Language and linguistics

LINGUISTIC THEORY

77–282   Comrie, Bernard. Causatives and universal grammar. *Transactions of the Philological Society 1974* (Oxford), 1975, 1–32.

In languages where the combination of a given verb and causative meaning is expressed by a single predicate (e.g. Turkish *öl-dür* 'kill, cause to die', cf. *öl* 'die'), a sentence containing such a causative predicate will normally have one noun phrase argument more than the corresponding non-causative sentence. Cross-linguistically, the syntactic expression of the greater number of arguments tends to follow the same general pattern, in accordance with a hypothesised Case Hierarchy (Subject (SU) – Direct object (DO) – Indirect object (IO) – Oblique object (Obl)). The syntactic expression of the Causee in the causative construction usually appears as the leftmost position on this hierarchy that is not already occupied by a noun phrase of the sentence, e.g. Turkish *Ali* HASAN-I (DO) *öl-dür-dü* 'Ali caused HASAN to die', *Ali mektub-u* HASAN-A (IO) *imzalat-t-tı* 'Ali caused HASAN to sign the letter', *Ali müdür-e mektub-u* HASAN TARA-FINDAN (Obl) *göster-t-ti* 'Ali caused HASAN to show the letter to the director'.

Although individual languages may deviate from this paradigm pattern – by allowing some position to be represented twice in a causative sentence (syntactic doubling), or by using a position further to the right than is required by the paradigm pattern (extended demotion), or by having no causative corresponding to non-causatives with a large number of arguments (causative blockage) – the paradigm pattern does establish a cross-linguistic norm from which individual languages tend to deviate minimally.

77–283   Lass, Roger. On generative taxonomy, and whether formalisations 'explain'. *Studia Linguistica* (Lund, Sweden), **30**, 2 (1976), 139–54.

Two notational conventions seem suspect if taken as devices for capturing linguistically significant generalisations (LSGs), the [–next rule] convention, and disjunctive operators like braces. Together these can disguise a genuine regularity as an unmotivated exception or disguise irrationalities as regular.

A general principle that low vowels show both length and qualitative change in certain environments in NY City dialect can be captured initially by such a formalisation, but many exceptions have continually to be introduced. The resulting complex notation does not constitute an LSG, and is not worth the effort; a generative statement, in any case purely taxonomic, may actually be

234

less revealing than an old-fashioned taxonomic statement. Any 'generalisation' like 'X Y except in A, B...' is an anti-generalisation; its content should be assigned to a 'garbage component' of the grammar where we can dump non-rule-governed phenomena.

77–284   Martin, Richard M. On the very idea of a logical form. *Theoretical Linguistics* (Berlin), **3**, 1/2 (1976), 209–23.

Five useful 'principles' for evaluating theories of logical form have been suggested by Harman. The discussion is carried further in this paper by bringing in 16 additional principles that seem all but indispensable if a really pliable and workable theory of form is ever to be achieved. Several of the sentences considered by Harman are then subjected to analysis and suitable structures for them suggested.

77–285   Mittwoch, Anita. Grammar and illocutionary force. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **40**, 1 (1976), 21–42.

The aim is to show that a particular set of facts about language, namely conditions on the conjunction of non-matching sentence types, is not a matter of syntax, as has been claimed, but of illocutionary force. The rules of illocutionary force, as sketched by Searle (1969), are examined and in many cases modified or augmented. The relationship between grammar and illocutionary force in a model of language is then discussed. Taking into account further data, it is argued that a separate pragmatic component is required but that this component must interlock with the syntactic-semantic component/s.

77–286   Straight, H. Stephen. Comprehension versus production in linguistic theory. *Foundations of Language* (Dordrecht), **14**, 4 (1976), 525–40.

