(1983/2017). In A. Bunger (Ed.)., *Special volume: Reissue of Innovations in Linguistic Education Volume 3. IULC Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 17, No. 4.

TOWARDS A COURSE IN CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS*

Louise Vasvari Fainberg

State University of New York
at Stony Brook

There can be no question that teachers must be well-informed both about the structure of the languages they are teaching and about language in general; it is our firm belief that contrastive analysis is the best tool for this purpose. Whether or not CA is useful as a methodology in a given language teaching context is a totally separate question (and one that will not be treated here) from its utility in training teachers to understand the workings of language.[1] Unfortunately, most textbook writers and language teachers alike continue to be ignorant of ANY applications of linguistics to language teaching. In the majority of foreign language classrooms in both secondary schools and colleges, while there is little conscious methodology of any sort, there is much sporadic and non-systematic implicit contrastive grammatical instruction, much of it based on the false generalization of normative grammar, and not infrequently on blatant absurdities.[2] As Hall (1968) aptly puts it, the 'traditional lore' that passes for grammar presents the problem that contrastive grammatical analysis must have as its task not simply to contrast the native and TL but must go through at least a threefold process: it must first contrast normative school grammars with the way English actually works and then contrast this, in turn, with the way the TL works, again, opposed to what that language's school texts say about it.[3]

It is not our aim in this paper to defend CA against the various charges[4] hurled against it as a methodology but simply to illustrate its inestimable utility for linguistic analysis, for the elucidation of points of conflict between languages, and, ultimately for the understanding of underlying principles as well. It will certainly depend on many factors of a given teaching situation how much, if any, explicitly contrastive explanations teachers may eventually want to apply in the classroom.

Contrastive analysis has obtained less favor than its potential utility might merit for two fundamental reasons. First, the majority of contrastive studies, due in part to the initial association of CA with structural linguistics and a behavioristic model of language acquisition, have paid almost exclusive attention to strictly surface differences between NL and TL. Although for teachers the most useful eventual applications of CA may well be to help them elucidate surface phenomena in a non-normative way, they will be unable to gain a

sufficient understanding of the working of language in general, that is, they will be lacking any theoretical framework, if the study of interlanguage surface contrasts is not coupled with an examination of underlying language universals. A second reason for the too limited utilization of CA is that too much of what is published continues to emphasize its methodological aspects at the cost of providing detailed analysis. A case in point is the recent *Contrastive Analysis* by Carl James (1980). On the one hand, it is a very useful work in bringing together the bibliography of the last two decades, and, for the neophyte, in explaining clearly what CA is. In addition, particularly useful is its integration of discourse analysis as part of CA. However, most of the actual illustrative examples presented are rather elementary and culled from a very limited number of languages.[5] For example, the concept of LEXICAL SPLIT (the term is not used by James) is illustrated (p. 155) only by Eng. *know* and *leave* contrasted with Ger. *kennen/wissen* and Spn. *salir/dejar*, respectively. It is unlikely that teachers acquainted with these languages would not already be aware of these basic facts. What is needed is to build on them in discussing other, less obvious splits and to analyze the relation of these semantic features to, say, syntactic constraints (see the discussion further in this article). So, while James' work is a useful synthesis, as a text on CA it can only provide a first step.[6] The instructor using it needs to supplement it by integrating available contrastively-oriented studies in a variety of languages (for which task James' bibliography is quite useful) with other, more 'straight' linguistic, theoretically oriented studies, such as many of the pieces appearing in Greenberg (1963), Greenberg (1978), or works like that of, say, Kramsky (1972).

The purpose of this article is to offer a series of illustrative examples, plus some bibliographical hints (both culled from a recent graduate course taught on CA), in an attempt to propose a rather incipient model of CA from the universalist point of view. Although the focus will be on contrasting English with a number of other languages, it is our feeling that a similar type of analysis can profitably be applied to first language teaching, particularly to the teaching of the standard written code to speakers of various geographic and social dialects.

It has been our experience that while students do not necessarily need to be familiar with the given languages exemplifying a certain feature (indeed, this is impossible, given the varied linguistic background of our students), in a theoretically oriented CA course it is most useful not to confine the examples to only two languages, as is done in the overwhelming majority of CA studies. On the other hand, we have found it most profitable to utilize examples from languages in which we ourselves were well-versed. This is important in order to avoid a major drawback of some of the articles oriented towards universals where mistakes and inconsistence may occur in the data

pertaining to those languages about which the author possesses only second-hand information.[7]

I. Phonology

In both diachronic and synchronic studies of language it is phonetics and phonology which have received the most attention, in part because the phonological framework of a given language is a closed system and thus more accessible to detailed analysis, and also because phonology was erroneously thought to be the most 'basic' part of language. It is the branch of linguistics whose applications were seen most obviously useful for language pedagogy, so much so that some basic use of phonetics for general accent correction is fairly widespread in classrooms. Even some recent textbooks, otherwise linguistically unsophisticated, not infrequently present pronunciation exercises with the aid of minimal pairs. However, the very basic concepts of phoneme and allophone are seldom applied in the classroom, although they can most easily clear up points often simply unanalyzable for paucity of adequate defining terminology. Take the example of Spn. *vivo* 'I live', *no vivo* 'I don't live', *boba* 'fool', *la boba* 'the fool', where the contrast between orthography versus pronunciation and between bound allophones of a given phoneme are intertwined parts of one problem from the point of view of the English speaker. The phonological facts are that the letters *b* and *v* can be distinguished only etymologically, while synchronically both represent [b] or [β], the first in absolute initial position and the second intervocalically or in the middle of a breath group, while labio-dental [v] does not exist in any position. Thus, *vivo* [biβo], *no vivo* [no βiβo], *boba* [boβa], *la boba* [laβoβa], all have initial [b], parallel to English, contrasted by the far more frequent intervocalic allophone [β], without equal in English. However, students in language classes are typically taught that Spn. *b* is 'the same' as English (with no mention of word-position) while *v* (again with no mention of collocative distinction) is 'somewhere between *b* and *v*'!

An interesting monolingual application to Spanish of the above contrast is that since teachers in the Spanish-speaking world also tend to impose the normative power of writing on pronunciation, many students have been trained in the 'correct' pronunciations of *v*, with the result that in some regions educated speakers have consciously mastered a kind of stage pronunciation of initial (but never of intervocalic) *v* based on their knowledge of the written form. The marginal status of this new allophone is humorously illustrated by the fact that when first exposed to English, 'normative *v*-pronouncers' seem just about as prone to pronounce [beri] in *very good* as their less sophisticated fellows.

