

Language and linguistics

LINGUISTIC THEORY

- 75-77 **Dascal, M. and Margalit, A.** A new 'revolution' in linguistics? – 'Text-grammars' vs. 'sentence grammars'. *Theoretical Linguistics* (Berlin), 1, 1/2 (1974), 195-213.

In *Some aspects of text-grammars* (Mouton, 1972), van Dijk claims that a grammar should account for the fact that speakers are aware of coherence between sentences within texts; hence a text-grammar, which specifies rules for generating coherent texts, will be superior to the traditional sentence-grammar that merely generates sentences. But van Dijk fails completely to specify rules distinct from those existing in sentence-grammars that are at the same time descriptively adequate. [His account of definitisation, pronominalisation, and presupposition are examined here.] His discussion of the 'plans' underlying texts, and of the 'naturalness' of text-grammars is also inconsequential; so there is no justification for claiming that (existing) text-grammars offer an alternative to sentence-grammars, and *a fortiori* there are no grounds for preferring them. [References.]

- 75-78 **Fraser, B.** An examination of the performative analysis. *Papers in Linguistics* (Champaign, Ill), 7, 1/2 (1974), 1-40.

Ross has presented a battery of syntactic arguments to show that the matrix of every deep structure containing a declarative (and by extension, all deep structures) is a performative sentence of the form I+PERFORMATIVE VERB+YOU+s. Many of Ross's arguments are examined in detail and shown to be either too loose, too tight or simply false. Other claims for the performative analysis by the Lakoffs, Bach and Baker are similarly criticised; and the problem of representing speech acts in grammars remains unsolved. [References.]

- 75-79 **Hodge, Robert and Kress, Günther.** Transformations, models and processes: towards a more usable linguistics. *Journal of Literary Semantics* (The Hague), 3 (1974), 5-21.

It is argued that the diagrams in Chomsky's formulation of TG conceal the truth that the theory has only a rudimentary and unmotivated account of the structure of the base, the structure of the basic syntactic units and the grammar. Transformations, seen as representing mental processes, are regarded as TG's most

usable contribution and one that needs rescuing from an unhelpful dependence on an inadequate base. Transformational analysis should be regarded as a strategy for arriving at a definition of the base. Linguistic theory should simultaneously be about language and the mind. Whorf's contribution, a view of mind based on the assumption that perception and cognition proceed in terms of *Gestalten*, is commended. Halliday's grammar of transitivity incorporates Whorf in that it focuses on the notion of processes but it does not draw overt parallels between process types and mental processes. The authors sketch their own theory in terms of processes, motivated by the attempt to show the intimate connection between intellectual and linguistic models. [References.]

75-80 **Holenstein, E.** A new essay concerning the basic relations of language. *Semiotica* (The Hague), **12**, 2 (1974), 97-128.

A phenomenological account of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in language is presented, using association theory to explicate (semantic) sense relations, selection conditions on lexical items, and certain syntactic phenomena. The arbitrariness of the sign is questioned. It is proposed that the binary distinction between the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes of language be extended by a theory of four basic operations: differentiation, signification, selection and combination. This is justified as an explanation of aphasic states and poetical composition. [References.]

75-81 **Karttunen, L.** Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics* (Berlin), **1**, 1/2 (1974), 181-94.

The projection problem in the theory of presuppositions is rooted in the attempt to explicate the presuppositions of complex sentences. The problem disappears if we try to capture those contexts which satisfy the presuppositions of a sentence. Presuppositions should be seen as a set of constraints on successive sentences (including those which constitute a complex sentence) such that the current conversational context satisfies the presuppositions of the next sentence that increments it. Hence sentences are associated with their proper contexts of use. Any given sentence may introduce presuppositions that must be pragmatically inferred because they are not explicit in the linguistic form; such inferences reveal which contexts will satisfy the presuppositions of the given sentence. [References.]

75-82 **Lieb, H. H.** Grammars as theories: the case for axiomatic grammar (part I). *Theoretical Linguistics* (Berlin), **1**, 1/2 (1974), 39-115.

