suggested that this is a good thing). However, ad hoc output constraints are necessary to block unacceptable derivations. System networks, realisation rules, recursion and co-ordination are exemplified. The lexicon, semantics, phonology and morphology in a systemic analysis are very briefly mentioned. [References.]

It has been accepted within TG that in a tree structure any node K is directly dominated by only one node J and not by more than one node, e.g. both I and J; this is the single mother convention. But there is nothing in PS rules to make the convention a condition on tree structures and in fact the grammar is simplified and more adequate if the single mother condition is rejected. Allowing a node to be directly dominated by more than one mother explains why some transformations are triggered by identical nodes in a tree (i.e. those which it is proposed have more than one mother) but none are triggered by a set of non-identical nodes. In addition the Bach-Peters paradox (of an apparently infinite underlying source, e.g. the pilot who shot at it hit the Mig that chased him) is explained, and identity of reference between distinct labels can be nicely captured. [References.]

Traditional transformational syntax has accepted a binary division of all sentences into NP and VP. Three arguments used to justify this analysis are examined: (1) intuition, which is found not to be satisfactory since there is no...
sure way of distinguishing between the linguist's intuition as a linguist and his intuition as a native speaker; (2) a binary division enables subject and object to be easily identified – but, it is argued, a ternary division (NP, V, NP) is just as suitable; and (3) a binary division enables transformations to be formulated simply – for some transformations, however [examples], a ternary division enables them to be formulated just as simply. [An alternative is briefly suggested.] A ternary division is also simpler for surface structure. Since there is no clear definition of 'simplicity', a final decision as to whether a binary or ternary division is simpler is difficult to make.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS

See also abstract 75–161


An attempt is made towards establishing a theoretical and empirical base for a sociology of bilingual education, using a historical and comparative perspective. The interrelationship between four dichotomies provides an initial typology (language given primary emphasis v. language given secondary emphasis, mother tongue v. other tongue, minor v. major language, official out-of-school significance v. no official significance). Predictions based on this typology were related to criterion ratings of success relative to language of secondary emphasis goals and language of primary emphasis goals for 60 instances of bilingual education. Tentative results suggest that for the language of primary emphasis greater rated success occurs when the language is the mother tongue and the language of important formal institutions outside school, and for the language of secondary emphasis when it is the mother tongue and a major language. A more advanced development of the same model is described and reference is made to the possibility of further empirical work, particularly through the International Study of Bilingual Education.


Superficial illusions of universality, solidly established in linguistic research, frequently distort the true nature of studied phenomena. Social dialects are normally considered as one of those areas of language where spontaneity completely dominates rule-governed structure and the divergence from a rule appears more regular than the rule itself. For this reason research into social dialects has normally been confined to a purely superficial description of accidental and unconnected facts. In fact social dialects, being a part of the whole
language system, reveal rules of their own, which are closely connected with rules in other branches of language structure. Only the study of 'intra-lingual typology', research into the rules of social and territorial dialects, on the one hand, and the standard literary norm on the other will spare linguistic science from spurious superficiality. Five universals are suggested and discussed in some detail.


There are two branches of 'neo-Humboldtian' linguists: the American branch being led by Sapir, Whorf and, latterly, Hymes and the European branch by Weisgerber and others. Their tenets vary in detail but both groups believe that language is the factor which determines thought and culture. But if language strictly and unambiguously defines the character of thought and the knowledge of actuality the development of both thought and knowledge would be impossible. It would also be impossible to explain the source and reasons for development of language itself. Being one of the components of the spiritual culture of society, language cannot have a decisive influence either on the material culture of society or on the remaining components of its spiritual culture. Language brings certain specific national characteristics directly only to those phenomena of spiritual culture expressed through language itself. The national specificity of these components of spiritual culture is not exhaustively described by those features present in the linguistic means of their expression. Works of literature preserve certain specific national features even after translation into another language. Language has some but not decisive influence on thought. It cannot in a fundamental way determine the character either of the material or of the spiritual culture of society. Thought, like language itself, is the product of social development.