It is helpful to supplement the discussion of such obviously pedagogically useful surface contrasts in several ways. First, by

progressing from the usual CA, limited to two languages, to the simultaneous comparison of several, for which task Delattre (1965), confronting English, Spanish, French, and German, is still the most complete study. Detailed analysis of the many charts offered in this work helps students understand the significance for CA not only of basic phonemic differences but also of comparative frequency of occurrence of given phonemes across languages, of distribution, syllable configuration, juncture, and the like.

To illustrate the implications of teaching the pronunciation of only the prestige dialect of the TL, the data in Matluck (1961) and Guitart (1978), dealing with the phoneme distribution of Puerto Rican Spanish, were used to illustrate how someone exposed only to the pronunciation of the standard, i.e., Castilian Spanish, might well encounter serious problems of comprehension when confronted with a linguistically 'radical' dialect of the Caribbean. For example, aspiration or deletion of word final *-s* in Caribbean Spanish has not only phonological but also morphological implications; both the second person singular *-s* and the *-s* of the plural are deleted, causing the uninitiated listener to perceive as homophonous, say, *pie* 'foot' and *pies* 'feet', or *ve* 'he, she sees' and *ves* 'you [fam.] see'.[8]

Finally, so that what is 'easy', 'hard', or 'strange' about a given language not remain simply a relativistic statement, it is useful to gauge surface peculiarities in relation to underlying universals. It becomes much easier for students to understand why, say, the vocalic systems of English and French offer genuine difficulties once they have dealt with some basic universal facts about vowels, such as minimum and maximum number of possible vocalic phonemes. In this way, the some fifteen vowels of French are seen to represent close to a maximum in universal terms; in addition, both the nasal vowels of French and its three interior height distinctions are seen to be statistically truly unusual. On the other hand, the same type of analysis illustrates that the number and distribution of Spanish simple vowels is amazingly easy, being fundamentally equivalent to the universal five 'basic' vowels. Similarly, for consonants it can be shown that, say, Spanish is unique among major European languages both in not possessing a labio-dental [v] and in having in all dialects [b̪] and [g̞] (the more frequent allophones of [b] and [g]). Particularly useful for offering information on phonological universals are Crothers (1978) and Haarman (1976).[9] See also Bolinger (1978) and Ruhlen (1978).

II. Lexical Semantics

While phonology and syntax study the structure of expressive possibilities in a language, semantics deals with meanings that can be expressed through them. Of the three, semantics has been the most

neglected in language teaching, its study having been largely relegated to dictionaries. One has only to open a bilingual dictionary to see the relatively arbitrary way that dictionaries deal with meaning. Typically, if one looks up a word like, say, Spn. *duración* or *vibración* the first translation offered will be its English partial cognate, although the more concrete meanings 'length (of time)' and 'shaking' are in fact considerably more frequent; more seriously, for *intervención* only 'intervention' will be listed, with the very frequent meaning 'participation' disregarded. Similarly, for Eng. *ignore* and *realize* the principal Spanish definitions given are 'ignorar' and 'realizar', with which they have, in fact, only a minor semantic overlap.[10] Dictionaries have even less reliable and less systematic information to offer on the lexical and syntactic range of words, on their co-occurrence restrictions, not to speak of non-referential factors such as register and various other connotative associations. The few studies on the subject typically do little more than list identical or partial cognates in two languages (Stevens [1943], Bolinger [1948], Reid [1948], Marín [1980]); two of the more useful studies are Masson de Gay (1969) and Nash (1980).

To return to the example of *leave* versus Spn. *salir/dejar* we can see that to consider it merely as semantic split is to treat only a small part of the problem. Syntactically, Eng. *leave* can be transitive, either active or passive, or it can be intransitive: in addition when followed by certain prepositions or adverbs it forms a phrasal verb, in various degrees of lexicalization; finally, it is partially or totally frozen, i.e., idiomatic, in a number of constructions. In this variety of roles it is, in fact, translatable not only by Spn. *salir/dejar*, as James stated, but by a number of other verbs as well. See the illustrative chart on the following page, which also includes French, German and Hungarian in the contrast.[11] Note, for example, that even Spanish and French, closely related languages, often do not employ cognate verbs; for example, *dejar* has a wider range than its none too obvious cognate *laisser*. Both German and Hungarian make ample use of prefixes to vary one root verb (e.g., Hung. *ott-* 'there', *el-* 'away', *rá-* 'upon, on', plus *hagyni* 'leave'). Unlike Eng. *leave*, none of the languages use any given verb in this group as both transitive and intransitive. Further, uses of *leave* in various degrees of 'frozenness' have, of course, numerous other possible translations: for example, phrasal verbs like *leave out* (Fr. *exclure, omettre, laisser a côté*), *leave off* (Spn. *cesar, discontinuar*); discontinuous phrasal verbs like *leave X [+ human]) be* (Spn. *dejar X en paz*, Hung. *békében hagyni X-et*, both 'leave X in peace', but Ger. *sein lassen*, like Eng.); expanded verbal idioms, such as *leave it up in the air* (Spn. *dejarlo pendiente* 'leave it hanging, pending', Hung. *ugyhagyni* 'leave it in that [way]'); and sememic idioms like *to leave no stone unturned* or *take it or leave it* (Hung. *minden követ megmozgatni* 'to move every stone' and *vagy tetszik vagy nem* 'either like it or don't').

