ent cultural or structural values in two different societies. The search, therefore, must always aim at discovering the patterns of the culture.

The principles and techniques of the structural approach can also help to avoid many of the worst pitfalls in the selection of the content, and contributes to the effective use in teaching of the cultural material that must become a fundamental part of any really satisfactory language course.

University of Michigan

NOTE

[1] Some still speak of "Descriptive Linguistics" as opposed to "Historical Linguistics" and equate "Structural Linguistics" with "Descriptive Linguistics." It is true that our "Structural Linguistics" arose in connection with the descriptive analysis of living languages, but its principles and new insights have significance for the complete range of linguistic data and are now providing a basis for very fruitful restudy of much of our historical evidence.

Structural Linguistics and Latin Teaching

ELEANOR HUZAR

I HAVE HEARD that the railroads in Spain are so archaic and inefficient that if a train reaches 35 mph, a tax is charged for "velocity." This is one tax so attractive that the volatile Spaniards cheer, wager, all but throw their luggage out the window to achieve this dashing speed. The American traveller, lacking this tradition of zeal for success in the face of inefficiency, is apt to suggest some modern equipment. Our previous speakers have been playing the roles of efficiency-minded moderns who offer us new equipment for language teaching. Any new equipment involves discarding or adjusting our old and paying the price of new learning. But when our particular Latin branch of the language line is carrying proportionately fewer passengers, rarely is accelerating to that coveted 35 mph, and all too often is reaching no destination at all, it should be worth considering the new equipment. Discarding our traditional equipment is perhaps the hardest task. In Latin we have hallowed it with so many years of use that we sometimes persuade ourselves that it is the best of all possible equipment, and that the passengers, not the train, are to blame when we fall short of 35 mph.

For improvement, there are at least four basic principles which Latin teachers may well adopt from structural linguistic studies: 1. Latin is a language. 2. Language is an open system, subject to constant change. 3. Languages are different. 4. Grammar is significant in itself. Let us look at each of these more fully.

Latin is a language, not a library; and the primary aim of the study of any language must be linguistic; that is, the study must be an activity involving the use of language itself. Modern language teachers recognize the practical advantages to be derived from the "oral approach." Latin teachers should recognize the linguistic and pedagogical advantages. Writing follows language. It is, indeed, a linguistic field of its own. But it is also a formalized code, conventionally recording speech. The phonemes of Latin inflectional suffixes were distinguished first by the voice and the ear, and written symbols were later assigned to acknowledge those distinctions. The child learns language first through the ear. The linguistic scientist starts his study of a language with a systematic description of phonemes, allophones, etc. So, too, for Latin, the creation and expression of a vital people, as well as the artistic tool for poetry or oratory, there must be oral-aural use of the language. And, as with other languages, it should be said and heard first, then the distinctions recognized on paper. To

add the weight of precedent, we may note that earlier teachers, even in this country in colonial times, stressed the oral aspects for Greek, Latin, and Hebrew as well as for modern languages. The "traditional" approach developed in the late 19th century when classes were more numerous than adequately trained teachers; and by 1924, the Classical Investigation of the American Classical League discouraged the use of the oral method, among other reasons because there were too few teachers adequately trained in those techniques (J. B. Carroll, *The Study of Language*, p. 172). This hardly seems a justifiable excuse for individual teachers to be using inferior teaching methods.

The second principle for Latin teachers to adopt from linguistic studies is that Latin is an open system, a dynamic system, subject to constant change. This does, indeed, sound like heresy! How many times have we heard that the great advantage of studying Latin over a modern language is that it is a closed system about which everything can be known. If the language were inflexible—I use the contrary to fact subjunctive—as with anything else as human as language, we might call it "rigor mortis," but the students would readily translate it into "dead language"! There are many ways in which Latin is an open system, and exciting because of it. One way is that language affects the hearer or reader as well as the speaker or writer; so that—if allowed to keep an open mind—students of each generation are finding something new in the Latin authors, and our classical libraries outgrow their shelves with new interpretations. Another area of growth is a direct use of Latin today, to some extent in such attempts as an international language, but more especially in the field of technical terminology (and it is a satisfaction to see how many schools are adding technical terminology to their Latin curriculum).