How does the listener come to construe a sentence such as Must you open the door? in its intended sense (Please don't open the door) instead of its literal sense (Is it necessary for you to open the door?)? It was proposed that the listener constructs the literal meaning, checks the context for its plausibility, and if it
is implausible applies a rule of conversation to derive the conveyed meaning. In a test of this theory, 23 subjects were timed as they drew simple deductions from 10 different pairs of conversationally conveyed requests (for example, Can you open the door? and Must you open the door?). The first member of each pair conveyed a positive request, and the second a negative one. Consistent with the theory, those sentences conveying positive requests behaved as if they were positive, even when they were negative in literal meaning (e.g. Why not open the door?); those conveying negative requests behaved as if they were explicitly negative, even when they were positive in literal meaning (e.g. Why open the door?). Some evidence was found for the notion that the listener constructs the literal meaning before the conveyed meaning.

**LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN**


This study of the speech development of the author’s monolingual daughter from birth to 32 months is based upon a corpus consisting of an extensive written record and 4 hours of tape-recorded material. The child’s phonological development is analysed at the ages of 3 months, 8 months and 16 months. The informant’s phonemic system at 32 months, including allophonic variants, is compared with her mother’s and found to be almost identical. Acquisition of suprasegmental features is also examined. Initial appearances of morpheme classes and subclasses are tabulated chronologically and discussed. A detailed account of the acquisition of personal pronouns is employed to demonstrate the child’s first use of the syntactic devices of government and concord. Examples of the use of stress, intonation, word order, negatives and deletions demonstrate at which ages various transformations appeared. The dominant types of sentence and average length of utterance at 32 months are examined, and examples are given to illustrate the informant’s awareness of the language system and her conscious practice of it during the first two years.


A theory of language acquisition is outlined which derives from a view of language as primarily a code for the communication of meaning intentions. It is hypothesised that progress in acquiring the ability to communicate through language will depend to a considerable extent upon the contexts, both interpersonal and situational, in which the child’s early experience of language occurs. Data from a longitudinal study of the spontaneous verbal interaction of a small
sample of children is presented in support of this hypothesis. Taking Mean Length of Utterance as an index of linguistic maturity, rate of development is examined in relation to the distribution over different contexts of the utterances produced by the children and of those addressed to them. Rate of development is also related to the sex, socio-economic status and position in the family of the children concerned. Whilst no significant relationship is found between rate of development and the interpersonal purposes of communication, highly significant relationships are found with the situational contexts of speech and with the child's position in the family: first-born children are the most advanced; they also experience most conversation in contexts of activities shared with an adult. Reference is made to a larger-scale study which will explore these relationships further. [References.]

PHONOLOGY AND PHONETICS


The different temporal variables of English and French in a similar linguistic task (radio interviews) are analysed. Both languages show many similarities, but differ considerably with regard to silent pauses and the distribution of the secondary variables. A tentative explanation for these differences is given; it is partly based on the hypothesis that the two languages have the same over-all behaviour in view of a given linguistic task, but differ in the distribution of the simple variables. A compensation would therefore take place at the level of the simple variables leading to identical central values for the complex variables of the two languages. [Tables; bibliography.]


An introduction to the problematics of intonation as a part of enunciation, this analysis is based on a confrontation of Bally's modal theory of intonation with Austin's linguistic concepts. Under the heading 'allocution', separate consideration is given to the performative acts of assertion, interrogation and order, to study the ways in which intonation can express them, depending on whether the texts concerned show marks of expression. The text plus intonation (or
utterance) meaning then becomes clear in accordance with the context and the situation. Modality is considered as a subcategory of expression to which it is linked by 'conversational postulates'. The question of the nature of the modal intonational categories is raised, as well as the problem of incidence of modal intonation. An oral enunciation attitude is then defined, which, if it is to become a part of training, would mean rethinking language-teaching methodology.

**LEXICOGRAPHY**


The aim is to develop a lexical model to help lexicographers. The basic unit is the word which belongs to competence as a lexeme and to performance as a word form. The lexeme consists of a lexical morpheme and a word-class morpheme. Compounds are combinations of a lexeme and a derivational morpheme. The meaning of a lexeme comprises paradigmatic and syntagmatic features which can be shown in a matrix [examples]. If a lexeme occurs in more than one square of the matrix, it has more than one meaning. Each meaning of a lexeme may be further modified [examples]. A lexeme may have two different meanings although sharing the same paradigmatic and syntagmatic features. The non-formal content of a lexeme cannot as yet be fully or exactly described. Lexemes with a common content form a lexical field, some of whose members may have transferred meanings. A lexical field may change in time by one semantic feature becoming more, or less, important, or being lost [examples]. [References.]