		SPANISH	FRENCH	GERMAN	HUNGARIAN
Transitive and Active in English	He left the book on the table	dejar	laisser	lassen	otthagyni
	He left the house at eight	salir de	laisser	verlassen	kimenni
	He left his homeland at the age of eight	abandonar	quitter	verlassen	elhagyni
	He left a wife and two children (when he died)	dejar	laisser	hinter-lassen	ott-/hátra-hagyni
	He left his wife and two children (for another woman)	abandonar	laisser	verlassen	elhagyni
	He left his money to his son	dejar	léguer	vererben	ráhagyni
	He left the care of his children to a nurse	confiar	confier/laisser le soin de	über-lassen	ráhagyni
	Seven minus three leaves you	ser	faire/rester	sein	(copula deletion)
English Passive	The room was left empty	quedar	rester	bleiben	maradni
		all in active form			
Intransitive	I must leave now	irse	en aller	gehen	elmenni
	The train leaves right away	salir	partir	abfahren	indulni
	When do you leave? (with emphasis on leaving a place)	partir	partir	abreisen	elutazni

The study of semantics has always been bound up to some degree with our classification of the external world. We cannot totally escape at least the partial arbitrariness with which different languages codify experience, how each places a structure on the world by somewhat arbitrarily treating certain distinctions as crucial while disregarding others. Native speakers of a language normally possess knowledge of these boundaries but a foreigner who wants to understand the word content of a foreign language has to learn each distinguishing feature (for which, componential analysis, borrowed from structural phonology, can be a useful tool; vid., for example, Geckeler [1976] and Lehrer [1974]). Öhman (1953) uses the analogy of a person who goes to a foreign country where a different measurement system is used, which he must consistently translate into his own system.

One can cite countless examples of linguistic surface differences, often of a fairly superficial sort, a consideration of which often goes hand-in-hand with a defense of a strong version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Again, a very important supplement to such a surface contrastive analysis is the consideration of semantic universals. Although most comparative semantic studies have had their base in anthropologically-oriented and taxonomic studies such as kinship and color terminology (for a full bibliography, see Gordon [1980]), most are still quite useful and can be supplemented by more universally-oriented and up-to-date analyses (Ullman [1963], Lehrer [1974], Andersen [1978]). To restrict our own examples to the lexical range of body parts, we can assume, for example, that the English speaker learning Spanish will be bothered by being forced to distinguish between *oreja* 'outer ear' and *oído* 'inner ear' (hence, 'earache' is *dolor de oído*), and by having to distinguish between the leg of a person (*pie*) from that of four-legged creatures and of furniture (*pata*), the hair on the head (*pelo*) from hair on the body (*vello*), but not fingers from toes (*dedo*). The last example illustrates nicely that no matter how 'natural' this differentiation seems to the English speaker, a consideration not merely of the isolated contrast with Spanish but of the underlying universals will make him see that English is among the minority of languages of the world which treat this distinction as essential; most do quite nicely with one composite term (although often with the possibility of recourse to a periphrastic clarification if necessary, e.g., Spn. *dedo del pie* 'digit of the foot', Hung. *lábúj* 'foot/leg digit'). As the English speaker goes on to learn about more 'exotic' languages he finds that, say, Hebrew, Hungarian and the Slavic languages do not feel hampered by ordinarily not bothering to distinguish between 'arm' and 'hand' or 'leg' and 'foot'. A further consideration of the universals will show that secondary terms for body parts are created by metaphoric extension, e.g., Hung. *lábfej* 'leghead' for 'foot' and *kézfej* 'armhead' for 'hand' (in the rare instances that context or emphasis demands this secondary distinction). The metaphoric creativity can, however, extend from the obvious, as above, to the more unusual and even the humorously grotesque: Eng. *eyesocket*, Hung.

szemgödör 'earditch', Ger. *Handteller* 'handtray' for 'palm', Spn. *ventana de la naríz* 'window of the nose' for 'nostril' and *ojo del culo* 'eye of the anus' for 'asshole'.

Again, from the point of view of the English speaker, other kinds of lexical splits may be particularly bothersome because of their seemingly arbitrary nature. Thus, while both Ger. *essen* and *fressen* and Hung. *enni* and *zabálni* distinguish 'to eat' if done by humans or animals, only Hungarian further makes a similar distinction in *meghalni* 'to die', said of people, and *megdögölni* 'to die', said of animals, and by extension, insultingly of people. (However, compare Yiddish *esn* and *fresn* paralleled by *štarbn* 'die [of a person]' and *péygern* 'die [of an animal]'.) A further type of difficulty is a multipronged split, as in Spn. *grande*, which can have at least six common English translations, as well as a number of idiomatic ones (in all of which syntactic and collocational restrictions also play an important role):

casa grande	'large house'
gran error	'serious mistake'
árbol grande	'tall tree'
los grandes	'grown-ups'
los grandes de España	'Spanish nobility'
grandes industrias	'major industries'
vivir en grande	'to live luxuriously'
sacar la grande	'to win the lottery'

Color terminology is one of the few semantic fields which have been systematically studied (vid., most recently, Forbes [1979], Gordon [1980] and Kristol [1980]), but generally in relation to the number of distinct primary color terms existing in a given language. However, equally problematic for CA is that often one color term in a given language can be translated by a variety of terms in another, partially due to fuzzy borders between colors but more often probably due to collocational restrictions. Thus, for example, Eng. *brown* could be rendered by Spn. *moreno, negro, bermejo, marrón, pardo, castaño, café, aceituna* and by Fr. *brun, noir, roux, marron, bis, chataîn.* Conversely both *brown hair* and *tan* might be reduced in German to *braun.*

Even when systems seem similar, their distribution can be markedly different. Compare the binary systems of demonstratives of English, Italian, German, and Hungarian, which can only be analyzed in terms of an underlying threefold structure, represented by the Spanish surface forms. Contrast also the French system, where the distinctions are neutralized.

English	German	Hungarian	Italian	French	Spanish	
this	dieser	ez	questo	(ci)	este	'where I am'
that		az		ce	ese	'where you are'
	jener		quello	(là)	aquel	'where he is'

Languages will also differ greatly in the degree of specificity of lexical items. For example, while German builds a heavy semantic load into the verbs *setzen* 'set (upright)', *sitzen* 'lay, set (flat)', *hängen* 'hang', *legen* 'lay', French can, relying on context, render all by *mettre* (although, if necessary, it can express periphrastically *mettre debout* 'place upright', and the like). Similarly French *aller* 'to go, move, travel' must be rendered much more specifically in German as *gehen* 'go on foot', *fahren* 'go, ride in a car or bus or train', *fliegen* 'fly, go by plane', *reiten* 'ride, go on horseback'; as can be seen by the English translations and paraphrases, English is somewhere between the extremes of German and French in the degree of specificity deemed necessary.