The requirements on a scientific grammar are different from those on, say, a pedagogic grammar; whether complete or partial it should be formulated as an

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

applied interpreted axiomatic theory in the language of predicate logic or set theory. No kind of TG presents a theory (of language) in the customary sense, because no TG makes explicit statements about language, only about symbolic systems. An outline of an axiomatic theory is presented and proposals made for combining theories; this is necessary because partial grammars must be combined with each other (no complete grammar is possible for practical reasons), a theory of grammar must be combined with the theory of language use it presupposes, the theory of language use with the theory of communication which it presupposes, and the latter with theories of psychology and sociology. Arguments in favour of axiomatic theory as a theory of grammar are adumbrated. [Index of technical terms. References.]

SEMANTICS

75–83 **Budagov, R. A.** Категория значения в разных направлениях современного языкознания. [The category of meaning in various directions of contemporary linguistics.] *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), 4 (1974), 3–20.

The problem of meaning receives radically different solutions from different contemporary linguistic schools, ranging from total exclusion (typical of American linguistics) to designation as the most important part of linguistics; Russian and Soviet linguists have, with few exceptions, not underrated the place of meaning in linguistic theory [examples]. Lexicographic practice further confirms the importance of meaning. Meaning, like other aspects of language, cannot be reduced to a set of relations, to the exclusion of substance. The claim that meaning is the whole of language is equally damaging, since it denies the study of the interaction of form and content. Although the distinction between linguistic and extralinguistic meaning is important, even within linguistics one must study the interaction of the two kinds of meaning. [Comparison with poetics.]

Although a given form may have a variety of meanings, this does not *a priori* or in practice exclude the possibility of its having a basic meaning. Formal methods are valuable in the study of meaning, but there are many semantic and other linguistic categories that cannot be formalised, and the interaction between the two types should be studied. [Summary.]

75–84 **Von Glaserfeld, Ernst.** 'Because' and the concepts of causation. *Semiotica* (The Hague), 12, 2 (1974), 129–44.

Aristotle's classification of causes ('material', 'formal', 'efficient' and 'final') is advanced as a schema for distinguishing the various functions of *because*.

'Material' and 'formal' causes are concerned with ontology and reflect a static conceptual situation. In a statement of the ontological relation between matter and being (Aristotle's 'material' causation), we do not find the use of *because* acceptable (e.g. *This statue is, because it is made of bronze*). *Because* can be used to mark a definitional or syllogistic relation ('formal' causation) but it introduces merely the speaker's justification for the statement in the other half of the sentence and in no way indicates an explanation of a state of affairs (e.g. *Socrates is mortal because he is a man*).

The conceptual situation underlying 'efficient' and 'final' causes is dynamic, involving change. Our concept of the causal relationship involved in 'efficient causation' depends entirely on inductive inference from cumulative experience [discussion and diagrammatic representations]. In 'efficient' cause statements, *because* introduces the specification of what brought about the state of affairs referred to in the other half of the statement. This is the only type where *A, because B* can be satisfactorily paraphrased *B causes A*. In 'final' cause statements the part of the sentence following *because* refers to a desired future result of the action in the other half of the sentence, which is seen as the 'efficient' cause of such a result. Here *A, because B* can be paraphrased *A, in order to B*. Many sentences remain, however, in which a knowledge of the situational context is also necessary in order to decide the function of *because*. [References.]

75–85 **Ruhl, C.** Semantic anaphora. *Papers in Linguistics* (Champaign, Ill), 7, 1/2 (1974), 205–38.

The treatment of anaphora (processes which under-represent semantic information in surface structure) in TG has been limited by strict conditions on deletion transformations, in particular the notion of recoverability, and the prohibited mention of specific lexical items on which the deletion rule operates. It is shown that there exists a vast amount of semantic material implicit in surface structures that cannot be accounted for under these conditions [many examples]. To deal with the problem, a set of 'coherence strategies' are informally described, employing pragmatic inference rules to make sense of sentences, alone and in combination (such as deciding whether parts of sentences like *John went to the store and bought some bread* have lexical or semantic material in common). These rules use situational as well as linguistic information. They will not apply to certain specialised constructions, like, for example, *she's expecting*, where the understood object *a baby* is an inference that must be learned like the sense of an idiom. Coherence strategies are necessary because natural language is not a logical object. [References.]

