

tactful and rare. (One might think of the four as successive subsets; more likely they should be pictured as overlapping circles.)

These questions may be asked from the standpoint of a system *per se*, or from the standpoint of persons. An interest in competence dictates the latter standpoint here. Several observations can be made. There is an important sense in which a normal member of a community has knowledge with respect to all these aspects of the communicative systems available to him. He will interpret or assess the conduct of others and himself in ways that reflect a knowledge of each (possible, feasible, appropriate), done (if so, how often). There is an important sense in which he would be said to have a capability with regard to each. This latter sense, indeed, is one many would understand as included in what would be meant by his competence. Finally, it cannot be assumed that the formal possibilities of a system and individual knowledge are identical; a system may contain possibilities not part of the present knowledge of a user (cf. Wallace, 1961b). Nor can it be assumed that the knowledge acquired by different individuals is identical, despite identity of manifestation and apparent system.

Given these considerations, I think there is not sufficient reason to maintain a terminology at variance with more general usage of 'competence' and 'performance' in the sciences of man, as is the case with the present equations of competence, knowledge, systemic possibility, on the one hand, and of performance, behavior, implementational constraints, appropriateness, on the other. It seems necessary to distinguish these things and to reconsider their relationship, if their investigation is to be insightful and adequate.

I should take *competence* as the most general term for the capabilities of a person. (This choice is in the spirit, if at present against the letter, of the concern in linguistic theory for underlying capability.) Competence is dependent upon both (tacit) *knowledge* and (ability for) *use*. *Knowledge* is distinct, then, both from competence (as its part) and from systemic possibility (to which its relation is an empirical matter.) Notice that Cazden (1967), by utilizing what is in effect systemic possibility as a definition of competence is forced to separate it from what persons can do. The 'competence' underlying a person's behavior is identified as one kind of 'performance' (performance A, actual behavior being performance B). The logic may be inherent in the linguistic theory from which Cazden starts, once one tries to adapt its notion of competence to recognized facets of personal knowledge. The strangely misleading result shows that the original notion cannot be left unchanged.

Knowledge also is to be understood as subtending all four parameters of communication just noted. There is knowledge of each. *Ability for use*

also may relate to all four parameters. Certainly it may be the case that individuals differ with regard to ability to use knowledge of each: to interpret, differentiate, etc. The specification of *ability for use* as part of competence allows for the role of noncognitive factors, such as motivation, as partly determining competence. In speaking of competence, it is especially important not to separate cognitive from affective and volitive factors, so far as the impact of theory on educational practice is concerned; but also with regard to research design and explanation (as the work of Labov indicates). Within a comprehensive view of competence, considerations of the sort identified by Goffman (1967, pp. 218-26) must be reckoned with - capacities in interaction such as courage, gameness, gallantry, composure, presence of mind, dignity, stage confidence, capacities which are discussed in some detail by him and, explicitly in at least one case, as kinds of competency (p. 224).

Turning to judgements and intuitions of persons, the most general term for the criterion of such judgements would be acceptable. Quirk (1966) so uses it, and Chomsky himself at one point remarks that 'grammaticalness is only one of the many factors that interact to determine acceptability' (1965, p. 11). (The term is thus freed from its strict pairing with 'performance'.) The sources of acceptability are to be found in the four parameters just noted, and in interrelations among them that are not well understood.

Turning to actual use and actual events, the term *performance* is now free for this meaning, but with several important reminders and provisos. The 'performance models' studied in psycholinguistics are to be taken as models of aspects of ability for use, relative to means of implementation in the brain, although they could now be seen as a distinct, contributory factor in general competence. There seems, indeed, to have been some unconscious shifting between the sense in which one would speak of the performance of a motor, and that in which one would speak of the performance of a person or actor (cf. Goffman, 1959, pp. 17-76, 'Performances') or of a cultural tradition (Singer, 1955; Wolf, 1964, pp. 75-6). Here the performance of a person is not identical with a behavioral record, or with the imperfect or partial realization of individual competence. It takes into account the interaction between competence (knowledge, ability for use), the competence of others, and the cybernetic and emergent properties of events themselves. A performance, as an event, may have properties (patterns and dynamics) not reducible to terms of individual or standardized competence. Sometimes, indeed, these properties are the point (a concert, play, party).