Linguists (of whatever theoretical persuasion) have habitually phrased their accounts of language knowledge (or language structure) as sound/meaning correspondences about which no mention need be made of differences that might exist between knowledge of how to analyse input versus knowledge of how to construct output (or between structures as objects of perception versus structures as products of verbalisation). However, evidence from many sources (including current research in semantics, syntax, phonology, historical and developmental linguistics, sociolinguistics) increasingly indicates that the dissimilarities between language as comprehension versus language as production are so profound that they nullify attempts to describe language in a 'non-directional' manner, 'neutral' with respect to interpretive versus expressive functions.

A two-component model of idealised linguistic performance can be devised on the basis of much past and present linguistic scholarship. Elements needed for the comprehension component are derivable from 'taxonomic' distributional analyses of phonotactics, morphosyntax and lexical semantics, as well as from recent cognitive psychological work on 'perceptual strategies', while the production component can be formulated in terms of 'generative-semantic' and 'generative-phonological' rules recast as meaning-to-sound transformational processes. Interaction between these two components may well be the crucial determinant of the 'creative aspect of language use'.

77–287   Van Parijs, Philippe. Explication et mécanisme en linguistique diachronique. [Explanation and mechanism in diachronic linguistics.] *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique* (Louvain), **3**, 4 (1975/6), 1–28.

In discussing the move from description to explanation, Chomsky refers to synchronic phenomena. Following on Bloomfield's denial of knowledge of the causes of language change, a number of linguists have seen diachronic linguistics as descriptive and reconstructive but not explanatory. However, Labov and his colleagues have undertaken the systematic study of contemporary language change in operation.

It is possible to distinguish five main explanatory approaches to diachronic phenomena: neo-grammarian, generative, functional, sociolinguistic, structural [discussion and references]. Diachronic linguistics is concerned with the explanation of states of language, of changes of state, as well as of the universality of certain properties of language [examples]. Language change can only be understood in terms of constant variation, with tools such as the 'variable rules' proposed by Labov. Variety is constrained and the direction of change is determined by the sanctions of success in communication and of status. [Notes; bibliography.]

SEMANTICS

77–288   Wojtak, G. Kontrastive Verbbeschreibung und Valenzanalyse. [Contrastive verb and valency analysis.] *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* (Berlin), **29**, 4 (1976), 364–74.

This article is an attempt to illustrate the concept of valency as applied to contrastive studies. Each of the three valency levels (*Stufen*) should be compared separately. This demands that all verbs in both languages should be described according to this three-level model. What is important for equivalence is not the similarity of potential valency slots but rather the agreement of actual,

occurring valency slots. Not merely surface similarities must be compared but deep structure equivalence. This can be done with the help of Fillmore's case grammar. His dative case can be subdivided into Goal, Experiencer and Addressee. A noun in the nominative can represent several deep structure cases, e.g. Instrument – *Der Schlüssel schliesst die Tür*, or Factitive – *Der Kuchen wurde gebacken*. In some cases the syntactic valency is the same but there is a semantic subdivision according to the context, e.g. *essen* and *fressen* both take animate subjects, [+human] in the case of *essen* and [+animal] in the case of *fressen*. Contrastive studies of this nature can be limited to showing where the valency of a verb in each language differs.

LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS
See also abstracts 77–313, –315, –319

77–289   Kohn, Kurt. Lernersprache aus linguistischer Sicht. [The learner's language from the linguistic point of view.] *Linguistische Berichte* (Braunschweig), **46** (1976), 47–60.

Following a short discussion of the characteristics in learners' language, such as regularity and variation which belong to the internal structure of his language, and mistakes, transfer and interference which have to be viewed in the context of the learner's own language or another foreign language he has already acquired, a method of description is introduced which contains all these components. This method is subtle enough to satisfy the needs arising in analysing learners' language and holds an important position in the strategy of research. The method, generative syntax, was chosen because through it one obtains a measure of clarity against which methodical problems stand out sharply and because it allows for the achievements of modern linguistics to be used in empirically orientated research. The analysis of the learner's language with regard to the systematic acquisition of a second language is a task which goes beyond the purely linguistic and requires the co-operation of linguistics, psychology and didactics.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS   *See also abstract* 77–344

77–290   Cassell, Eric J. and others. A preliminary model for the examination of doctor–patient communication. *Language Sciences* (Bloomington, Ind), **43** (1976), 10–13.

