

中央广播电视大学继续教育教材

现代语言学 名著选读

下 册

编 者：刘 润 清
史蒂文·麦基
赵 桐 天
阎 晓 天

测绘出版社

中央广播电视大学继续教育教材

现代语言学名著选读

刘润清 史蒂文·麦基 编
赵 桐 闫 晓 天

下 册

Continuing Education Series
China Central Radio and Television University

**Readings in Linguistics:
Seventy-five Years since Saussure**

Volume Two

Edited by
Liu Runqing
Stephen R. Magee
Zhao Tong
Yan Xiaotian

现代语言学名著选读(下册)

刘润清 史蒂文·麦基
赵 桐 闫晓天

*

测绘出版社出版
测绘出版社印刷厂印刷
新华书店总店科技发行所发行

*

开本 787×1092 1/16·印张 35.5·字数 888 千字
1988 年 9 月第一版·1988 年 9 月第一次印刷
印数 0,001—8500 册·定价 9.50 元
ISBN 7-5030-0193-3/H·4

目 录

5	其他美国学派	(1)
	K. 派克:语言中的质点,波,和场	(3)
	K. 派克:《语言学概念:法位学语法引论》节选	(22)
	S. 兰姆:《层次语法纲要》节选	(30)
6	英国语言学	(64)
	J. R. 弗斯:个性与社会中的语言	(69)
	J. R. 弗斯:1930-1955 年间语言理论纲要	(85)
	韩礼德:《语法理论的范畴》节选	(121)
	韩礼德:结构的类型	(146)
	韩礼德:《语言与社会人》节选	(163)
7	心理语言学	(195)
	B. F. 斯金纳:《语言行为》节选	(198)
	N. 乔姆斯基:语言理论与语言学习	(203)
	E. H. 列尼伯格:从生物学角度看语言	(214)
	D. I. 斯洛宾:《心理语言学》节选	(231)
	J. A. 福特, T. G. 比维:语言切分的心理现实性	(279)
8	社会语言学	(290)
	J. A. 费什曼:语言社会学	(293)
	B. 伯恩斯坦:从社会语言学角度看语言学习	(304)
	W. 拉波夫:《社会语言学中的规律》节选	(324)
	P. 特鲁吉尔:《诺里奇英语的社会差异》节选	(362)
	D. H. 海姆斯:《交际民俗学初探》节选	(402)
9	语言学的发展趋势	(423)
	J. L. 奥斯汀:《论言有所为》节选	(429)
	J. R. 赛尔:《言语行为:语言哲学论文》节选	(470)
	J. R. 赛尔:言外行为的分类	(487)
	H. P. 格莱斯:逻辑与会话	(511)
	G. N. 利奇:语用学,语篇,文体学及“著名书信”	(529)
	参考书目	(548)

CONTENTS: VOLUME 2.

5 American Alternatives	(2)
K. L. Pike; Language as Particle, wave and Field	(5)
K. L. Pike; Excerpt from <i>Linguistic Concepts</i>	(22)
S. M. Lamb; Excerpt from <i>Outline of Stratificational Grammar</i>	(31)
6 British Linguistics	(66)
J. R. Firth; Personality and Language in Society	(70)
J. R. Firth; A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory, 1930—1955	(86)
M. A. K. Halliday; Excerpt from Categories of the Theory of Grammar	(123)
M. A. K. Halliday; Types of Structure	(147)
M. A. K. Halliday; Extracts from <i>Language as Social Semiotic</i>	(164)
7 Psycholinguistics	(196)
B. F. Skinner; Extracts from <i>Verbal Behavior</i>	(199)
A. N. Chomsky; Excerpt from <i>Aspects of the Theory of Syntax</i>	(204)
E. H. Lenneberg; A Biological Perspective of Language	(215)
D. I. Slobin; Extracts from <i>Psycholinguistics</i>	(232)
J. D. Fodor and T. G. Bever; The Psychological Reality of Linguistic Segments.	(280)
8 Sociolinguistics	(291)
J. A. Fishman; The Sociology of Language	(294)
B. Bernstein; Extracts from <i>Class, Codes and Control</i>	(305)
W. Labov; Extracts from <i>Sociolinguistic Patterns</i>	(325)
P. Trudgill; Extracts from <i>The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich</i>	(363)
D. Hymes; Toward Ethnographies of Communication; The Analysis of Communicative Events	(403)
9 Recent Trends	(425)
J. L. Austin; Extracts from <i>How to Do Things with Words</i>	(430)
J. R. Searle; Extracts from <i>Speech Acts</i>	(471)
J. R. Searle; Extracts from <i>Expression and Meaning</i>	(488)
H. P. Grice; Logic and Conversation	(512)
G. Leech; Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, Stylistics and "The Celebrated Letter"	(530)
BIBLIOGRAPHY	(548)