The concept of 'performance' will take on great importance, insofar as the study of communicative competence is seen as an aspect of what

from another angle may be called the ethnography of symbolic forms - the study of the variety of genres, narration, dance, drama, song, instrumental music, visual art, that interrelate with speech in the communicative life of a society, and in terms of which the relative importance and meaning of speech and language must be assessed. The recent shift in folklore studies and much of anthropology to the study of these genres in terms of performances with underlying rules (e.g. Abrahams, 1967) can be seen as a reconstruction on an ethnographic basis of the vision expressed in Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms. (This reconstruction has a direct application to the communicative competence of children in American cities, where identification and understanding of differences in kinds of forms, abilities, and their evaluation is essential.)

The concept of 'performance' will be important also in the light of sociological work such as that of Goffman (cited above), as its concern with general interactional competence helps make precise the particular role of linguistic competence.

In both respects the interrelation of knowledge of distinct codes (verbal: non-verbal) is crucial. In some cases these interrelations will bespeak an additional level of competence (cf., e.g., Sebeok, 1959, pp. 141-2): 'Performance constitutes a concurrently ordered selection from two sets of acoustic signals - in brief, codes - language and music. . . . These are integrated by special rules. . . .') In others, perhaps not, as when the separate cries of vendors and the call to prayer of a muezzin are perceived to fit by an observer of an Arabic city, but with indication of intent or plan.

The nature of research into symbolic forms and interactional competence is already influenced in important part by linguistic study of competence (for some discussion see Hymes, 1968b). Within the view of communicative competence taken here, the influence can be expected to be reciprocal.

Having stated these general recommendations, let me now review relations between the linguistic and other communicative systems, especially in terms of cultural anthropology. I shall consider both terminology and content, using the four questions as a framework.

1. *Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible*

This formulation seems to express an essential concern of present linguistic theory for the openness, potentiality, of language, and to generalize it for cultural systems. When systemic possibility is a matter of language, the corresponding term is of course *grammaticality*. Indeed, language is so much the paradigmatic example that one uses 'grammar' and 'grammaticality' by extension for other systems of formal possibility (recurrent references to a cultural grammar, Kenneth Burke's *A Grammar of Motives*,

etc.). For particular systems, such extension may well be the easiest course; it is much easier to say that something is 'grammatical' with respect to the underlying structure of a body of myth, than to say in a new sense that it is 'mythical'. As a general term, one does readily enough speak of 'cultural' in a way analogous to grammatical (Sapir once wrote of 'culturalized behavior', and it is clear that not all behavior is cultural). We may say, then, that something possible within a formal system is grammatical, cultural, or, on occasion, communicative (cf. Hymes, 1967b). Perhaps one can also say uncultural or uncommunicative, as well as ungrammatical, for the opposite.

2. *Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible*

The predominant concern here, it will be recalled, has been for psychological factors such as memory limitation, perceptual device, effects of properties such as nesting, embedding, branching, and the like. Such considerations are not limited to linguistics. A parallel in cultural anthropology is Wallace's hypothesis (1961a, p. 462) that the brain is such that culturally institutionalized folk taxonomies will not contain more than twenty-six entities and consequently will not require more than six orthogonally related binary dimensions for the definitions of all terms. With regard to the cultural, one would take into account other features of the body and features of the material environment as well. With regard to the communicative, the general importance of the notion of means of implementation available is clear.