The various ways in which communication between doctor and patient can fail are discussed, and a framework is suggested which should help in distinguishing and analysing the factors involved in the success or failure of verbal com-

munications. The research is based on a study of the use of language by doctors and patients being carried out at Cornell University Medical College. The problems in communication cover the following areas: acoustics, phonology, syntax, lexicon, conceptions, intent and credence [examples]. [References.]

77–291   Manor, Ruth. An analysis of a speech. *Theoretical Linguistics* (Berlin), **3**, 1/2 (1976), 125–43.

A speech is an ordered set of speech-acts normally used to express commitments to propositions, which a speaker S performs in some context. Employing the point of view of the audience and by using the formal language CA^V for conditional assertion, a concept of pragmatical presuppositions and the order of the speech-acts performed, it is determined at each step to which possible propositions S expressed his commitment both at this step and so far in the speech. Different cases are distinguished where S expresses commitments inconsistent with his previous commitments. S may do so, to some extent, and change his mind while in other cases this will cause the logical end of the speech.

77–292   Riley, P. Discursive and communicative functions of non-verbal communication. *Mélanges Pédagogiques* (Nancy), 1976, 1–18.

The paper is concerned with discourse analysis, not of written discourse but of face-to-face informal interaction. The communicative aspects of interaction comprise three components: (1) the verbal component (+verbal+vocal), (2) the paralinguistic component (−verbal+vocal), (3) the non-verbal component (−verbal−vocal). Interaction cannot be described on the basis of the verbal component alone.

   Categories of gesture are here established according to their communicative value and function, with items representing a decreasing degree of linguisticness. Broad headings are (*a*) psychological or affective indices (smiling, blushing), (*b*) social information (class, occupation), and (*c*) biological indices (age, health). The next problem is to integrate the relevant linguistic non-verbal behaviours into the model, for which functional categories are required. These include: kinematopoeia, deictics, gestures having illocutionary force, turn-taking signals, attention signals, and address signals. [Description of the model, which consists of realisation, communicative level and discursive level.] Possible applications of the model include the description of small-group interactions, psychiatric symptoms and discursive roles and status. [References.]

77–293   Turner, Roy. Utterance positioning as an interactional resource. *Semiotica* (The Hague), **17**, 3 (1976), 233–54.

An *ad hoc*, interested analysis of conversation must be distinguished from one constructing an apparatus usable on other materials. *The first five minutes* presents a transcript of a psychiatric interview and an *ad hoc*, utterance by utterance, commentary. There it is argued that the sequence P: *I'm a nurse, but my husband won't let me work.* T: *How old are you?* is in a sense defective in that T does not follow up P's remark.

Consideration of the preceding utterances demonstrates that whatever else it may be, P's utterance is at least an answer to a previous question. T's opening question, *What brings you here?* also guarantees that *I'm a nurse...* will be monitored for its relevance, and also that P may use that answer slot to provide appropriate material for such monitoring. P's utterance is additionally a complaint, using a 'standard explanation format': *My* [category term] *won't let me* [activity term]. There is an extensive range of such activities which are 'permissibles' in our society for children, whose 'responsibles' are invariably adults. The significance of T's utterance is that it asks in effect, *Are you a child that you leave that responsibility to others?*

SOCIOLINGUISTICS   *See also abstract 77–292*

77–294   Fishman, Joshua A. The spread of English as a new perspective for the study of 'language maintenance and language shift'. *Studies in Language Learning* (Urbana, Ill), 1, 2 (1976), 59–104.