The concept that language is logical, ultimate, and existing in the very nature of things goes back at least as far as the Greeks, whose city-state smugness made them consider speakers of all foreign tongues *bárbaroi*. The humane Socrates tried, but without success, in the *Cratylus* to persuade his friends that language is an arbitrary and frequently illogical set of symbols, based on convention and custom, not on inherent and inevitable qualities of the words. The Renaissance replaced Greek with Latin as the ideal, absolute language, God-given, and to be revered as such. And in the 19th century, even historical and comparative linguists, by tying Indo-European languages together in patterns of uniformity, for a time contributed to the assumption of one absolute, universal grammar.

Instead, like any language, Latin is infinitely flexible within itself: it has different words for the same thing, or the same word for different things; it has different ways of saying the same thing. But it is this redundancy or economy, this variety and change which we call style. If there were only one way of expressing an idea, it would truly be a dead language. It is the excitement of choice and discrimination, done by the author, recognized by the student, that makes Latin literature great and makes it perennially worth reading in the Latin rather than in translation. For this versatility, too, it is necessary to read not only a very few authors, from a very restricted time—the age of Caesar and Augustus—or geographically only from Rome, but rather to range widely, from Plautus to Erasmus, from Britain to Tomi. The subtle changes in the Latin reflect the changes in the people. To say that *only* Augustan Latin is good Latin is to assert arbitrary canons of taste, which apparently the Romans themselves did not share since they evolved the changes we deplore. Taste is certainly a personal matter, and some of us may

choose, all our days, to read Cicero instead of Aquinas, or Vergil instead of Abelard; but linguistics should teach us, and we should teach the students, that it is a matter of taste rather than an intrinsic virtue or vice in the language. Our duty, then, is to describe the language changes rather than to prescribe the language norms.

The third linguistic principle to apply to Latin is that languages are different. The conventions of all languages—such as the patterns and distribution of phonemes, syntactical order, etc.—are different; they are arbitrary, and they are always changing. What, then, happens to our last-ditch stand—students should learn Latin in order to know English? Even after Professor Fries' revolutionary barrage, we are still holding our last ditch; but we have changed our weapons. After looking at Latin with a dispassionate, descriptive eye, and after hearing how little English fits Latin's grammatical categories, we can realize that Latin is as different from English as any of the Indo-European languages; and that the English student can learn most from Latin by realizing these differences. The fundamental contrast is that in Latin the grammar depends upon morphemic suffixes, and in English upon word order. Each language is structured to a self-consistent, but not universally consistent, system. Then the vocabulary is fitted into the structure of each language. But Latin vocabulary, like grammar, is not directly transferable to English. The meanings depend upon the context and upon the entire semantic interpretation, and rarely would these coincide exactly in the two languages. This is not to say that there are no similarities between English and Latin. The historical linguists have worked out the common ties of the Indo-European languages; and they are many. The Latin teacher, therefore, should take maximum advantage of the likenesses of the languages—as he always has done—but instead of forcing unreal English constructions on a Latin pattern, he should accept the many differences between the two languages himself and use the shock treatment of alerting the students to English techniques by showing through Latin that the same ends can, and have been achieved differently.

Fortunately for us, the Greek, and subsequent Latin grammars, since they were the first grammars, were drawn up through real structural analysis, and are appropriate for the languages. It is subsequent grammars that have been forced into this earlier mold. But Latin teachers, because the grammar, for the most part, does fit, must be wary lest they fall into the trap of believing that it is logical or the necessary norm. Like the linguist, the Latin teacher should rather observe how things are said than dictate how they should be said; and this especially in English, so that the parallels drawn between the two languages may, indeed, be valid.