As we have seen, question 2 defines one portion of what is lumped together in linguistic theory under the heading of performance, and, correspondingly, acceptability. Clearly a more specific term is needed for what is in question here. No general term has been proposed for this property with regard to cultural behavior as a whole, so far as I know, and *feasible* seems suitable and best for both. Notice, moreover, that the implementational constraints affecting grammar may be largely those that affect the culture as a whole. Certainly with regard to the brain there would seem to be substantial identity.

3. *Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate*

As we have seen, appropriateness is hardly brought into view in the linguistic theory under discussion, and is lumped under the heading of performance, and, correspondingly, acceptability. With regard to cultural anthropology, the term *appropriate* has been used (Conklin, Frake, etc.), and has been extended to language (Hymes, 1964, pp. 39-41). 'Appropriateness' seems to suggest readily the required sense of relation to contextual features. (Since any judgement is made in some defining context,

it may always involve a factor of appropriateness, so that this dimension must be controlled even in study of 'purely grammatical competence' (cf. Labov, 1966). From a communicative standpoint, judgements of appropriateness may not be assignable to different spheres, as between the linguistic and the cultural; certainly, the spheres of the two will intersect. (One might think of appropriateness with regard to grammar as the context-sensitive rules of sub-categorization and selection to which the base component is subject; there would still be intersection with the cultural.)

Judgement of appropriateness employs a tacit knowledge. Chomsky himself discusses the need to specify situations in mentalistic terms, and refers to proper notions of 'what might be expected from anthropological research' (1965, p. 195, n. 5). Here there would seem to be recognition that an adequate approach to the relation between sentences and situations must be 'mentalistic', entailing a tacit knowledge, and, hence, competence (in the usage of both Chomsky and this paper). But the restriction of competence (knowledge) to the grammatical prevails, so far as explicit development of theory is concerned. By implication, only 'performance' is left. There is no mention of what might contribute to judgement of sentences in relation to situations, nor how such judgements might be analysed. The lack of explicitness here, and the implicit contradiction of a 'mentalistic' account of what must in terms of the theory be a part of 'performance' show again the need to place linguistic theory within a more general sociocultural theory.

4. *Whether (and to what degree) something is done*

The study of communicative competence cannot restrict itself to occurrences, but it cannot ignore them. Structure cannot be reduced to probabilities of occurrence, but structural change is not independent of them. The capabilities of language users do include some (perhaps unconscious) knowledge of probabilities and shifts in them as indicators of style, response, etc. Something may be possible, feasible, and appropriate and not occur. No general term is perhaps needed here, but the point is needed, especially for work that seeks to change what is done. This category is necessary also to allow for what Harold Garfinkel (in discussion in Bright, 1966, p. 323) explicates as application of the medieval principle, *factum valet*: 'an action otherwise prohibited by rule is to be treated as correct if it happens nevertheless'.

In sum, the goal of a broad theory of competence can be said to be to show the ways in which the systemically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behavior.
[...]

V

We spoke first of a child's competence as 'in principle'. Of course no child has perfect knowledge or mastery of the communicative means of his community. In particular, differential competence has itself a developmental history in one's life. The matrix formed in childhood continues to develop and change throughout life with respect both to sentence structures and their uses (cf. Labov, 1965, pp. 77, 91-2; Chomsky, 1965, p. 202) and recall the northeast Amazon situation mentioned earlier. Tanner (1967, p. 21) reports for a group of Indonesians: 'Although the childhood speech patterns ... foreshadowed those of the adult, they did not determine them. ... For these informants it is the principle of code specialization that is the important characteristic of childhood linguistic experience, not the pattern of code specialization itself. (All are multilingual from childhood.) Not one person interviewed reported a static linguistic history in this respect.' See now also Carroll, 1968).