A new look at LMLS from the point of view of spreading LWCs (languages of wider communication) in general, and from the point of view of the spread of English as an additional language in particular, prompts a number of promising hypotheses or emphases. Most of the recent progress has been made in conjunction with the measurement of habitual language use, and least in conjunction with socio-cultural processes. Progress made in conjunction with behaviour toward language lies somewhere in between these two. Apparently, the more societally embedded a topic has been, the less progress there has been in connection with it, and the more language-focused, the more progress there has been. In part, this relationship reflects the greater precision of scholarly work with language as a result of the more highly systematic nature of language and language behaviour. The social sciences in general and sociology in particular have not reached the same levels of analysis. The discrepancy between these two parent fields from which LMLS (and all of the sociology of language) must derive its basic theories and methods is reflected in the discrepancies between one sub-topic and the other within the area of LMLS itself.

77–295 Littlewood, William T. Linguistic change during interpersonal interaction. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **41**, 1 (1977), 1–11.

Three processes are suggested to account for linguistic change at the interpersonal level. The first is the creation of a partly stable, partly dynamic frame of reference, against which lexical items become endowed with semantic features unique to a situation or group. The second is the negotiation of the social category to which the communication situation belongs, and which motivates the speakers to draw on a specific and usually mutually similar set of linguistic items from their repertoire. The third is a process of direct behavioural influence, as observed in studies of conformity and verbal conditioning. In terms of the proposed model, aspects of language variation at societal level can be traced to their origin at the interpersonal level.

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS

77–296 Baker, Wm. J. An 'information structure' view of language. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* (Toronto), **21**, 1 (1976), 1–16.

Linguistic analysis cannot usefully be carried out independent of psychological constraints; a sample of language product can be described, but such a description cannot provide an explanation for the data, since this is to be found only in the purposes for which they were used. This use, to communicate, is the one invariant property of language. The interpretation of the linguistic structure of an utterance, the appreciation of the information it contains, whether it is to be taken literally, or makes sense, all depend on psychological processes in the hearer. Psycholinguistics is not a hybrid discipline; linguistics and psychology are not separable in the first place. Linguistics is an essential part of cognitive psychology and cognitive psychology is fundamentally dependent on a clear understanding of the properties of language.

77–297 Serebrennikov, В. А. К проблеме 'язык и мышление' (всегда ли мышление вербально?) [Towards the problem of language and thought (Is thought always verbal?).] *Серия литературы и языка* (Moscow), **36**, 1 (1977), 9–17.

Two approaches to the problem of the relationship between language and thought are contrasted; the first, the 'verbalist' approach, contends that all thought is based on language. The other approach admits that some thought is based on language, but contends that other sorts of thought also exist.

Verbalists are said to argue for their position chiefly on the basis of its foundation in the Marxist classics, and on psychological evidence concerning

the linguistic nature of internalised speech. Both of these views are claimed to be ill-founded, the first based on misinterpretation of Marx and Engels, and the second inconsistent with recent psychological work. It is argued that various sorts of associations and logical connections form the basis for a type of non-verbal thought which must have existed as a necessary precondition for the development of language.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

77–298   Blount, Ben G. and Padgug, Elise J. Prosodic, paralinguistic, and interactional features in parent–child speech: English and Spanish. *Journal of Child Language* (London), **4**, 1 (1977), 67–86.

Parents employ a special register when speaking to young children, containing features that mark it as appropriate for children who are beginning to acquire their language. Parental speech in English to five children (ages 0; 9–1; 6) and in Spanish to four children (ages 0; 8–1; 1 and 1; 6–1; 10) was analysed for the presence and distribution of these features. Thirty-four paralinguistic, prosodic and interactional features were identified, and rate measures and proportions indicated developmental patterns and differences across languages. Younger children received a higher rate of features that marked affect; older children were addressed with more features that marked semantically meaningful speech. English-speaking parents relied comparatively more on paralinguistic and affective features, whereas Spanish-speaking parents used comparatively more interactional features. Despite these differences, there was a high degree of similarity across parents and languages for the most frequently occurring features.

77–299   Henning, Wode. Four early stages in the development of LI negation. *Journal of Child Language* (London), **4**, 1 (1977), 87–102.