SOCIOLINGUISTICS

- 75-86 **Cooper, R. L. and Fishman, J. A.** The study of language attitudes. *Linguistics* (The Hague), 136 (1974), 5-19 [also *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (The Hague), 3 (1974), 5-19].

Hitherto, sociolinguists and attitude theorists have worked independently of one another, but sociolinguistics can provide important data and an empirical methodology for theories of language attitude. There are four kinds of issues in studying language attitude: the nature of attitude, the determinants of attitude, the effects of attitude, and the measurement of attitude. Studies on language attitudes in Israel are reported, covering each of these categories. [References.]

- 75-87 **Edwards, A. D.** Social class and linguistic interference. *Research in Education* (Manchester), 12 (1974), 71-80.

Popularisation of Bernstein's work, explaining working class 'underachievement' with reference to the social conditioning of patterns of speech and perception, has proved dangerously misleading. The different modes of speech which were claimed as typifying working- and middle-class children were not based on evidence, but inferred from theory. Criticism of Bernstein's work is made at two levels: the determinism of the early work, and possible weaknesses and ambiguities which remain. Three aspects of the later work are considered: (1) the generalisations about social class differences in socialisation, (2) the concept of sociolinguistic codes, and (3) the increasing awareness of the constraints of the immediate social context in which language is used. [References.]

- 75-88 **Frances, Hazel.** Social background, speech and learning to read. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* (London), 44, 3 (1974), 290-9.

Samples of the speech of infant-school children in a story recall task were analysed, and a moderately reliable measure of the structural complexity was devised. With this measure and with a standardised vocabulary test the language skills of children entering school from different social backgrounds were investigated. The relationship between speech and educational progress was explored with particular reference to learning to read. The speech of the socially disadvantaged children was rather less well developed than that of the advantaged, but at each testing during the first two years of schooling this difference lay in the frequency of use of various complex forms, not in their presence or absence. Differences between children within social groups were

considerable. Reading ability was related to vocabulary skill; but there was no correlation with speech structuring skill, which was generally adequate in both groups to support early reading.

- 75-89 Kraus, I.** К общим проблемам социолингвистики.
[General problems of sociolinguistics.] *Вопросы языкознания*
(Moscow), 4 (1974), 27-36.

Sociolinguistics has not yet become an established discipline with its own object of study and an elaborate methodology. It is an 'interdiscipline', finding its object of study in two spheres: the relationship of language to society, and the cognitive reflection of linguistic phenomena. Recent linguistic movements have played an important role in the study of social linguistic problems, for example, the introduction of empirical methods, the recognition of the importance of external social factors in the development of language, work on geographical and social dialects, functional styles, linguistic environments (e.g. bilingual contexts) and so on. Tasks ahead of sociolinguistics are the study of texts aimed at stimulating particular responses (e.g. propaganda, laws, etc.), the establishment of modern norms and usage and the attitudes of speakers to their language and linguistic environment, and the codification of the dynamics of the development of norms. A further aim is the regulation of linguistic development in the interests of more effective and rational communication. Modern sociolinguistics is not the first with experience in these fields [innovators in the sphere of literary language development are mentioned, and an analogy with classical rhetoric is claimed].

- 75-90 Starkey, Duncan, Jr.** On the structure of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns. *Language in Society* (London), 3, 2 (1974), 161-80.

The structure of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns was explored, using detailed transcriptions of language, paralinguistic, and body-motion behaviours displayed by both participants in dyadic, face-to-face conversations. On the basis of certain observed regularities in these behaviours, three signals were hypothesised: (a) a speaker within-turn signal, (b) an auditor back-channel signal, and (c) a speaker continuation signal. These signals were composed of various behaviours in language and in body motion. It was further hypothesised that the display of appropriate ordered sequences of these signals by both participants served to mark 'units of interaction' during speaking turns. [Conversational analysis; speaking turns; back-channel behaviours; interrelations of verbal and non-verbal behaviour; American English (Chicago).]

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS

- 75-91 **Wakefield, J. A., Jr., Doughtie, E. B. and Lee Yom, B.-H.** The identification of structural components of an unknown language. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* (New York), 3, 3 (1974), 261-9.