Perhaps one should contrast a 'long' and a 'short' range view of competency, the short range view being interested primarily in understanding innate capacities as unfolded during the first years of life, and the long range view in understanding the continuing socialization and change of competence through life. In any case, here is one major respect in which a theory of competence must go beyond the notion of ideal fluency in a homogeneous community, if it is to be applicable to work with disadvantaged children and with children whose primary language or language variety is different from that of their school; with intent to change or add, one is presupposing the possibility that competence that has unfolded in the natural way can be altered, perhaps drastically so, by new social factors. One is assuming from the outset a confrontation of different systems of competency within the school and community, and focusing on the way in which one affects or can be made to affect the other. One encounters phenomena that pertain not only to the separate structures of languages, but also to what has come to be called *interference* (Weinreich, 1953) between them: problems of the interpretation of manifestations of one system in terms of another.

Since the interference involves features of language and features of use together, one might adopt the phrase suggested by Hayes, and speak of *sociolinguistic interference*. (More generally, one would speak of *communicative interference* to allow for the role of modes of communication other than language; in this section, however, I shall focus on phenomena of language and language *per se*.)

When a child from one developmental matrix enters a situation in which the communicative expectations are defined in terms of another, misperception and misanalysis may occur at every level. As is well known,

words may be misunderstood because of differences in phonological systems; sentences may be misunderstood because of differences in grammatical systems; intents, too, and innate abilities, may be misevaluated because of differences of systems for the use of language and for the import of its use (as against other modalities).

With regard to education, I put the matter some years ago in these words (Hymes, 1961, pp. 65-6):

... new speech habits and verbal training must be introduced, necessarily by particular sources to particular receivers, using a particular code with messages of particular forms via particular channels, about particular topics and in particular settings - and all this from and to people for whom there already exist definite patternings of linguistic routines, of personality expression via speech, of uses of speech in social situations, of attitudes and conceptions toward speech. It seems reasonable that success in such an educational venture will be enhanced by an understanding of this existing structure, because the innovators' efforts will be perceived and judged in terms of it, and innovations which mesh with it will have greater success than those which cross its grain.

The notion of sociolinguistic interference is of the greatest importance for the relationship between theory and practice. First of all, notice that a theory of sociolinguistic interference must begin with heterogeneous situations, whose dimensions are social as well as linguistic. (While a narrow theory seems to cut itself off from such situations, it must of course be utilized in dealing with them. See, for example, Labov and Cohen (1967) on relations between standard and non-standard phonological and syntactic rules in Harlem, and between receptive and productive competence of users of the non-standard vernacular.)

Second, notice that the notion of sociolinguistic interference presupposes the notion of sociolinguistic systems between which interference occurs, and thus helps one see how to draw on a variety of researches that might be overlooked or set aside. (I have in mind for example obstacles to use of research on 'second-language learning' in programs for Negro students because of the offensiveness of the term.) The notions of sociolinguistic interference and system require a conception of an *integrated theory of sociolinguistic description*. Such work as has been done to contribute to such a theory has found it necessary to start, not from the notion of a language, but from the notion of a *variety* or *code*. In particular, such a descriptive theory is forced to recognize that the historically derived status of linguistic resources as related or unrelated languages and dialects, is entirely secondary to their status in actual social relationships. Firstly, recall the need to put language names in quotes (section II). Secondly, the degree of linguistic similarity and distance cannot predict mutual intelligibility, let alone use. Thirdly, from the functional standpoint

of a sociolinguistic description, means of quite different scope can be employed in equivalent roles. A striking example is that the marking of intimacy and respect served by shift of second person pronoun in French (*tu*: *vous*) may be served by shift of entire language in Paraguay (Guarani: Spanish). Conversely, what seem equivalent means from the standpoint of languages may have quite different roles, e.g., the elaborated and restricted codes of English studied by Bernstein (1965). In short, we have to break with the tradition of thought which simply equates one language, one culture, and takes a set of functions for granted. In order to deal with the problems faced by disadvantaged children, and with education in much of the world, we have to begin with the conception of the speech habits, or competencies, of a community or population, and regard the place among them of the resources of historically-derived languages as an empirical question. As functioning codes, one may find one language, three languages; dialects widely divergent or divergent by a hair; styles almost mutually incomprehensible, or barely detectable as different by the outsider; the objective linguistic differences are secondary, and do not tell the story. What must be known is the attitude toward the differences, the functional role assigned to them, the use made of them. Only on the basis of such a functionally motivated description can comparable cases be established and valid theory developed.