5 其他美国学派

虽然转换生成语法六七十年代曾在美国居统治地位,但其他学派一直存在,并且不断发展。结构主义语言学继续流传,以豪克特为代表人物(见第三章)。此外,法位学语法和层次语法也是颇有影响的学派。

法位学语法与美国结构主义语言学一脉相通,主要研究对语言的描写问题。其主帅和理论大师是肯尼思·派克。派克的观点不同于行为主义和结构主义,他对语言的看法更全面,研究范围更大;他不仅分析句子层次,而且分析大于句子的结构。起初,他的“法位”(即语法单位)只包括功能和形式两部分,后来也包括作用和接应,这对语篇分析有重要意义。

层次语法师承于欧洲功能主义学派,特别是丹麦学者耶姆斯列夫(见第二章)。层次语法的创始人是S.M.兰姆。他认为,语言不仅是一个关系系统,而且这些关系存大于不同的层次之中。兰姆和他的同事绘制了一套颇有独到之外的图形,可以清楚地说明不同层次上的关系系统,和层次与层次之间的关系系统。

尽管这些理论在风行一时的转换生语法面前有些逊色,但时至今日它们仍在发展之中。另外还有些理论尚未发展到如此成熟的地步,比如六十年代D.G.黑斯提出的“依存语法”。近几年来,美国又出现了一些新派别,大都派生于转换生成语法,如“弓行对语法”,“词汇功能语法”,“综合短语结构语法”等。目前,对这些新兴流派还很难作出中肯的评价,所以这里暂未选录他们的文章。

5. AMERICAN ALTERNATIVES

Although the paradigm of Transformational Grammar has come to predominate in the USA, other perspectives have persisted and developed. Apart from the older tradition of Structuralism, which continued notably through the work of C. F. Hockett (see chapter 3), Tagmemics and Stratificational Grammar deserve mention.

Tagmemics derives directly from the American structuralist tradition of being chiefly concerned with the practical business of the description of languages. Its driving force and principal theoretician is K. L. Pike. From an originally behaviouristic and structuralist perspective, Pike's views have developed to encompass a much broader conception of language and an analysis that recognises structural units beyond the level of the sentence. The original concept of the "tagmeme" as a combination of both function and form has expanded to include the ideas of role and cohesion which are so essential to the analysis of discourse.

Stratificational Grammar, on the other hand, owes a greater debt to the European functionalist tradition in linguistics and especially to the emphasis placed on relationships by the Danish linguist, Hjelmslev (see chapter 2). The driving force behind the stratificational view has been S. M. Lamb. He viewed language not only as a system of relationships but as stratified or consisting of a set of levels. Lamb and his co-workers have developed a highly original representational system to capture the postulated arrangement of interconnecting systems both on and between the different strata.

While these views were undoubtedly eclipsed by the rising star of Transformational Grammar, they are still being developed to this day. Others have not come so far, for example, the work on Dependency Grammar started in the 1960's by D. G. Hays. There are, of course, other theories that have arisen even more recently in the USA, but these are to a large extent derived from a transformational generative perspective on linguistic theory. These include the work done on Arc Pair Grammar, Lexical-Functional Grammar and Generalised Phrase Structure Grammar. It would be extremely difficult to put such relatively recent innovations into perspective yet and, in consequence, they have not been included in this edition.