Adult subjects attempted to identify structures (words and constituents) in sentences of a language they did not know. They heard each sentence twice – once with a pause interrupting a structural component and once with a pause separating different structural components. They were asked to choose the version that sounded more natural. An experimental group of subjects who had previously been exposed to a spoken passage in the same language as the test sentence was more successful in identifying structures of the sentences than was the control group with previous exposure to another language. This result was interpreted as demonstrating that language structure may be partially acquired during a brief exposure without reliance on meaning. It was also noted that the experimental group identified constituents more accurately than words. This result suggested that constituents, more than words, function as acquisitional units of language.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

- 75-92 **Wells, Gordon.** Learning to code experience through language. *Journal of Child Language* (Cambridge), 1, 2 (1974), 243-69.

An attempt is made to explain how the child comes to relate his acquisition of the form of language with the categories that he is establishing in the organisation of his non-linguistic experience, by hypothesising a basis for language in prelinguistic cognitive development. The child's task is seen as being to match the organisation of language with the cognitive organisation that he has already imposed upon his experience. This is made possible, it is argued, because the organisation of meaning within the language system is closely related to the universal categories of early experience. Evidence from recordings of a small sample of children in the early stages of language acquisition is advanced in support of this hypothesis, and the results of the linguistic analysis are discussed in the light of findings from the Geneva school of developmental psychology. [References.]

PHONETICS

- 75-93 **Fromkin, Victoria A.** On the phonological representation of tone. *Working Papers in Phonetics* (Los Angeles, Cal), 27 (1974), 1-17.

To define a tone language as one in which pitch is used contrastively does not sufficiently constrain the theory of grammars, since it does not predict how pitch

can function grammatically. What are the criteria for distinguishing between tone and non-tone languages? [The views of Pike, Leben, McCawley and others are discussed.] Should tone be represented as a suprasegmental or segmental feature? Leben's view that tone is sometimes suprasegmental is supported, and attention is called to the special status of tone, as evidenced by young children's ability to imitate and respond to intonation patterns, the retention of tonal contours in aphasia, and the phenomena of certain word-games. Mapping of suprasegmental tone onto the segmental matrix varies from one language to another.

Phonetic contour tones are discussed with reference to the views of Hyman and Schuh, Mohr, Li and Gandour, and with examples from Yoruba, Mandarin, Chinese, Kru and Lue. Any feature system must allow for the representation, in such languages, of contours. What features are generally needed to represent tone either suprasegmentally or segmentally is not clear, but contrasts between level tones, contour tones, the relation between phonation types and tones, assimilatory tonological rules, natural tone classes, and tonal development and change must all be accounted for. Tone languages may be of two types: those in which underlying representation of formatives requires suprasegmental matrices and those in which tone must be represented segmentally. In some languages tonal rules need not refer to segmental features; in some, also, phonetic contours may be derived from level tones. [References.]

LEXICOLOGY

75-94 Baker, Lorian N. The lexicon: some psycholinguistic evidence. *Working Papers in Phonetics* (Los Angeles, Cal), **26** (1974), 1-132.

The thesis investigated is the form of lexical items stored in the brain and the structure of the lexicon. The following hypotheses are discussed: (a) the lexicon in TG competence models, (b) Brown and McNeill's argument that a lexical item is variously categorised and some of its structural features are more significant than others, (c) Wickelgren's lexicon constructed from unordered context-sensitive allophones, (d) Fromkin's lexicon of an indexed network of phonological, syntactic and semantic features, and (e) MacKay's hierarchically structured formal and semantic components of the lexicon. Three original experiments show that it is easier to think of a two-part word when the first part is given than when the final part is given, and that speakers are much more adept at retrieving words according to their initial consonant or consonant cluster [#C(C) -] and final vowel+consonant [- VC#] than according to initial consonant+vowel [#CV -], or the number of syllables, or the final syllable

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

(as distinct from – VC#). Evidence points to the formal structuring of lexical items in the brain and the grouping of them according to phonological shape of initial and final elements. Further evidence from aphasics, word association tests and slips of the tongue, suggests the grouping of lexical items within the brain into parts of speech and semantic sets; the sets consist of items related paradigmatically, not syntagmatically. [References.]