Now with regard to sociolinguistic interference among school children, much relevant information and theoretical insight can come from the sorts of cases variously labelled 'bilingualism', 'linguistic acculturation', 'dialectology', 'creolization', whatever. The value of an integrated theory of sociolinguistic description to the practical work would be that

1. it would attempt to place studies, diversely labelled, within a common analytical framework; and
2. by placing such information within a common framework, where one can talk about relations among codes, and types of code-switching, and types of interference as between codes, one can make use of the theory while perhaps avoiding connotations that attach to such labels as 'second-language learning'. (I say perhaps because of course it is very difficult to avoid unpleasant connotations for any terms used to designate situations that are themselves intrinsically sensitive and objectionable.)

William Stewart's (1965, p. 11, n. 2) suggestion that some code relationships in the United States might be better understood if seen as part of a continuum of cases ranging to the Caribbean and Africa, for example, seems to me from a theoretical standpoint very promising. It is not that most code relationships in the United States are to be taken as involving different languages, but that they do involve relationships among different

codes, and that the fuller series illuminates the part. Stewart has seen through the different labels of dialect, creole, pidgin, language, bilingualism, to a common sociolinguistic dimension. Getting through different labels to the underlying sociolinguistic dimensions is a task in which theory and practice meet.

Let me now single out three interrelated concepts, important to a theory of sociolinguistic description, which have the same property of enabling us to cut across diverse cases and modes of reporting, and to get to basic relationships. One such concept is that of *verbal repertoire*, which Gumperz (1964) has done much to develop. The heterogeneity of speech communities, and the priority of social relationships, is assumed, and the question to be investigated is that of the set of varieties, codes, or subcodes, commanded by an individual, together with the types of switching that occur among them. (More generally, one would assess communicative repertoire.)

A second concept is that of *linguistic routines*, sequential organizations beyond the sentence, either as activities of one person, or as the interaction of two or more. Literary genres provide obvious examples; the organization of other kinds of texts, and of conversation, is getting fresh attention by sociologists, such as Sacks, and sociologically oriented linguists, such as Labov. One special importance of linguistic routines is that they may have the property that the late English philosopher Austin dubbed *performative* (Searle, 1967). That is, the saying does not simply stand for, refer to, some other thing; it is itself the thing in question. To say 'I solemnly vow' is to solemnly vow; it does not name something else that is the act of vowing solemnly. Indeed, in the circumstances no other way to vow solemnly is provided other than to do so by saying that one does so. From this standpoint, then, disability and ability with regard to language involve questions that are not about the relation between language and something else that language might stand for or influence; sometimes such questions are about things that are done linguistically or not at all. (More generally, one would analyse linguistic routines, comprising gesture, paralinguistics, etc. as well.)

A third concept is that of *domains of language behavior*, which Fishman has dealt with insightfully in his impressive work on *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966, pp. 424-39). Again, the complexity and patterning of use is assumed, and the focus is upon 'the most parsimonious and fruitful designation of the occasions on which one language (variant, dialect, style, etc.) is habitually employed rather than (or in addition to) another' (p. 428). (More generally, one would define domains of communicative behavior.)

