

5274202

*International Journal of
American Linguistics*

Volume 53

1987

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 53 (1987)

PM101
 .I6
 v. 53
 no. 2-4
 1987
 RR5

COPYRIGHT 1987 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
 PUBLISHED JANUARY, APRIL, JULY, AND OCTOBER 1987
 PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

1

Thomas E. Payne: Pronouns in Yagua Discourse 1
Emanuel J. Drechsel: On Determining the Role of Chickasaw in
 the History and Origin of Mobilian Jargon 21
Geoffrey Kimball: Men's and Women's Speech in Koasati: A
 Reappraisal 30
Tor Ulving: The Fskimo Suffixes *-a* and *-i*: Markers of What? 39
John Enrico: The Dimensions of Language 61
William J. Samarin: Demythologizing Plains Indian Sign Lan-
 guage History 65
John S. Robertson: The Origins of the Mamean Pronominals: A
 Mayan/Indo-European Typological Comparison 74

2

Monica Macaulay: Cliticization and the Morphosyntax of Mixtec 119
Geoffrey Kimball: A Grammatical Sketch of Apalachee 136
Thaddeus C. Grimm: A Comparison of Catawba with Biloxi,
 Mandan, and Dakota 175
Bruce L. Pearson: Savannah and Shawnee: The End of a Mini-
 controversy 183
Maria Bittner: On the Semantics of the Greenlandic Antipassive
 and Related Constructions 194
Lars J. Larsson: Who Were the Konomihu? 232

3

Lyle Campell: Syntactic Change in Pipil 253
Fernando Peñalosa: Major Syntactic Structures of Acatec (Dialect
 of San Miguel Acatán) 281
Desmond C. Derbyshire: Morphosyntactic Areal Characteristics
 of Amazonian Languages 311
Susan M. Knowles-Berry: Negation in Chontal Mayan 327
Ofelia Zepeda: Desiderative-Causatives in Tohono O'odham . . . 348

4

Robert D. Van Valin, Jr.: The Role of Government in the
 Grammar of Head-Marking Languages 371
Stephen A. Marlett and Velma B. Pickett: The Syllable Structure
 and Aspect Morphology of Isthmus Zapotec 398

82-554116/S

Vastness of Natural Language, it would have vastly overstated L & P's case. This suggests that what importance *VNL* may have is for the philosophy of linguistics rather than the practice of linguistics: one can analyze languages with blithe disregard for infinite linguistic objects and be safe in the knowledge that any misrepresentation that one has thereby engendered can be corrected in a trivial way.

JAMES D. MCCAWLEY, *University of Chicago*

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM A. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1966. *Language, Mathematics, and Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- JOHNSON, DAVID, AND PAUL M. POSTAL. 1980. *Arc-Pair Grammar*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- MCCAWLEY, JAMES D. 1982. How far can you trust a linguist? *Language, Mind, and Brain*, ed. T. Simon and R. Scholes, pp. 75-87. Hillsdale, N.J.: Ablex.
- _____. 1983. Towards plausibility in theories of language acquisition. *Communication and Cognition* 16:169-83.
- MONTAGUE, RICHARD. 1973. The proper treatment of quantification in ordinary English. *Approaches to Natural Language*, ed. J. Hintikka et al., pp. 221-42. Dordrecht: Reidel. [Reprinted in R. Montague, *Formal Philosophy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974), pp. 247-70.]
- POPPER, KARL. 1976. *Unended Quest*. LaSalle, Ill.: Open Court.

A REPLY

Una Canger devotes much space to a detailed critique of my *Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl* (henceforth *ADN*) in which she raises many questions, some of broad methodological import and others of a very specific nature (*IJAL* 52, no. 2 [April 1986]: 188-96).

Canger is not content with the orthography that I use in the dictionary and suggests her own alternative which would use *v* to represent /w/, *s* to represent /s/, and *h* to represent glottal stop; moreover, she would have the process of alphabetization pass over *h* as invisible. I cannot believe that this would be a convenience for users of a Nahuatl dictionary working with Nahuatl texts. The orthography that J. Richard Andrews adopted for his grammar, *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*, and which I chose to use in *ADN* to avoid proliferation of orthographies, is very close to that used in most extant Nahuatl texts. It requires a minimum of transliteration (equating *ç* with *z* and—in the oldest texts—*u/v* with *hu/uh*, putting in syllable-final *h* for glottal stop, paying attention to macrons over vowels) and is Spanish-based (*hu* for /w/, *z* for /s/, *c* for /s/ before front vowels), appropriately for Nahuatl. Words in the work of Andrews and myself look very much as they do in the Nahuatl texts. Canger's proposed orthography, on the other hand, can match no texts, since the *v* she proposes