No reasonably successful theory of the acquisition of negation seems to have yet been proposed. Most studies describe *post hoc* what has taken place; but they fail to go on to suggest a theory that will predict what will take place. McNeill (1970) seems to be the only one to have explicitly aimed at a theory with at least a certain amount of predictive capacity, but his views leave much to be desired. This paper outlines an alternative proposal to cover four very early stages for the acquisition of negation systems in natural languages. It emphasises the formal linguistic devices as the major variables that determine the various language-specific developmental sequences.

77–300   Montes Giraldo, J. J. El sistema, la norma y el aprendizaje de la lengua. [System, norm and language acquisition.] *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* (Bogota), **31**, 1 (1976), 14–40.

This case-study shows forms used by children which deviate from the norm and violate the system (are generally syncretistic in character) both at the lexical and grammatical levels. Further data show violation of the norm but fidelity to the system (are generally hyperforms). (The terms 'system' and 'norm' follow Coseriu's usage). [Bibliograph. Abbreviations.]

77–301   Rosansky, Ellen J. Methods and morphemes in second language acquisition research. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development* (Stanford, Calif), **12** (1976), 199–211.

Methodological issues relating to research on second-language acquisition are considered: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses, data collection and data analysis. Much of the research methodology for L2 acquisition research has followed precepts set by L1 acquisition research, particularly that of Brown (1973) and the de Villiers (1973), respectively longitudinal and cross-sectional studies. Because of high correlation between the two, it has been assumed that cross-sectional studies of L2 performance would yield reliable information about the L2 acquisition process, though it has never been demonstrated that the two developmental learning curves are similar.

A longitudinal analysis is reported which raises serious questions about the validity of cross-sectional studies of second-language acquisition – at least in the area of morpheme acquisition. It may well be more profitable to undertake more detailed longitudinal investigations.

BILINGUALISM

77–302   Schneiderman, Eta. An examination of the ethnic and linguistic attitudes of bilingual children. *ITL* (Louvain), **33** (1976), 59–72.

Three stages are posited in the development of attitudes towards language and their own culture in children between five and eleven: (1) the pre-assimilative stage (birth to age three or four), (2) the assimilative stage, when minority children adopt the values of the majority culture, and (3) the post-assimilative stage (pride in the minority culture). A study is described which was designed to monitor attitude development in the second (assimilative) stage. The subjects were French-Canadian elementary-school children in kindergarten and grade six; it was hypothesised that the older children would exhibit more favourable attitudes towards the English language and culture than the younger

242

children. The testing instrument was a puppet show presented on video-tape. [Method and results.] The hypothesis was not proved: the older children showed stronger French preference than the younger group, possibly because their motivation for increased use of English is only instrumental, i.e. practical, and does not imply rejection of their own culture. [References.]

77–303   Thiéry, Christopher. Le bilingualism vrai (l'acquisition d'une double compétence). [True bilingualism – the acquisition of dual competence.] *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* (Paris), **24** (1976), 52–63.

A survey was conducted among 48 international conference interpreters, all true bilinguals. The latter is defined as one having the competence of a native speaker in two languages, whom native speakers of both languages recognise as one of their own kind. The criteria are more than purely linguistic: something akin to bi-culturalism is involved. The bilingual adult is rare, whereas bilingualism among children is relatively common. However, childhood bilingualism is frequently lost in later life; in order to maintain it, a bilingual environment and strong motivation are needed – provided in the case of the interpreters by the demands of their careers.

Interviews with bilingual subjects confirmed that bilingualism can only be acquired in childhood. The true bilingual has two mother tongues – the crucial difference between mother tongue and second language residing in *how* the language is learnt. Different mental processes are involved. Acquisition of the mother tongue represents the child's reaction to its linguistic environment; the language is learnt 'automatically' and is not deliberately taught or the result of conscious effort. The written language differs from the spoken in that writing always requires to be taught. Bilingualism is a matter of speech, not writing.

PHONOLOGY   *See also abstracts* 77–320/1, –342

77–304   Dressler, W. Tendenzen in kontaminatorischen Fehlleistungen (und ihre Beziehung zur Sprachgeschichte). [Tendencies in contaminatory speech errors and their connection with language history.] *Die Sprache* (Wiessbaden), **22**, 1 (1976), 1–10.