语言中的质点,波和场

K·派克

编者评述:

派克是法位学语法的创始人,三十年来一直是该学派的主要理论家。他任暑期语言学讲习所所长多年,现任其名誉所长。他的观点影响了数以千计的语言工作者,而这些学者研究着世界上边远地区的数百种从来未被描写过的语言。法位学理论不仅广泛用于语言描写,而且用于翻译,用于创造文字系统。

法位学理论不同于其他语言理论,它试图解释整个人类行为,语言行为只是其中的一部分。派克认为,人类研究事物时,总是把自己纳入研究之中,影响着对事物的观察。例如,我们可以把事物看成“质点”,即互不相联的、固定不变的实体;也可以看成“波”,即互相联系的事物构成一个延续体;也可以看成“场”,即把事物连结在一起的各种关系。观察语言时,这三个角度分别为静态角度,动态角度和功能角度。派克认为,结构主义语言学过分注重静态角度,忽视了动态和功能角度所能观察的语言事实。为了克服这种弱点,派克提出了“法位”的理论。

起初,派克认为,“法位”由轨位和类别构成。就是说,一个语法单位有两种特征:一是轨位,即出现位置,一是所属类别,即可替换单位的类别。后来,派克进一步发展了“法位”的概念,把它定义为语境中的单位(见第二篇选文)。现在,一个法位有四个特征:轨位,类别,作用,接应。轨位仍指由某种类别来填充的位置。类别是可在该位置上出现的一组单位。作用指一个单位与其他轨位上的单位的相关意义。接应指各种成分如何连结在一起。

派克认为,语言有三个相互关联的等级系统。第一,语音单位与其所在结构之间的部分对整体的关系是音位等级系统,包括音,音节,重读群,停顿群,修辞停顿等层次。第二,词汇或类似词的单位(从词素一直到对话)与其所在结构之间的部分对整体的关系,是语法等级系统。具体地讲,这个系统有五个语法层次,各与所表达的意义相对应:

意 义	最小单位	扩大单位
社会交往	一问一答	谈 话
主题发展	段落或句群	独 白
命 题	子 句	句 子
名 称	词	短 语
词汇成分	词 素	词素群

第三,所指等级系统是语言与客观现实的相交处。一个有目的事件或实体,可在语言中有几种不同的表达方式,可以是一个词,也可以是一句话。其意义是一个概念,不同的表达方式是一个释义集。概念和释义集之间的关系,构成语言的所指等级系统。三个等级系统中的每个层次,都可以用法位来分析。

派克一直注重分析大于句子的单位。他的“场”、“语境”和“所指”等概念都超出句子的范围。他的理论都不受句子的限制。他常用“语篇世界”来概括所指系统的总体框架,任何语言事件都离不开它。语篇世界可以包括主题,文体,体裁,学科,以及说话人和听话人之间的预示。这是接应特征存在的基础。

在第一篇选文中,派克阐述了“质点”、“波”和“场”的理论,以及如何用来分析语言。第二篇选文详细介绍了法位的轨位、类别、作用和接应等四大特征。

派克的著作很多,主要的专著有:《语言与人类行为结构统一理论的关系》(1954),《派克文选》(1972),《语法分析》(1977),(与夫人伊夫林·派克合著),《法位语法导论》(1982),《语篇与法位》(1983)(与夫人伊夫林·派克合写)。

KENNETH LEE PIKE

Language as Particle, Wave and Field. In The Texas Quarterly Vol. 2 (1959). Reprinted in Pike: Selected Readings. R. M. Brend ed. Mouton (1972).

Kenneth L. Pike is the principal proponent of Tagmemics. He is both the founder of the school and over the past thirty years has been its major theoretician. Pike was for many years the president of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and is currently its president emeritus. His views, as a result, have influenced many thousands of language workers who have dealt with hundreds of hitherto undescribed languages in remote areas all over the world. Tagmemic theory has been the instrument not only of a significant body of linguistic description but has also been applied to the devising of writing systems and to translation.

Tagmemics is a unique theory in the sense that it attempts to account for verbal behaviour as but one aspect of human behaviour as a whole. Pike believes that when man studies things, he imposes part of himself onto, or injects himself into, their definitions. We may perceive things as particles — entities that are separable, stable and motionless; or as waves — not entities that are separated but that belong in some kind of continuum; or as fields — sets of relationships by which things are linked to one another. Pike refers respectively to these as the Static, Dynamic and Functional perspectives and he maintained that much structuralist linguistics focused too much attention on the static, particle perspective (see first selection below) to the detriment of the wider possibilities offered by adopting dynamic and functional perspectives as well. To compensate for this, Pike developed his view of the "tagmeme".