An interlanguage study of idioms is a very useful part of a semantic CA for a number of reasons. First, because normative grammars are notoriously centered on their own culture in their definition of idioms, treating as idiomatic anything that is not expressed with the same semantic and syntactic constraints as in the NL. Thus, an English grammar would consider Spn. *¿Cuántos años tienes?* 'How many years have you?' for 'How old are you?' or *Me gusta* 'to me is pleasing' for 'I like' as 'idiomatic', regardless of the fact that these forms are much closer than is English both to how many languages express these concepts and to the actual semantic relationships involved. Further, normative grammars totally disregard many types of idioms, such as lexemic idioms (i.e., compound words) or irreversible binomials, leaving it to the learner to figure out how, say, *red carpet, red alert, red cent, red light, red tape, redneck,* and *redeye* might be related, and why none of the translations into the student's NL are likely to contain the word *red*; similarly, why, in English, when it is raining *cats and dogs* one gets wet *from head to toe* while in Spanish it rains *perros y gatos* 'dogs and cats' and one gets wet *de pies a cabeza* 'feet to head'. In addition, idioms offer an excellent way to illustrate the interrelation of semantics and syntax through the consideration of the frozenness hierarchy of phrasal idioms, as in the well-known example *John kicked the bucket* 'John died', but not **The bucket was kicked by John.* Very similar are Spn. *estirar la pata* 'stretch out one's (animallike) leg', *liar el petate* 'tie one's straw mat (i.e., bags)', *doblar la servilleta* 'fold the napkin', *hincar el pico* 'to bend or dig in one's beak', all meaning 'to die' and none allowing any transformations. Overall, it seems that the degree of frozenness of idioms in Spanish tends to be greater than that in English. Comparison of idioms among a number of

languages (see Müller [1961] and [1960], Malkiel [1959], Makkai [1972] and [1978], Cooper and Ross [1975]) will show that a recurrent universal is that everyday familiar objects and animals are often invoked as images to represent more abstract ideas. Thus, Eng. *One swallow doesn't make a summer* is paralleled by Hung. *Egy fecske nem hoz nyarat* 'One swallow doesn't bring summer', Eng. *A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush* is Spn. *Más vale pájaro en mano que ciento volando* 'A bird in hand is worth more than a hundred flying'. While there are hundreds of such examples, reflecting in part, at least among the European languages, some degree of common cultural heritage (e.g., animal stories from Aesop's fables and various animal taboos), this still leaves a very rich store of idioms in which cultural peculiarities or humoristic creations of a given language are apparent, e.g., Eng. *to rob Peter to pay Paul* is Spn. *desnudar un santo para vestir otro* 'to take the clothes off one saint in order to dress another one', which refers to the Catholic custom among elderly ladies and spinsters of dressing up statues of saints in churches, or *to go powder one's nose, to take a leak*, and the like, parallel to Spn. *hacer lo que otro no puede hacer por uno* 'to do what another can't do for one' and *ir donde el rey va solo* 'to go where (even) the king goes alone'.

III. Syntax

One useful way to approach contrastive syntax is through the organization of the message in terms of focus or emphasis. For example, English, which has relatively little freedom in word order can only distinguish *Her húsband is sick* from *Her husband is sick* through the stress, while Spanish would render the first *Está enfermo su marido* 'Is sick her husband' and the second *Su marido está enfermo* 'Her husband is sick' (Bolinger [1954]). While both English and Spanish can achieve further emphasis by clefting (*It is her husband who is sick* and *Es su marido quien está enfermo*), this is a syntactical device by far much less frequent in Spanish, seldom used unless a contrast is not only implied but expressed (*Es su marido que/quien está enfermo, no su hijo* '...not her son'). (On universals of clefting, see Harries-Delisle [1978].) In contrast, Hungarian, typical of many languages with no clefting, compensates for this feature, as well as, incidentally, for its lack of passive voice by an extremely variable syntax:

SOV	Mária kávét főzött	'Mary cooked coffee'
SVO	Mária főzött kávét	'It was Mary who cooked coffee'
OSV	A kávét (a) Mária főzte	'The coffee was cooked by Mary'

While the change from the unmarked SOV to the more emphatic SVO is marked only in the word order, in the change to OSV the fronted object

must be preceded by the deictic marker *a*, also optional before the subject. This converts the non-count and indefinite *kávé* to definite and thus elicits the further change from the third person of the indefinite conjugation *főzött* to definite *főzte*. Still another possibility is *(A) Mária a kávét főzte*, with SOV plus definite object, which again allows Hungarian to express through its syntax still another category which it is lacking in its morphology, the imperfective. Thus, *Mária főzte a kávét* is 'Mary was cooking the coffee' and would normally be used in contrast to another action, such as, say, 'when John walked in'. This sentence can, incidentally, be changed into perfective, not with a further word order change but by the insertion of the perfective prefix *meg-*; thus, *Mária megfőzte a kávét* 'Mary cooked the coffee [and it is done]'. These examples from Hungarian illustrate not only syntactical differences among languages but also the very important notion of CROSSOVER CATEGORIES or INTERLANGUAGE SHIFTS. James' (1980) assertion that the degree to which it is necessary to cross levels is a useful measure of the degree of interlingual non-correspondence between the NL and the TL, is aptly illustrated by the above examples.

Spanish, unlike Hungarian, does have a passive voice, but, if anything, that is only likely to cause even greater problems for the English speaker. At least one estimate (Fente Gomez [1971]) holds that Spanish uses less than seven percent of the number of passives that English does. The use of the passive in Spanish is practically extinct in the spoken language and is mostly limited to the third person, and that to a great extent particularly in journalistic style. Instead, a number of alternate active forms and periphrastic constructions are preferred, which provides the language with rich potential expressive possibilities. While English uses passive for focusing in *John was found by the police*, Spanish achieves the same effect by the anticipation of the object plus the impersonal pseudopassive in *A Juan se le encontró la policía* 'To John reflex.-impers. he-dat. found the police'.

Also extremely useful for syntactical CA are case grammar functions as developed originally by C.J. Fillmore (1968), who clearly delineates a distinction between these traditional grammatical categories, pertinent only to surface structure, and abstract relational categories called CASES. The exact nature and number of case categories is still an open question, but certainly four of central importance are AGENTIVE (A), DATIVE (D), INSTRUMENTAL (I), and OBJECTIVE (O). These deep case relationships comprise

> a set of universal, presumably innate, concepts which identify certain types of judgements human beings are capable of making about events that are going on around them, judgements about such matters as who did it, who it happened to, and what got changed (Fillmore [1968:24]).