The article is restricted to speech errors of normal adults and deals in particular with phonological contaminations or overlappings of the kind *shout+yell → shell*. Only unconsciously produced speech errors are considered, not play on words. Various factors influencing contamination forms are studied but none are wholly responsible. All the tendencies can be linked with the premise that the con-

243

tamination results from the evocation of the configuration of the sounds at the moment of their planning. In this connection the syllable and rhythmic structure are important. Psychological questions are not examined; instead the question is pursued as to how far these tendencies throw light on historical contaminations, which Paul considered to be an accepted speech error, combining two parts of related words, which has become lexicalised. These contaminations in language history have little to do with phonological speech errors, since the words involved in the latter are scarcely ever related. Phonological contaminations are performance errors which only occur once and are not accepted by either the speaker or the speech community.

LEXICOGRAPHY

77–305 Bujas, Željko. Testing the performance of a bilingual dictionary on topical current texts. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrebiensa* (Zagreb), **39** (1975), 193–204.

The lexicographer has two problems with the bilingual dictionary: (1) ensuring that really frequent items are included, particularly in the foreign-to-native part, and (2) achieving and maintaining the up-to-dateness of the dictionary. The first is met by selecting the bulk of the entries according to frequency lists, the second by constant checking of current texts (newspapers, journals, etc.). The lexicographic reading of texts also serves as a direct test of the performance of a bilingual dictionary. A procedure is described which was used to test one particular bilingual dictionary, and at the same time to amend and update it. The dictionary was the English–Croatian dictionary by Drvodelić (1970 edition), for which the author of this article was the reviser. The 18 analysts either relied on intuition, looking up in the dictionary only those words or phrases which they expected to be absent, or methodically looked up almost every word in the text being analysed. The second group found more inadequacies than the first [method described; table showing distribution of items – nearly 80 per cent of which were recommended for insertion; sample of additions.]

INTERPRETING

77–306 Barik, Henri C. Types of translation departures and other linguistic events occurring in simultaneous interpretation. *ITL* (Louvain), **33** (1976), 45–58.

In simultaneous interpretation, the interpreter's version may depart from the original in three general ways: material may be omitted, added or substituted

by the interpreter. An analysis of translations obtained from three classes of interpreters (professionals, students and amateurs) permits the categorisation of these events. Four categories of omissions (skipping, comprehension, delay and compounding omissions), four categories of additions (qualifier, elaboration, relationship and closure additions), and five categories of substitutions or errors (varying degrees of semantic or phrasing changes) are specified, and examples of each type are given. Other linguistic events occurring in simultaneous interpretation are discussed.

TRANSLATION

77–307   **Newmark, Peter.** A tentative preface to translation: methods, principles, procedures. *Audio-Visual Language Journal* (Birmingham), **14**, 3 (1976/7), 161–9.

Translation is the attempt to replace a written message in one language by the same message in another language. This objective can most nearly be attained by two translation methods, (1) communicative translation, which attempts to make the second reader respond as nearly like the first reader as possible (equivalent effect principle) and (2) semantic translation, which attempts to render the exact meaning of the original ('literal' translation). [Other translation methods are noted.] Twenty-nine principles which apply to semantic and communicative translation are discussed.

77–308   **Pergnier, Maurice.** L'envers des mots. [The reverse side of words.] *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* (Paris), **24** (1976), 92–126.

The term 'translation' is used to refer equally to equivalences of *parole* (i.e. of messages) and of *langue* (i.e. of words). It is possible to study, from a purely structural point of view, the linguistic conditions in which the translation of messages operates. The object of the study is to show that the evaluation of message equivalences in translation cannot be based on a simple substitutability of the *signifiés* of two languages; and to examine why the untranslatability of the words of two languages does not necessarily lead to the impossibility of translating messages between those languages.