In his earlier work, Pike defined the tagmeme as a slot-class correlative. In other words, the tagmeme represented a combination of a slot or position (i. e. the syntagmatic aspect) and the class of mutually substitutable items (i. e. the paradigmatic aspect) that could fill that position. More recently, Pike has put forward a more broadly based notion of the tagmeme as the unit in context (see second selection below). The tagmeme now has four facets; slot, class, role and cohesion. As before, slot refers to the position filled by any particular class. Class is the set of items that can stand in that position. Role concerns the relevance of any item in that class to the other sets in the whole being analysed. And cohesion refers to how all the various parts are tied together.

Pike holds that language has three interrelated hierarchies. The relationships of sounds to their including syllables, stress groups, pause groups and rhetorical periods comprise the phonological hierarchy. Items or sequences of items, from the level of the morpheme upwards to the conversation, and the relationships of the included parts to the including patterns constitute the grammatical hierarchy. More specifically, for Pike this hierarchy consists of five paired grammatical levels defined according to the type of meaning they express (see below). Finally, the referential hierarchy is seen as the interface between language and reality. A purposeful event or entity can be represented in language in various different ways from the word to the complex statement. The meaning of such an

event or entity is a concept and the different ways of referring to it are called its paraphrase set. The interrelationships obtaining between these concepts and their paraphrase sets comprise the referential hierarchy. Each level within each hierarchy, can be analysed in terms of its comprising tagmemes.

GRAMMATICAL HIERARCHY

<u>MEANING</u>	<u>MINIMUM UNIT</u>	<u>EXPANDED UNIT</u>
<i>Social Interaction</i>	<i>Exchange</i>	<i>Conversation</i>
<i>Theme-Development</i>	<i>Paragraph/Sentence Cluster</i>	<i>Monolog</i>
<i>Proposition</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Sentence</i>
<i>Term</i>	<i>Word</i>	<i>Phrase</i>
<i>Lexical Package</i>	<i>Morpheme</i>	<i>Morpheme Cluster</i>

Pike has for long recognised the importance of units of analysis above the level of the sentence. His concepts of field, context and reference go beyond the sentence. His views draw no theoretical barrier at the sentential level. Pike has often talked of the universe of discourse by which he refers to the general frame of reference, whether temporary or more permanent, against which any piece of communication takes place. It includes topic, style, genre, discipline and speaker/hearer expectations. It reflects the cohesive aspect of any tagmeme of the referential hierarchy.

In the paper below, Pike expands his ideas of particle, wave and field and outlines how they may be applied to the analysis of language. In the second excerpt, he details his conception of the four-cell tagmeme.

Pike's numerous works include "Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior" (1954), "Selected Writings" (1972), with E. G. Pike "Grammatical Analysis" (1977). "Linguistic Concepts: An Introduction to Tagmemics" (1982) and with E. G. Pike "Text and Tagmeme" (1983).

What is the nature of language? What are its parts? How is the structure of language related to structural problems in other areas of investigation?

Language, in my view, can be viewed profitably from three distinct standpoints. One of these is traditional, and views language as made up of PARTICLES—'things', pieces, or parts, with sharp borders. The second view is not at all thought of in lay circles perhaps, and is largely neglected on the technical front. This second view treats language as made up, not of parts which are separated one from the other and added like bricks on a row, but rather as being made up of WAVES following one another. This

second view is one which I have recently been developing, and leads to some very stimulating insights as to the nature of language structure. A third view consists in viewing structure as a total FIELD. Technicians have studied semantic fields as part of language, but the handling of the concept systematically in terms of the more ordinary structuring of sentences has not even been attempted. Some components which could enter such a possible view, however, have been developed for other purposes, and I have found the concept fruitful in certain practical situations of applied linguistics.

These three views of language can be summarized in different terms. Language, seen as made up of particles, may be viewed as if it were STATIC—permanent bricks juxtaposed in a permanent structure, or as separate ‘frames’ in a moving-picture film. The view of language made up of waves sees language as DYNAMIC—waves of behavioral movement merging one into another in intricate, overlapping, complex systems. The view of language as made up of field sees language as FUNCTIONAL, as a system with parts and classes of parts so interrelated that no parts occur apart from their function in the total whole, which in turn occurs only as the product of these parts in functional relation to meaningful social environment.