A is typically the animate instigator of the action expressed in the verb, D the case of the animate being affected by the action of the verb, I the inanimate instrument with which the action of the verb is carried out and the O, "the semantically most neutral case, the case of anything representable by a noun...affected by the action or state identified by the verb" (*ibid:* 46-7). Each of these cases can occur only once in a simple sentence. Fillmore's system, which implies a descriptive simplification in dispensing with the phrase structure component of transformational grammar, is, in our opinion, the most readily accessible and useful model for the purposes of syntactic CA. (For further applications of Fillmore's model, see Goldin [1968], Contreras [1978], Schnitzer [1977], with reference to Spanish, and Straub [1974a, 1974b], Brown [1971, 1972], Donaldson [1973] for French, Zimmerman [1972] for German, and, in more general terms, Boas [1977].)

As stated earlier, many syntactic incompatibilities between languages, lumped together in school texts under 'idiomatic expressions', can be analyzed with the aid of case grammar. To limit ourselves to the notion of surface subjects, note, for example, that English is particularly permissive in allowing inanimate subjects:

The milk is hot	Spn.	La leche está caliente
	Fr.	Ce lait est chaud
	Ger.	Die Milch ist heiss
	Hung.	A tej meleg
The room is hot	Spn.	Hace calo en este cuarto
	Fr.	Il fait chaud dans cette chambre
	Ger.	Es ist heiss in diesem Zimmer
	Hung.	Meleg van ebben a szobában

In spite of the surface similarity of the two sentences, it is evident that in the second series the surface subject *the room* must be regarded as a deep structure locative, as can be illustrated by the permissible English equivalent *It is hot in this room.* Note in this second case the need for the insertion of the dummy subject *it*, identical to the functions of *il* and *es* in the French and German examples. In contrast, in Spanish, where subject pronoun deletion is the norm, no such addition is necessary in *Hace calor en este cuarto* '[It] makes heat in this room'. Hungarian also allows subject deletion, although not as regularly as Spanish. Here *van*, in form the third person singular of 'to be' unambiguously carries the impersonal function 'there is/there are', since as a copulative it would be deleted. Thus, *Meleg van ebben a szobában* 'Warm [there] is in this room' versus, say, *János tanár* 'John [is] [a] teacher'.

Also typically treated as idiomatic in normative texts are phrases denoting physical and mental states and sensations, as *I am hot*, below (cf. Zimmerman [1972b]):

ENGLISH	GERMAN	SPANISH	HUNGARIAN
I am hot	*Ich bin heiss	*Estoy caliente	*Meleg vagyok
I feel hot I am feeling hot	?Ich fühle mich heiss	?Me siento caliente	Melegen érzem magamat
*It is hot to me It seems hot to me	Es ist mir heiss/Mir ist es heiss	*Me es caliente	Melegem van
*I have heat	*Ich habe Heisse	Tengo calor	

The English construction with personal subject plus copulative verb, *I am hot* for 'I feel heat outside of my body' is paralleled only by the Ger. *Ich bin heiss*. Sp. *Estoy caliente* is grammatical only if taken metaphorically to refer to sexual ardor, where the 'heat' is, of course, generated within one's own body. Hung. *Meleg vagyok* could mean only that one's own body is emanating heat, as when one has a fever. German prefers a dative subject construction: *Mir ist es heiss / Es ist mir heiss* 'Me is it hot / It is me hot'. Hungarian *Melegem van* 'warm + [me-possessive postpos.] [there] is'. The Hungarian expression could also be translated as 'I have heat' because possession is also expressed by the same construction; thus, it is semantically also equivalent to the Spn. *Tengo calor* 'I have heat', reflecting the close relation of locative, possessive, and existential constructions (cf. Clark [1978], Berman [1980]).

English nominative NP subjects regularly paralleled by dative subjects in certain TL is a common source of confusion for normative grammars, which, having no better explanation to offer, treat not only expressions of physical state, as above, as 'idiomatic', but also a number of related constructions, the most common of which are of course verbs of liking and disliking, such as Spn. *Me gusta el libro*, It. *Mi piace il libro*, Ger. *Das Buch gefällt mir*, Hung. *Nekem tetszik a könyv*, all, loosely, 'I-dat. pleases the book' for 'I like the book'. Similar constructions are used in many languages for other stative verbs, such as of possession (Hung. *Nekünk két gyerekünk van* 'we-dat. two children + poss. postpos. [there] is'), verbs denoting lacking, needing, missing (Spn. *Me falta el dinero* 'To me lacks the money' for 'I lack the money'; *Me hace falta más dinero* 'To me makes lack more money' for 'I need more money'), verbs of obligation (Hung. *Nekem muszáj haza mennem* 'I-dat. home-to ought go + poss. postpos.' for 'I have to go home'). For dative subject constructions in South Asian languages, vid., Sridhar [1979] and, further, Cole *et al.* [1980].)

As a final example relating to the notion of subject, note that while English permits parts of the body, when preceded by the possessive adjective, to function as subject, as in *His forehead is dripping sweat* such a construction must be translated in, say German and Spanish, respectively, as *Dem tropft der Schweiz von der Stirn* and *Le gotea el sudor de la frente*, both 'He-dat. drips the sweat from the forehead', where the deep case relationship of loc. *forehead* and dat. *he* is also reflected in the surface structure. Similarly, Eng. *John's stomach is empty*, must be rendered in Spanish by *Juan tiene el estómago vacío* 'John has the stomach empty', where only an animate surface subject is permitted; *El estómago de Juan está vacío* 'John's stomach is empty' would be considered grammatical only in some strange circumstance where it could be conceived of as independent of John's body, parallel to, say, grammatical *La maleta de Juan está vacía* 'John's suitcase is empty'.

The foregoing cross-linguistic syntactical examples illustrate that in English the abundance of clefting, the use of deep case locatives and instrumentals as surface subjects, as well as the use of the passive partially compensates for the restricted word order. Only a consideration of all these factors together can go towards explaining the multiple difficulties of transposing a seemingly simple sentence like *It was both her money and mine that was put into the house* into Spanish *La casa la pusimos con el dinero de los dos* 'The house it-acc. [we] put with the money of the two'.