The comparison of *signes* from two languages shows that they are differentially polysemic [examples]. The *signe* not only has a sense but a value which it derives from its participation in a system. The application of structural description to the lexis has not been easy or successful. The different levels at which the systematic relations and differences of lexical items can be defined lend themselves to the establishment of different structural models. The author examines the notions in their original Saussurean formulation [discussion, using as examples the items *mouton* and 'sheep'].

245

Such polysemic items as *tableau* make necessary a distinction between 'designation', a symbolic relation between sign and one or more concepts, and 'signification', a semantic invariant. The distinction makes possible explanation of the paradox that a sign may be translatable although not transposable [discussion, using 'record' and *disque*]. Associations are important to the meaning of words. A useful classificatory distinction is that of Trier's 'conceptual fields' and 'lexical fields'. At the lexical level the translation problem arises from the possibility of conceptual fields converging.

Rather than demonstrating the impossibility of translation the study shows that translation necessitates the insertion of a term in the appropriate conceptual field and an exploration of both the implicit and explicit content of the message.

SEMIOTICS

77–309 **Losev, A. F.** Специфика языкового знака в связи с пониманием языка как непосредственной действительности мысли. [The specification of the linguistic sign in relation to the conception of language as the direct representation of thought.] *Серия литературы и языка* (Moscow), **35**, 5 (1976), 395–407.

The linguistic sign is specified in relation to a series of theses which are proposed and exemplified. These are: (1) the linguistic sign is an act of human thought. (2) Every linguistic sign is an act of human thought, reflecting a particular system of relationships is the designated object, once created, exists to an independently existing object. (3) Every linguistic sign, reflecting a particular system of relatinships in the designated object, once created, exists independently, both with respect to thought, and to objective reality in terms of the object, as a designation of which it was first created. (4) Every linguistic sign is an interpretative act, both with respect to instances of thought, and to corresponding instances of reality. These theses are applied to instances of language at different grammatical levels (word and sentence), and the similarities and differences between grammatical and logical predications are explored, especially relations between logical and grammatical subjects and logical and grammatical predicates.

77–310 **Losev, A. F.** О бесконечной смысловой валентности языкового знака. [On the infinite semantic valency of the linguistic sign.] *Сериа литературы и языка* (Moscow), **36**, 1 (1977), 3–8.

The position is defended that grammatical forms as such have infinite semantic potentiality, reduced only by contextual and intonational factors. Each linguistic sign is said to be an act of thought, so its potentiality reflects the infinite

variability of human thought, which in turn, it is claimed, reflects the infinite variety of reality.

It is concluded that on the one hand language is directly related to thought (rather than being *about* thought, for example) but is distinct from thought, this distinctness being reflected in the independent laws of historical development of language. Asemantic linguistic structuralism is said to have the severe limitation that it equates language with its structure, while in fact language only *has* a structure. [This conclusion also applies to a previous article – *see abstract* 77–309.]

77–311 **Wunderli, Peter.** Umfang und Inhalt des Semiologiebegriffs bei Saussure. [The scope and content of Saussure's concept of semiology.] *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* (Geneva), **30** (1976), 33–68.

On the basis of the available primary sources an inventory of all the semiological systems mentioned by Saussure is given. What distinguishes those various systems and what they have in common is then examined. When the similarities of semiological systems are emphasised, semiology according to Saussure becomes a special theory of a broader subject, namely social institutions. It is a definition of these institutions that their units are signs, i.e. compounds of *signifiant* and *signifié*. A deliberate step beyond Saussure is made when semiology is distinguished from semiotics. They differ in that semiology deals with artificial signs only, which are to a certain extent, if not completely, arbitrary, whereas semiotics would include, in addition, natural signs called 'indices' here. Semiology will then have to be considered not only a special branch of the theory of social institutions, but also a special branch of semiotics. Hence, semiology turns out to be a combination of semiotics and the theory of social institutions, such that semiotics provides the basic concept of a sign, with its double-faced character of *signifiant* and *signifié*, while the arbitrariness and changeability of signs derives from their being part of socially institutionalised forms of behaviour.