The fourth principle which the Latinist should take from the linguist is that grammar itself is a broad and significant field of the humanities, not just a means to the end of reading literature or an intellectual discipline—like any discipline, right and proper for our youth. Now grammar is viewed rather as structure, and this structure is a statement of normal, patterned human activities, communities, and values. Grammar, as part of all language, is a social development, subject to social control, demonstrating the aesthetic, complex, subtle aspects of communication. In this respect, it can even be termed a social science, and a new way of reaching, and understanding, and appreciating the Roman people. Robert Browning wrote "A Grammarian's Funeral" to honor, as a hero of faith, the grammarian so resolute of learning that he would not stop for life. Though Browning did not lament the decease of grammar too, his ideal grammarian may well have carried his

subject to the grave with him. There is now hope that the broader and more humane linguistic grammar may yet resuscitate the subject.

These are the linguistic principles that should be part of the Latin teacher's thinking. It is hoped that, far from weakening the teacher's objectives of helping the students to read Latin well, to appreciate the literature, and to understand the people, it will help to make real Latin-learning faster, more efficient, more meaningful, and more fun. With our traditional system, the problem is not so much that people challenge the richness and nobility of our aims as that they note, rather pointedly, how rarely we reach those aims in the little time allowed.

For the practical application of these principles, I worked under Professor Waldo Sweet's guidance, and found successful the following teaching attitudes and techniques. At the beginning of the course, time spent demonstrating to the students that "languages are different" is time well spent. Any other Indo-European language can be used to prove that other people have just as much right and logic to their way of conveying ideas as we have in English. Of course, if you can brush up a bit on Bantu, Chinook, or Tagalog, you can demonstrate even more startling differences in ways of viewing and talking about the world—and you can certainly impress the students!

Mr. Fries' analysis forces us to ask, what about teaching grammar? We are fortunate that Latin was originally analyzed thoroughly, and no radical revision of the traditional grammar seems necessary. What linguistics should give us is a new understanding of what grammar means and some simplifications. Diederich has said that the average first-year text introduces 1572 forms. To this number we would hardly wish to add more linguistic terms than necessary. The concepts of the phoneme, the morpheme, the allomorph, and the form class, however, should alert the students to what the significant differences in the forms really are and help him to generalize.

A practical technique, based on morpheme analysis, is already being included in a number of textbooks: that is, the "horizontal approach" to paradigms. The morpheme is defined as the smallest significant unit of structure embodying a grammatical meaning. The Latin morpheme for the accusative singular, masculine and feminine, of all five declensions is -m. The "horizontal approach," therefore, introduces the nominative of all five declensions, then with one morpheme covers five forms for the accusative singular. Next, the ablative, the dative, the genitive. Some cases and some verb tenses, like the pluperfect, of course, offer greater simplification than others. But, at worst, there are no more forms under the horizontal listing than under the vertical. At best, there is a substantial economy. As another very important advantage, the uses of each case can be taught simultaneously for the five declensions. Ultimately, the harder concept for the students is not isolating the first declension but is understanding the meaning and uses of the cases, which, in the vertical approach, all appear on the first day in the first declension without adequate understanding of how the cases work. An incidental aid and comfort is the greater range of vocabulary for early stories supplied by the "horizontal approach" —a welcome change after years of "puella rosam amat, agricola nautam pulsat, puella et agricola ambulant."

In mastering any of the grammar, the traditional names can and should be used when they really promise to supply an efficient shorthand for generalizations about the language. But the terminology should be applied rather to patterns of structure than to patterns of meaning, which can be used only after the passage has been translated. For example: it seems enough, and involves one term less, to learn that

natus and *ortus* pattern regularly with the ablative, without adding the name Ablative of Source. The stress throughout structure-teaching should be on morphemic contrasts. The morphemic endings should be so significant, prominent, and mastered that they leap out of the page. The meaning of any sentence should come from the forms, not the forms from the meaning.