IV. Pragmatics

All the phonological, semantic and syntactic examples we have dealt with up to now are part of Code Linguistics (James [1980]), where data are regularized, standardized, and decontextualized, both by being removed from the context of the sentences which precede and follow them and by being separated from any real life situation. This is of course characteristic of modern linguistics, which, with its emphasis on linguistic competence, has tended to be concerned with language as an autonomous formal system rather than with language in use. Performance, while equated with the latter, is concerned with psychological aspects of grammar and not with sociolinguistic factors. While code linguistics specifies what is grammatical, in discourse analysis and analysis of speech acts attention switches from the code to the process of communication. For the person who is to communicate effectively a knowledge of the code is not sufficient. He must also take into consideration units larger than the sentence, since not only single sentences but longer texts possess the property of well-formedness, based on how utterances follow one another in a rule-governed, coherent manner. In fact, some well-formed sentences may not be fully acceptable except in a specific larger context. Further, one must acquire in a

foreign language not only knowledge of what is formally appropriate, whether on the level of sentence or of discourse, but also what is functionally appropriate, which Hymes (1971) has dubbed COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. Di Pietro (1968), in the conclusion of an otherwise excellent article, holds that it is "inappropriate" for the linguist "to incorporate an accounting of how sociostructural settings affect the understanding of an utterance"; he prefers to leave this task to the philosopher. But, if one is to communicate effectively it is precisely the extralinguistic setting and the sociocultural constraints of the TL which he must learn to understand. Some recent research (Gumperz and Roberts [1978]) has shown that students in advanced language classes may well commit more serious errors on the level of communicative competence than in problems of a purely linguistic sort. Such errors, when commited not in the schoolroom but in the home country of the TL, can lead not only to serious problems of communication but to the fostering and abetting of ethnic prejudices in relation to standards of politeness, formality, humor, empathy, and the like. Hymes, extending Jakobson's earlier analysis, identifies six components in a speech act: setting (time and place); participants (addressor, addressee, audience, whether in equal, superior, or inferior position to one another); purpose (persuasion, command, question, etc., or simply phatic communication); key (tone or manner, such as friendly, stern); content or topic; channel or medium (speech or writing). Some of the important communicative rules one must learn in relation to these are, for example:

1. How to open, maintain, and terminate a conversation (vid., Donaldson [1979]).

2. Turn-taking conventions, interruptions (ibid).

3. What modes of address to use when and to whom (vid., Brown and Gilman [1960], followed by Ervin-Tripp [1969], Head [1978], Ford [1974], Rivero [1978], Slobin [1963] among others).

4. What topics, lexical items, and gestures are taboo (vid., Kany [1960], Grimes [1977], Morris [1979]).

5. What stereotyped expressions, topics, and the like are favored for phatic communication (vid., Laver [1975], West [1962]).

6. How to be polite, how and when to be indirect, how to order, how to be sarcastic, humorous, etc. (vid., Apte [1974], Goody [1978] Kalivoda [1978]).

7. What facial expressions and body movements may be indispensable to proper interpretation of the spoken word (vid., Brault [1963]).

8. Which linguistic forms mark the speaker as a member of a certain dialectal, caste or socio-economic group (vid., Mitford [1956], Bolinger [1960], Schur [1980]).

A detailed discussion of any of these considerations would constitute another article. Let us, therefore, take very briefly the one example of address systems. Learning how many levels of address there are in a given language (on universals vid. Head [1978]) and with which verbal forms they are paired belongs to linguistic competence (e.g., Spanish uses the third person singular for the formal *Usted* while German *Sie* goes with the third person plural and French *Vous* the second person plural). Part of communicative competence, however, is the much more involved problem of WHEN to use which form, a problem which has been reduced in most normative texts to the formula "use the 'familiar' to family, children, and dogs and the 'formal' at all other times." The terms 'familiar' and 'formal' are highly misleading, as the formal may well be used to emphasize any or all of the following: (social or personal) distance, anger, pseudo-politeness, and, in special cases, even endearment.[12] One must, in fact, simultaneously take into account at least all of the following factors:

1. Language: e.g., Korean will always be more rigidly formal than any European language; within Europe, German and Hungarian will likely be more formal in a given situation than, say, Spanish.

2. Dialect: e.g., Caribbean dialects of Spanish use the familiar much more frequently than does the standard language.

3. Age and/or social class of the addressee and/or addressor: e.g., although reciprocal familiar address among family members is becoming the norm in European languages, many lower class parents still require that their children address them non-reciprocally in the formal form; in some languages upper or middle class married couples address each other with a reciprocal formal form; for example, while in a given language it may be appropriate for a twenty-year old garage mechanic to address a male customer of roughly his age in the familiar, the same form of address to a young female may be interpreted as a sexual advance.

4. Setting: friends or lovers may in a public setting, such as a classroom or conference, switch to the formal address in order to depersonalize the situation; they may, conversely, also switch to the formal in a very intimate situation, in this case to indicate endearment.

Our aim in the foregoing series of examples and bibliographical indications has been to illustrate the path a truly useful CA might take, one based on both surface structures and underlying universals and

on linguistic as well as communicative competence. Further, it is our hope that our analysis has also indicated the research potential of CA, as well as its viable contributions to theoretical linguistics.

NOTES

*I would like to express my appreciation to Professors Mark Aronoff, Christina Bethin, Robert Hoberman and Carol Troen for their suggestions and criticisms. However, I alone claim responsibility for any errors and infelicities that may remain.

[1]Wilkins (1972) points out that teachers often look only for direct applications of linguistics and may overlook the less direct INSIGHTS that it provides; by INSIGHTS Wilkins understands "linguistic notions that increase one's understanding of the notion of language and consequently of language learning."

[2]To cite only one blatantly telling example: most of us would object to geography teachers who would teach that the world is flat or to biology teachers who teach creationism as fact. Yet, in many Spanish classrooms students receive the (unfortunately NOT tongue-in-cheek) 'folkloristic' explanation for the reason that the verb *estar* rather than *ser* (the first, according to normative grammars, equivalent to 'to be' when denoting a TEMPORARY STATE as opposed to PERMANENT *ser*) is used in the seemingly rather untemporary circumstance of *El santo está muerto y está enterrado en el cementerio* 'The saint is dead and is buried in the cemetery' because Spanish people, being Catholic, believe in the resurrection of the body and soul and hence consider the saint's state temporary. One cannot refrain from a rejoinder in the same 'spirit' and ask why, then, does one also say *está casado, -a* 'he/she is married', when, being Catholic, Spanish-speaking people might be expected to be equally staunch defenders of the indissolubility of the marriage sacrament.