It is extraordinary that in the twentieth century we should still be viewing language almost entirely from a static, particle-like view rather than in a dynamic fashion. Only recently have approaches of a dynamic type begun to appear. In my own work the insistence on a wavelike hierarchical blending and fusion of units is designed in part to fill this gap. In the so-called ‘prosodic’ approach in London, developed by Firth and his colleagues, there are also dynamic elements.

In spite of the importance of the wave and field concepts of language we shall first, however, discuss the structure of language as made up of particles, since it is easiest for us to grasp psychologically, closest to the lay view of language, and most fully developed in technical exposition. (Later, we will affirm that each of the three views must be retained, supplementing one another, if we wish to preserve an empirically and theoretically adequate view of language.) This particle view reflects a common-sense attitude; Language is made up of words, with sharp boundaries between them. A language, for some people, would appear to be ideally comprised of a dictionary. Once one has the dictionary of a language one seems to have under control the heart of the language, if one thinks in this way. This view appears to be very common in some areas of our culture.

A more sophisticated particle view aims at an analysis of great simplicity. It attempts to reduce high-level language structures to combinations of a few small units in more and more restricted groupings. The unit chosen is the sound—the PHONEME—or a component of a phoneme. If one has a list of the sounds and the possible restrictions on the combination of these sounds, one is assumed to know the structure of the lan-

guage. This view — though I have oversimplified it — has had high prestige in the United States in the past few years.

Harris has attempted, for example, to study the combinatorial structure of language without reference to meaning and has attempted to go as far as possible in finding the lexical units — the MORPHEMES — by purely distributional techniques. That is, by studying the fashion in which one sound may follow another, he has tried to arrive at successive groupings of sounds in structurally significant combinations on higher and higher levels of organization until the words and sentences are analyzed without reference to the meaning or identification of the morphemes or words or sentences as such. For example, after a sequence of sounds such as represented by the English letters *I th-o-u-g-h-t th-*, there are only a few specific letters which could follow, such as *a* of the word *that*. (The scholars referred to, however, would be very careful to handle such a problem in reference to the pronounced sounds, not in reference to spelling by letters.) Here, then, is a 'thing-centered' view of language, but with the particular parts made up of small sound units rather than of word units. It tends towards a philosophical reductionism, with sounds or sound components as the ultimate and only primitive units and with all other units as merely combinations of these in a distributional relationship.

This view has been very fruitful in stimulating linguistic discussion and development. Some of us feel, however, that characteristics inherent in language structure will prevent its complete fulfillment. (The pendulum has in the last year or two begun to swing for these authors, however, away from complete rejection of meaning to a basic reliance upon it in specified areas of study. Harris, for example, now treats of some grammatical problems in which a basic constant necessary to identify the relations between, for example, *John hit Bill* and *Bill was hit by John* is a retention of certain lexical meanings. He appears to avoid destroying his earlier work — that based on an attempted rejection of meaning-relevance in grammar — by a semantic device. He calls the one type 'combinatorial' or 'descriptive' grammar, and the kind based on meaning relations 'transform' grammar. In my view, a synthesis of these extremes into a single hierarchical approach would seem to reflect the data more effectively.) Most linguists have not in practice attempted as formally 'rigorous' an analysis of language into meaningless discrete parts as this latter view seems to imply (with 'rigor' used in a mathematical sense as 'nonintuitive' — rather than as 'coherent, consistent presentation of the data'). Nevertheless, the development of the analysis both of the phoneme and of the morpheme is very intricate, very extensive, and represents one of the greatest achievements of twentieth-century linguistic science.

A phoneme may include within its various pronunciations a large number of different varieties of pronunciation. The *t* at the beginning of the word *time*, for example, is much different from the single consonant sound in the middle of an American pro-

nunciation of *Betty* (which in turn is very different from the pronunciation of the *t* in *bought*). (The first has a puff of breath following it, the second is made by a quick flip of the tongue, and the last may be heard sometimes as cut off rather sharply at the end of an utterance.) Some scholars, however, prefer to work more extensively with a unit smaller than the phoneme as the basic unit, namely one or more of the components which make up the phoneme, as atoms can make up a molecule. The sound *d*, for example, has a component of voicing—produced by the vibrating vocal chords—as well as a component of mouth closure by tongue tip, plus a component of nasal passage closure by the soft palate, and so on.