An accepted linguistic principle is that grammar describes rather than prescribes. This "inductive method" of having the students describe the way the language works, then generalize grammar about it, was for me the most effective and astonishing of all the linguistic techniques. Instead of the teacher's giving the rules for, say, the passive, then showing examples of it, he shows the students first a number of sentences including the passive and contrasting with the active, then asks the students to describe what is happening in structure and in meaning. If a grammatical term is necessary, it can then be applied. In no case did I give the students the paradigms. They gave them to me. The improvement in the student's understanding and remembering this descriptive rather than prescriptive grammar is convincing.

The linguist's concentration on structural analysis and morphemic mastery tends to subordinate vocabulary-learning in the early stages. Some vocabulary, of course, is necessary; but it shouldn't be a complication for or distraction from the syntax. A few words, learned so as to become automatic, can be used to demonstrate the structure. Once the patterns are known, enlargement of vocabulary is a matter of substitution within the grammatical framework. With sound knowledge of structure and a dictionary, one can handle a language. With a vocabulary but no structure, we may never know whether "Dog bites man" or "Man bites dog."

The earlier descriptive linguists tended to shy away from vocabulary meaning. They wanted to study structure independent of meaning. But the more recent linguistic semantic studies offer some important suggestions for work on Latin vocabulary. Most significantly, semantics demonstrates that different civilizations have different flavor, different overtones, different significance for words which reflect all degrees of their differences in culture. An idea of exact identity in the words of two languages, a one-to-one correspondence, should be avoided. The words are more apt to coincide in areas than in points of meaning. And even those areas shift in different times and places. The student, therefore, properly should be made conscious of the need to shift his interpretations to fit shifting customs and conventions; conversely, to vitalize customs and conventions through the vocabulary. Realizing that meanings are not absolute but relative to the context should encourage the student to do some intelligent guessing at meanings. What, then, of our vocabulary lists? They operate on the learning law that two things are connected by being experienced together, association by contiguity. "Guilt by association" might be a more appropriate name for lists of English and Latin equivalents. It is this overemphasis on translation that hinders the student in trying to think exclusively in a foreign language. Let the vocabulary be learned in Latin context and in use. A closely limited vocabulary must be automatic for grammar practice. The limitless breadth of vocabulary words and the depth of each word's meaning can be known only by meeting vocabulary in the context in extensive reading.

The linguists have made audio-visual aids seem almost indispensable for language teaching. Yet there seems to be considerable opposition to oral Latin. Teachers frequently object that they have to fill every minute of the short teaching period with solid Latin learning, and don't have time for "frills." For the linguist, teaching oral Latin is

the fastest and most effective way of teaching solid Latin. Experiments in various languages indicate that skill in reading develops faster once an oral-aural foundation has been laid, and, as Bloomfield recommends, perception of a printed word should be conditioned to a previously established phonetic habit, instead of trying to set up an oral response to the printed word. After oral Latin there is less tendency for reading to be a mechanical exercise in what Mortimer Graves has called "that puzzled decipherment known as the translation method." Moreover, most teachers agree that oral work raises the interest level of the class and sustains it effectively.

The "mimicry-memorization" method of language teaching was developed during the war. It is based on the learning principles of frequency and intensity, and the total—ear as well as eye—participation of the student. It accepts, too, Bloomfield's dictum that "the thousands of morphemes and tagmemes of the foreign language can be mastered only by constant repetition." The types of records linguists use are rarely long, uninterrupted passages in or about Latin, a type which, unless very lively indeed, produces an overwhelmingly soporific effect. Rather, these records demand student participation. As a typical example: the record will ask a question; then the record will be silent while the student gives his response; then the record gives the correct response as an immediate check for the student. A most effective use for such tapes and records (but one often difficult for high-school teachers to arrange) is homework drill outside of class. Instead of innocently building up a pattern of hard-to-eradicate errors in his work alone, the student who works with a record has a constant check on his accuracy, and a constant stimulus to sustained effort and speed to match the record.