[3]Examples one could cite would be legion. Typical statements for English would be, for example, that *It is I*, or *We shall go* (but *He will go*) are the only 'correct' forms; that 'two negatives make a positive'; that *he* rather than *they* substituting for an indefinite antecedent is the 'logical' and hence 'correct' form. On this see the brilliant analysis of Bolinger (1980), who dubs normative grammarians 'shamans'. For French, see Söll (1980).

[4]Some of the typical criticisms have been: that error analysis is not predictive, that first language interference is not a major cause of difficulties in second language learning, that contrastive analysis is 'teacher centered' rather than 'learner centered', that it does not

solve all the problems, and, perhaps, most telling of all, that language teachers who do not know linguistics resent it.

[5]In addition, infelicities or errata appear in a number of the examples. This is so frequent in the Spanish forms that one suspects they are not merely errata: p. 30, read *sabiamos, supimos*; p. 154, read *quiero hablar* and *quiero que hable*; p. 155 *Dejé la ciudad* should not be starred; it is grammatical in the sense 'I left the city behind'.

[6]James himself is very careful not to claim too much. Witness his closing words (p. 192): "It is hoped that some readers of this book will be stimulated to proceed far beyond its limited confines."

[7]A case in point is Anderson's "Lexical Universals of Body-part Terminology" (1978). For *finger* versus *toe*, for example, only English, Finnish, and Eskimo are cited as having distinct terms. German *Zehen* is ignored, although German examples are cited elsewhere. French and Spanish *dedo* and *doigt* are listed under "polysemy," while in another chart of terms derived by "structural similarity" "most Romance languages" are listed. In fact, Spanish uses *dedo* for both 'finger' and 'toe' but occasionally distinguishes *dedo del pie* 'digit of the foot'; French does the same with *doigt* and *doigt de pied* but also has primary *orteil* 'toe'.

[8]There is a copious literature on this subject, some of which shows that other phonological features (such as compensatory opening of the vowel preceding the deleted -s) or syntactic ones, such as using the subject pronoun, serve to disambiguate these forms. This, however, does not affect the fact that the unprepared listener exposed to the dialect encounters initial problems of comprehension. For a full bibliography, see, among others, Terrell (1978).

[9]Haarman actually discusses only European languages. His book seems to have been totally overlooked in this country, although it is extraordinarily useful also for morphological and syntactic comparisons. Crothers offers a wealth of information about the phonology of many languages. Some of the universals he offers, however, particularly on number and types of phonemes, are invalidated by the criteria he sets up for marginal phonemes, which he applies unequally to various languages, probably those with which he has no first-hand familiarity.

[10]Spanish *ignorar* (and French *ignorer*) still carry the etymological meaning 'not to know', which meaning occurs in English only in the lexicalized verbal participle *to be ignorant of (the facts)*; contrast lexicalized *to be ignorant* as an adjective, originally 'not knowing', hence now 'stupid'. English is parallel to Spanish *realizar* 'achieve' only with severe co-occurrence restrictions, as in *He realized his ambitions/dreams/desires/??wishes*.

[11]We could further complicate our analysis considerably if we were then to work back to English from the other languages and note, for example, that Ger., Fr., Spn., Hung., *lassen, laisser, dejar, hagyni* also equal Eng. 'let, allow, permit', or that Spn. *confiar* is also 'confide in'.

[12]The terms 'reciprocal and non-reciprocal address' coined by Brown and Gilman in their trailblazing (1960) article and continued in all studies published since that date offers increased theoretical clarity. However, the terms pronouns of 'power' and 'solidarity' are not without problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andersen, Elaine S. 1978. Lexical Universals in Body-part Terminology. In J. Greenberg (ed.), 1978, III, pp. 335-68.

Apte, Mahadev L. 1974. 'Thank you' and South Asian Languages: A comparative Sociolinguistic Study. *Linguistics* 136.67-89.

Berman, Ruth A. 1980. The case of an (S)VO Language: Subjectless Constructions in Modern Hebrew. *Language* 56.759-76.

Boas, Hans Ulrich. 1977. Some remarks on Case Grammars as Bases for Contrastive Studies. *Papers and Studies in CA* 7.21-31.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1948. 1464 Identical Cognates in English and Spanish. *Hispania* 31.271-79.

_____. 1954. English Prosodic Stress and Spanish Sentence Order. *Hispania* 37.152-56.

_____. 1960. L'uso di *gli, le* e *loro* como regime indiretto. *Lingua Nostra* 21.58-65.

_____. 1978. Intonation Across Languages. In J. Greenberg (ed.), 1978, II, pp. 471-524.

_____. 1980. *Language: The Loaded Weapon*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Brault, Gerard J. 1963. Kinesics and the Classroom: Some Typical French Gestures. *The French Review* 36.374-82.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1960. Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.

Brown, T. Grant. 1971. Pedagogical Implications of Case Grammar of French. *IRAL* 9.229-94.

_____. 1972. Case Grammar and the Teaching of French. In J. Casagrande and B. Saciuk (eds.), *Generative Studies in Romance Languages*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, pp. 362-75.

Clark, Eve V. 1978. Locationals: Existentials, Locative, and Possessive Constructions. In J. Greenberg (ed.), IV, pp. 85-126.

Cole, Peter, Wayne Harbert, Gabrielle Hermon, and S.N. Sridhar. 1980. The Acquistion of Subjecthood. *Language* 56.719-43.

Contreras, Heles. 1978. *El orden de palabras en Español*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra. (Original version: *A Theory of Word Order with reference to Spanish*.)

Cooper, W.E. and John R. Ross. 1975. World Order. In R. Grossman, *et al*. (eds.), *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*. Chicago Linguistics Circle, pp. 63-111.

Crothers, John. 1978. Typology and Universals of Vowel Systems. In J. Greenberg (ed.), II, pp. 93-152.

Delattre, Pierre. 1965. *Comparing the Phonetic Features of English, German, Spanish and French*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1968. Contrastive Analysis and the Notions of Deep and Surface Grammar. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *Report on the Nineteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies: Contrastive Linguistics and its Pedagogical Implications*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 65-80.

Donaldson, Susan Kay. 1979. One kind of Speech Act: How Do We Know When We're Conversing. *Semiotica* 28.259-99.

Donaldson, W.D. 1973. *French Reflexive Verbs (A Case Grammar Description)*. The Hague: Mouton.

Ervin-Tripp, S.M. 1969. Sociolinguistics. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 4.93-107.

Fente Gomez, R. 1971. *Estilística del verbo en inglés y en español*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.