Too often, to be sure, the significance of a sociolinguistic feature, such

as a code, routine, or term or level of address, is sought by purely distributional means. The feature is traced through the set of contexts in which it can be used without regard to an intervening semantic structure. Such an approach neglects the fact that sociolinguistic features, like linguistic features, are 'signs' in the classical Saussurean sense, comprising both a form and a meaning (*signifiant* and *signifié*). The difference is that one thinks of a typical linguistic sign as comprising a phonological form and a referential meaning (*chîen* and the corresponding animal), whereas a sociolinguistic sign may comprise with respect to form an entire language, or some organized part of one, while meaning may have to do with an attitude, norm of interaction, or the like. (Recall the Paraguayan case of Spanish/distance: Guaraní/closeness (among other dimensions)). Thus the relation between feature and context is mediated by a semantic paradigm. There is an analogue here to the representation of a lexical element in a language in terms of form (phonological features), meaning (semantic features), and context (features of syntactic selection), or, indeed, to the tripartite semiotic formula of Morris, syntactics, semantics, pragmatics, if these three can be interpreted here as analogous of form, meaning and context.

If the distributional approach neglects semantic structure, there is a common semantic approach that neglects context. It analyses the structure of a set of elements (say, codes, or terms of personal reference) by assuming one normal context. This approach (typical of much componential analysis) is equally unable to account for the range of functions a fluent user of language is able to accomplish (cf. Tyler, 1966). It is true that the value of a feature is defined first of all in relation to a set of normal contexts (settings, participants, personal relationships, topics, or whatever). But given this 'unmarked' (presupposed) usage, an actor is able to insult, flatter, color discourse as comic or elevated, etc., by 'marked' use of the feature (code, routine, level of address, whatever) in other contexts. Given their tacit knowledge of the normal values, hearers can interpret the nature and degree of markedness of the use.

Thus the differences that one may encounter within a community may have to do with:

1. Presence or absence of a feature (code, routine, etc.).
2. The semantic value assigned a feature (e.g., English as having the value of distance and hostility among some American Indians).
3. The distribution of the feature among contexts, and
4. The interrelations of these with each other in unmarked and marked usages.

This discussion does not exhaust the concepts and modes of analysis relevant to the sort of theory that is needed. A number of scholars are developing relevant conceptual approaches, notably Bernstein, Fishman, Gumperz, Labov (my own present formulation is indicated in Hymes, 1967a). The three concepts singled out do point up major dimensions: the capacities of persons, the organization of verbal means for socially defined purposes, and the sensitivity of rules to situations. And it is possible to use the three concepts to suggest one practical framework for use in sociolinguistic description. [...]

Reference

- ABRAHAMS, R. D. (1967), 'Patterns of performance in the British West Indies', mimeographed working paper.
- ALBERT, E. M. (1964), 'Rhetoric, logic and poetics in Burundi: culture patterning of speech behaviour', in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *The Ethnography of Communication*, *Ama*, vol. 66, no. 6, part 2.
- BERNSTEIN, B. (1965), 'A sociolinguistic approach to social learning', in J. Gould (ed.), *Social Science Survey*, Penguin.
- BLOOMFIELD, L. (1927), 'Literate and illiterate speech', *Amer. Speech*, vol. 2, pp. 432-9.
- BONHOFFER, D. (1965), 'What is meant by "telling the truth"?', *Ethics*, pp. 363-72.
- BRIGHT, W. (1966), *Sociolinguistics*, Mouton.
- BURKE, K. (1966), *Towards a Better Life. Being a Series of Epistles, or Declamations*, University of California Press (first published 1932).
- CARROLL, J. B. (1968), 'Development of native language skills beyond the early years', in Reed and J. B. Carroll (eds.), *Language Learning*, National Council of Teachers of English.
- CAZDEN, C. B. (1966), 'Subcultural differences in child language: an interdisciplinary review', *Merrill-Palmer Q.*, vol. 12, pp. 185-218.
- CAZDEN, C. B. (1967), 'On individual differences in language competence and performance', *J. Spec. Educ.*, vol. 1, pp. 135-50.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, MIT Press.
- FERGUSON, C. A. (1966), 'On sociolinguistically oriented surveys', *Linguistic Reporter*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1-3.
- FISHMAN, J. A. (1966), *Language Loyalty in the United States*, Mouton.
- GARFINKEL, H. (in press), 'Remarks on ethnomethodology', in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1956), 'The nature of deference and demeanor', *Ama*, vol. 58, pp. 473-502.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday; Allen Lane The Penguin Press.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1963), *Behavior in Public Places*, Free Press.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1964), 'The neglected situation', in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *The Ethnography of Communication*, *Ama*, vol. 66, no. 6, part 2.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1967), *Interaction Ritual*, Doubleday.
- GOODENOUGH, W. H. (1957), 'Cultural anthropology and linguistics', in P. Garvin (ed.), *Report of the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Languages and Linguistics*, Georgetown University Press.