The records may drill on phonemes, or on paradigms, or on translation, or on taking down dictation. But the linguists also have taught us very effective methods of teaching structure through records. Just as a child learns morphology and syntax by learning "phrase wholes" (sequences of words in grammatical patterns) as single patterns, and then learns to differentiate the parts, so the Latin student learns thoroughly a number of "phrase wholes," then learns to choose among alternative learned responses. The sentences in such a recorded pattern practice are short, with simple vocabulary, and show only one new principle at a time—let us say, indirect discourse. The record may provide the direct discourse, the student turns it into indirect discourse, the record gives the indirect discourse correctly. The sentences are graded to change only one element at a time, so that that change is significant. These sentences are practised, under pressure of speed, until they are automatic and can be used in conversation. What is provided by the records is really rapid-fire, short-sentence Latin composition centered around single grammatical points. For the linguist, like the Latin teacher, insists that no one really knows a language until he can produce it.

Do the linguists, then, leave us no problems? I'm afraid that it is rather that they freshen our outlook by providing us with new kinds of problems. Linguistics now claims to be the most technical of the social sciences; but like any social science, it has trouble being scientific when dealing with society. The very important field of semantics, the relation of language to culture and culture to language, (metalinguistics, as Trager calls it) is still in its infancy. The linguist generally has limited his field of inquiry by not concerning himself with the content of the communication. For the Latinist, with a significant heritage of literature and history as well as language, what was said and why is as engrossing as how it was said. We must

achieve again the synthesis of linguistics and literature which was characteristic of Renaissance humanism.

Nor have the linguists, any more than the psychologists, solved all questions of learning. Is there transfer of learning from one language to another? What are the processes involved in encoding and decoding information through a people's linguistic system? Dunkel indicates that we know these language problems better, but aren't at all sure that we have better teaching methods than the traditional ones. For Latin there is still a thorough linguistic grammar to be developed. There is a very practical problem of applying these linguistic principles while still inhabiting the same classroom with our standard texts. And, finally, no linguist has yet had the temerity to assert that learning a foreign language is anything but a long, hard, infinitely painful task.

But, to end on the more positive note: I believe that structural linguistic principles, well applied, will help the student to know more about language in general and the Latin language, as a language, in particular, to understand literary style with more sensitivity and adapt to varieties of Latin style more sympathetically; to understand the Roman people better for realizing the significance of their language subtleties; and, finally, to learn solid Classical Latin more thoroughly, with more zest for learning, and so quickly that our train tax for "velocity" can be applied only at 80 mph!

Southeast Missouri State College

Logical Analysis and Linguistics

JAMES M. VAIL

THE PRECEDING PAPERS have made the study and teaching of languages seem complicated enough; and, before I complicate the matter still more, I would like to comfort the traditional teacher who wants only to teach his language, without too much concern about phonetics, semantics, historical and comparative grammar, and the hosts of ideas which proceed from psychological and philosophical linguists. I join the traditional teacher in thinking that ability to *translate* is by far the most important sign of success in language study.

At the same time, the ideal teacher of languages will hear, buzzing around his head, these myriad ideas which proceed from various sorts of linguists. If neurologists and poets can agree that language is one of the most complex and subtle of human activities, teachers in the liberal arts cannot neglect the opportunity to make language study a liberal discipline—which in theory it has always been. Toward the attainment of this goal, as well as toward greater efficiency, a judicious and discreet use of the various linguistic disciplines is helpful and healthy.

The approach of which I am to speak is that of logical analysis. Let me say first that logical analysis does not commit one to any particular philosophic doctrine; that it does not require, although it suggests, the use of symbolic logic; that it does not properly belong to the realm of linguistics. Yet, it is not irrelevant to our purpose today. Logical analysis, which goes *beyond* the structure of any spoken language, offers a background against which a particular language can be understood. Consider an example: reciprocal constructions such as "They love one another" (or "each other") convey the information that A loves B and B loves A. Logical analysis means no more (for our purpose) than the reduction of a statement, however expressed, and in whatever language, to clearly formulated information. In our