The second unit, the morpheme, would include such lexical items as *boy*, *dog*, *house*, and, in addition, meaningful lexical units such as the suffix *-s* of *cups* or the prefix *un-* of *unpleasant*. Morphemes, like phonemes, have been studied heavily in reference to their varieties. The plural suffix *-s* of *cups*, for example, occurs in a special form *-es*, in *houses*, and in further forms in *feet*, *children*, and *data*. The development of techniques to discover, describe, and systematize the phonemic and morphemic variants has required a great deal of research by some of the most competent linguistic scholars of our generation and is by no means finished.

While still keeping within the view of language as made up of parts, pieces, or units, a third small unit, it appears to me, must be postulated. This is a unit of grammar, comparable to the units of phonology and lexicon just discussed. Some of my recent research has been the introduction of TAGMEME unit into linguistic theory, on a par with the phoneme and the morpheme. (The term itself is given to us by Bloomfield, although his particular attempt to define, describe, or isolate such a unit has not been fruitful and has not entered into current linguistic theory or practice.) The new concept (of the same name) has already proved helpful in analyzing languages in field situations. The layman would recognize some such units or unit classes if he were told, for example, that there may be in an English sentence several kinds of subject, each of which is a separate tagmeme. Thus a subject-as-actor unit in the sentence *John came home* would be one tagmeme, whereas subject-as-person-affected would be a distinct tagmeme in the sentence *John was hit by Bill*.

In my current researches I am applying to such units the same kind of linguistic development which has been so successfully applied to the phoneme and morpheme. Variants of tagmemes occur just as one finds variants of phonemes and morphemes. A subject variant, for example, might be a simple one such as *John* in the sentence just quoted, or a complex subject in a sentence such as *My big Johnny came home yesterday*. Both the simple subject and complex subject here are variants of the English subject-as-actor tagmeme. The tagmeme concept, it should be noted, resists the reductionism of language structure to meaningless sounds. It points in the direction both of preserving a meaning-

ful lexical unit and of introducing a meaningful grammar unit as primitive terms in linguistic theory.

The structure of a complex word in the Candoshi language of northern Peru may serve to illustrate the way morpheme, phoneme, and tagmeme pieces function together. (The data utilized are chosen from those published by Doris Cox in the *International Journal of American Linguistics* and by Lorrie Anderson and me in *Lingua Posnamiensis*.) In the word *kopáako* 'She washes' the consonants and vowels are quite audible and easily analyzed with an 'ordinary' (from the English viewpoint) stress on the first part of the second syllable. A few 'special' sounds, however, occur in the language. The phrase 'She cooks', for example, differs from the one quoted only by the fact that the first vowel is whispered rather than spoken aloud. We may write that vowel with a capital latter thus: *kOpáako*. Only once elsewhere in the history of the world, in the information which has reached me, has careful documentation been published of this phenomenon; this other instance concerns the Comanche of Oklahoma, as found in the researches of Canonge. (Such differences are highly important to Bible translators, such as Cox and Anderson, in pairs of words such as these, in passages like Revelation 1:5 "[Christ] washed us from our sins in His own blood". In a head-shrinking or cannibal culture these must not be confused!)

±	±	±	+(干	±	±	±)	±	+	±
-ia	-ya	-ran	-k	-ma	-ch	-sha	-t	-i	-ya
locative	recent	past	indicative	durative	incomplete	2nd order	individ- ualizer	1st person sg.	emphatic
-mpa	-la		-r	-shan	-nch	-masi		-ish	-pa
inten- sive	punctil- iar		current	movement	complete	1st order		2nd person sg.	potential
				-lar				-o	-sha
				habitual				3rd person sg.	negative
				-ts				-ini	-a
				possible				1st person pl.	interrog- ative
								-is	
								2nd person pl.	
								-ana	
								3rd person pl.	
								-ich	
								impersonal	

Fig. 1. Chart of independent indicative suffixes.

The consonants and vowels make up the parts which, going together, produce words. Compare the word *táyanchshatana* which means 'I have stayed there then'. It is made up of the parts *tá* (the stem, 'to be'); *ya* 'recently'; *nch* 'completely'; *sha* 'next'; *t* 'individually'; *a* 'I'; *na* 'emphatically'; — that is, 'Emphatically-I-individually-next-completely-and-recently-was-there'.