- GUMPERZ, J. J. (1964), 'Linguistic and social interaction in two communities', in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *The Ethnography of Communication*, *Ama*, vol. 66, no. 6, part 2.
- HYMES, D. (1961), 'Functions of speech: an evolutionary approach', in F. Gruber (ed.), *Anthropology and Education*, University of Pennsylvania.
- HYMES, D. (1964), 'Directions in (ethno-) linguistic theory', in A. K. Romney and R. G. D'Andrade (eds.), *Transcultural Studies of Cognition*, American Anthropological Association.
- HYMES, D. (1967a), 'Models of the interaction of language and social setting', *J. Soc. Iss.*, vol. 23, pp. 8-28.
- HYMES, D. (1967b), 'The anthropology of communication', in F. Dance (ed.), *Human Communication Theory: Original Essays*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- HYMES, D. (1968a), 'Linguistic problems in defining the concept of the tribe', in J. Helm (ed.), *Proceedings of the 1967 Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, University of Washington Press.
- HYMES, D. (1968b), 'Linguistics - the field', *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Macmillan Co.
- HYMES, D. (in press), 'Review of Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, *Language*.
- JOHN, V. (1967), 'Communicative competence of low-income children: Assumptions and programs', *Report of Language Development Study Group*, Ford Foundation.
- KATZ, J. J. (1967), 'Recent issues in semantic theory', *Foundations of Language*, vol. 3, pp. 124-94.
- LABOV, W. (1965), 'Stages in the acquisition of standard English', in R. Shuy (ed.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*, National Council of Teachers of English.
- LABOV, W. (1966), *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Center for Applied Linguistics.
- LABOV, W. and COHEN, P. (1967), 'Systematic relations of standard and non-standard rules in the grammar of Negro speakers', paper for Seventh Project Literacy Conference, Cambridge, Mass.
- QUIRK, R. (1966), 'Acceptability in language', *Proceedings of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne Philosophical Society*, vol. 1, no. 7, pp. 79-92.
- SAPIR, E. (1925), 'Sound patterns in language', *Language*, vol. 1, pp. 37-51.
- SEARLE, J. (1967), 'Human communication theory and the philosophy of language: some remarks', in F. Dance (ed.), *Human Communication Theory*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- SEBEOK, T. (1959), 'Folksong viewed as code and message', *Anthropos*, vol. 54, pp. 141-53.
- SINGER, M. (1955), 'The cultural pattern of Indian civilization: a preliminary report of a methodological field study', *Far East. Q.*, vol. 15, pp. 223-36.
- STEWART, W. (1965), 'Urban Negro speech: sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching', in R. Shuy (ed.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*, National Council of Teachers of English.
- TANNER, N. (1967), 'Speech and society among the Indonesian élite: a case study of a multilingual community', *Anthrop. Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 15-40. (See also this volume.)
- TYLER, S. (1966), 'Context and variation in Koya kinship terminology', *Ama*, vol. 68, pp. 693-707.
- WALLACE, A. F. C. (1961a), 'On being just complicated enough', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 47, pp. 438-64.
- WALLACE, A. F. C. (1961b), *Culture and Personality*, Random House.
- WEINREICH, U. (1953), *Languages in Contact*, Linguistic Circle of New York.
- WOLF, E. (1964), *Anthropology*, Prentice-Hall.