Fillmore, C.J. 1968. The Case for Case. In E. Bach and R.T. Harms (eds.), *Universals of Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Forbes, Isabel. 1979. The Terms *brun* and *marron* in Modern Standard French. *Journal of Linguistics* 15.295-305.

Ford, Jerome C. 1974. The Semantics of Direct Address Pronouns in French. *French Review* 47:2.1142-57

Geckeler, Horst. 1976. *Semántica estructural y teoría del campo léxico*. Madrid: Gredos. (Original version: *Strukturelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie*.)

Goldin, Mark G. 1968. *Spanish Case and Function*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Goody, Esther (ed.). 1978. *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, W. Terrence. 1980. *Semantics: A Bibliography (1965-1978)*. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press.

Greenberg, Joseph (ed.). 1963. *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press. (Second edition 1966.)

_____ (ed.). 1978. *Universals of Human Language*. I - IV. Stanford University Press.

Grimes, Larry M. 1977. The Linguistic Taboo: Examples from Modern Mexican Spanish. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 4.69-80.

Guitart, Jorge M. 1978. Conservative Versus Radical Dialects in Spanish: Implications for Language Instruction. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 5:1&2.57-64.

Gumperz, John and Celia Roberts. 1978. Developing Awareness Skills for Interethnic Communication. Middlesex: National Centre for Industrial Training.

Haarman, Harald. 1976. *Grundzüge der Sprachtypologie: Methodik, Empirie und Systematik der Sprachen Europas*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1968. Contrastive Grammar and Textbook Structure. In J.E. Alatis (ed.), *Report on the Nineteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies: Contrastive Linguistics and Its Pedagogical Implications*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Harries-Delisle, Helga. 1978. Contrastive Emphasis and Cleft Sentences. In J. Greenberg (ed.), IV, pp. 419-86.

Head, Brian. 1978. Respect Degrees in Pronominal Reference. In J. Greenberg (ed.), III, pp. 151-211.

Hymes, Dell H. 1971. *On Communicative Competence*. Excerpts in J.B. Pride and J. Holms (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, Penguin, 1972, pp. 269-93.

James, Carol. 1980. *Contrastive Analysis*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Kany, Charles E. 1960. *American Spanish Euphemisms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kalivoda, Theodore B. 1978. Effects of Social Situation in the Use of Spanish: Theory and Application. *Hispania* 61.84-93.

Krámský, Jiří. 1972. *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Kristol, Andres M. 1980. Color Systems in Southern Italy: A Case of Regression. *Language* 56:1.137-45.

Lehrer, Adrienne. 1974. *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structures*. N.Y.: Elsevier Publishing. North Holland Linguistic Series.

Lover, John. 1975. Communicative Functions of Phatic Communication. In A. Kendon *et al.* (eds.), *Organisation of Behavior on Face-to-Face Interaction*. The Hague: Mouton.

Makkai, Adam. 1972. *Idiom Structure in English*. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1978. Idiomacy as a Language Universal. In J. Greenberg (ed.), III, pp. 403-48.

Malkiel, Yakov. 1959. Studies in Irreversible Binomials. *Lingua* 8:2.113-60. Reprinted in Y. Malkiel, *Essays on Linguistic Themes*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968, pp. 311-55.

Marín, Diego. 1980. Los 'falsos amigos' en español/inglés. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 37.66-98.

Masson de Gay, Suzanne. 1969. *Unos falsos amigos: algunas interferencias de lengua* (francés - español). Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Matluck, Joseph H. 1961. Fonemas finales en el consonantismo puerto-riqueño. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 15.332-42.

Mitford, Nancy. 1956. *Noblesse Oblige*. London: Penguin.

Morris, Desmond, *et al.* 1979. *Gestures*. N.Y.: Stein and Day.

Müller, Walter. 1960. *Englische Idiomatik nach Sinngruppen*. Stuttgart: Walter de Gruyter.

_____. 1961. *Französische Idiomatik nach Sinngruppen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Nash, Rose. 1980. Paralexicon: A Dictionary of Shared Vocabulary. In Rose Nash and Domitilla Belavel (eds.), *Readings in Spanish English Contrastive Linguistics*, II. San Juan: Interamerican University Press.

Ohman, Suzanne. 1953. Theories of the Linguistic Field. *Word* 9.123-34.

Reid, John. 1948. 123 Deceptive Cognates. *Hispania* 31.280-97.

Rivero, Maria Luisa. 1978. A Speech-act Analysis of Polite Verb Forms in Romance. *Recherches Linguistiques à Montréal* 10.231-42.

Ruhlen, Merrit. 1978. Nasal Vowel. In J. Greenberg (ed.), II, pp. 203-42.

Schnitzer, Marc. 1977. A Case-grammar Approach to Spanish-English Contrastive Analysis. In Rose Nash (ed.), *Comparing English and Spanish: Patterns in Phonology and Orthography*. N.Y.: Regents Publishing.

Schur, Norman W. 1980. *English, English*. Essex, Conn.: Verbatim.

Slobin, Dan I. 1963. Some Aspects of the Use of Pronouns of Address in Yiddish. *Word* 19.193-202.

Söll, Ludwig. 1980. *Gesprochenes und geschriebenes Französisch*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Sridhar, S.N. 1979. Dative Subjects and the Notion of Subject. *Lingua* 49.99-125.

Stevens, L.C. 1943. Textbook Vocabularies and Deceptive Cognates in Spanish. *Modern Language Journal* 27.116-18.

Straub, Sylvia A. 1974. Case Grammar and French Passive Sentences. In Roger W. Shuy and Charles-James N. Bailey (eds.), *Towards Tomorrow's Linguistics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 23-35.

Terrell, Tracy. 1978. Sobre la aspiración y elisión de [s] final en el español de Puerto Rico. *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 27:1.24-38.

Ullmann, Stephen. 1963. Semantic Universals. In J. Greenberg (ed.), 1963, pp. 217-62.

West, Michael. 1962. Conversational Tags. *English Language Teaching* 14.164-66.

Wilkins, D.A. 1968. Review of A. Valdman, *Trends in Language Teaching*. *IRAL* 6.1.

Zimmermann, Rüdiger. 1972a. Die Kasusgrammatik in der Angewandten und Kontrastiven Linguistik. *IRAL* 10.167-78.

_____. 1972b. Subjektlose und intransitive Sätze im Deutschen und ihre Englischen Äquivalente. *IRAL* 10.233-45.