In turn these morphemes, made up of phonemes, are members of classes of morphemes which are replaceable in particular slots in a potential structure. The combination of such a functional slot, along with the class of morphemes which can fill that slot, makes up one of the tagmemes interior to the verb. Note the chart of independent indicative suffixes (Fig. 1), which suggests how (with certain unimportant exceptions) words — among them the word quoted — can be made on this particular 'mapping' pattern. The \pm on the chart means that a particular class is optional in the verb. The \mp followed by \pm within the parentheses indicates that some one or more of these classes must be represented. A + indicates obligatory occurrence of some member of the class in every word of that type. In the particular form quoted, furthermore, certain special sub-varieties of these morphemes occur. In our illustration above, for example, the first person instead of being represented by the vowel *-i* is represented *-a* (which is found always replacing *-i* after the *t*), while the normal variety *-ya* 'emphatic', is replaced following *i* by a variety spelled *-na*, which is especially restricted to its occurrence there.

With some special restrictions, any morpheme can be chosen from its respective column to go toward making up a word.

Other quite different mapping must be made for independent desiderative suffixes, independent imperative suffixes, independent optative suffixes, dependent conditional suffixes, and nonpersonal dependent suffixes.

The tagmemes in the chart are represented (1) by the column (which indicates the functional positions of the suffixes), correlated (2) with the particular class of morphemes listed in that column. For the learning of the language, such a chart provides the morphemes and tagmemes upon which practical substitution drills can be based for the assimilation of the language structure.

The minimal particles — phoneme, morpheme, tagmeme — are not the only 'particles', however, which some of us treat as basic. Each of the three is rather, in a hierarchical view of language, merely the smallest unit of several units in an increasing complexity of organization leading to larger and larger units. The phonological minimal unit of sound (the phoneme) is part of a larger phonological unit which may be called the SYLLABLE.

In much of the technical linguistics in America during the past two decades, however, due to a phonological reductionism and nonhierarchical treatment, the syllable has either been denied theoretical status or ignored in theoretical treatments. It is only within

the last few years that this unit, so well known to the layman, has begun to be handled in our country by more structural theoreticians. The reason for this has been a kind of reductionism which has wished to eliminate all higher level units of complexity as primitive terms (although occasionally they replace these units, in description, with units of the same name which were defined merely as aggregations of sequences of lower level units; that is to say, that the term SYLLABLE while appearing in such writings would be treated not as a new KIND of unit, but merely as the resultant of specific distributions of sounds which gave the characteristic effect we call syllables). A scholar by the name of Stetson for many years objected to this, but only recently has his work had the impact necessary to force a few structuralists to begin to work the syllable into their theories as both a physiological and distributional element.

Above and beyond the syllable in size and complexity within the phonological hierarchy lie other units. These include the stress group (or rhythm unit), the pause group, and other units with phonological characteristics such as the rhetorical period.

In a hierarchical approach we assume that the morpheme is at the base of a lexical hierarchy, distinct from the phonological hierarchy in structure. Groups of morphemes make up specific words on a higher level of that hierarchy. Thus *boy* plus *-s* makes up the word *boys*.

For the layman, some of the most easily seen units on the next levels of the lexical hierarchy are idioms. *To step on the gas* is a high-level unit of the lexical hierarchy. It differs from a different kind of high unit, *putting one's foot on top of the gasoline*. Still higher in this same hierarchy are items like sonnets, limericks, and other integrated specific verbal pieces.

The grammatical hierarchy, on the other hand, may be illustrated as proceeding from a particular kind of subject (but with the particular subject unspecified—whether it be *John*, *Bill*, *Joe*) to a higher unit such as a subject-predicate complex which makes up a clause. Clauses in turn make up complex sentences, and so on. The problem of distinguishing between the lexical and grammatical hierarchies is a very technical one which is crucial to this point of view—but which at the moment seems to be more in doubt from the point of view of the technician than from that of the layman. I shall not set forth here the intricate arguments which I have been developing to attempt to make the essentiality of this distinction clear to my colleagues.

Thus far it has been difficult to show how modern linguistics and current literary criticism have much in common, although some scholars such as Hill and Jakobson have attempted to exploit this area. It seems to me clear, however, that once linguistics turns its attention more fully to higher hierarchical levels, it will begin to look at many of the problems which have taken part of the attention of literary scholars. In some of their formal aspects, linguistics study and literary study of such high-level units might mutu-