was characteristic of only the earliest Nahuatl texts, while the *s* convention came into limited use in the eighteenth century. Using the letter *h* for glottal stop but treating the *h* as though it were not there seems like a major headache for the user. Canger cites cases of reduplicated forms of the same stem being separated alphabetically in my dictionary, but such reduplicated pairs are cross-referenced to each other and to the basic stem. In general, in *ADN*, words that are spelled alike in the underdifferentiated traditional orthography are noted and cross-referenced in each entry so that the user is aware of the potential for mistaken identity.

Canger seems to treat the dictionary as an exegesis of Carochi's grammar, which it certainly is not. There is considerable material in *ADN* that is not attested in Carochi. The Bancroft manuscript, which apparently was written by one of Carochi's Nahua assistants, contains material not in Carochi's grammar, amplifies on some that is, and contradicts a mite of it. There are two eighteenth-century sources, Clavijero's glossary and Paredes's sermons, and material from three modern sources, Tetelcingo, Xalitla, and Zacapoaxtla. So *ADN* is based on three time periods (early seventeenth century, mid eighteenth century, and twentieth century) and four geographic areas (the Valley of Mexico, Morelos, Guerrero, and the Sierra de Puebla). *ADN* would have been built on even broader sampling of time and geographic spread had more sources been available. The bias I mention in my introduction springs from the fact that all the early sources are from the central highlands area, with which Tetelcingo closely agrees, not because I prefer it that way. Thanks to Canger's own lucid work on Nahuatl dialectology, it is recognized that the central dialects share some innovations that have never completely spread to the peripheral Nahuatl-speaking communities. Hence, given the sources available and what Canger has shown about innovations, I do not equate the *ADN* canonical forms with historically prior or underlying forms, as I state in the section which she quotes. Contrary to Canger's reading of this passage and her understanding of my work, *ADN* is not about Classical Nahuatl but about what might be called "general Nahuatl"—that core that is common to the historical and geographic variants of the language.

There is a philosophical difference that separates Canger and me. She is a "splitter" and I am a "lumper." I do not think there is a value judgment to be made here, although Canger's tone suggests that she feels otherwise. To state my side of the matter, I do not really believe in "Classical Nahuatl." How is it to be defined? Why is Carochi's mid-seventeenth-century grammar "classical," although it is a century and a quarter removed from precontact Nahuatl? Are late sixteenth-century notarial texts, which have a great deal in common with seventeenth- and eighteenth-century notarial texts, "classical" or not? Are we talking about style or content or date or place of redaction? Moreover, despite Canger's strong belief in marked dialectal variation, the notarial texts of the colonial period show very little, despite their broad geographic coverage. Since I have worked with texts written over a period of two and a half centuries, I see the language as an entity, changing markedly in time, mainly through contact with Spanish, but not split up into a myriad of strongly differentiated local dialects. Because Canger has done a great deal of fieldwork in Mexico in the

past decades, she is deeply impressed with local variation and has worked hard toward rationalizing it for the rest of us, for which we are all grateful. But I am not convinced that she can legitimately project current dialect features back three or four centuries. She believes in a "Classical Nahuatl" and seems to hold it in some contempt, while I do not believe in it as something separate in the sweep of the history of Nahuatl.

It seems to me that because of her orientation, Canger wants *ADN* to be some sort of dialect atlas, and that she holds it against me that it is not. I have identified my sources, and where an entry in the dictionary is based on attestations from a single source, that is noted in the entry. Moreover, Canger complains that certain possible alternatives are missing. They are missing because they are not attested. The closest to invention in *ADN* are the rare instances in which the canonical form given disagrees with an attested form in matters of vowel length or the presence or absence of a glottal stop, and in those cases, I have stated in the entry that the canonical form goes against the attestation and why.

Finally, Canger asserts that the Spanish glosses are from Molina (1571), and she seems to assume that the English glosses are translations of the Spanish ones. In fact, I have given Molina's gloss whenever one is available, even in a very few cases providing a gloss from Molina of a synonymous but morphologically slightly variant form; but when a gloss from Molina has not been available, I have taken one from elsewhere or reluctantly written one myself (and identified such glosses with the letter *K*). The English glosses are not simply translations of Molina, as I explain in the introduction; they are mine and strive to express the basic sense and the use of the lexical item. In writing them, I have called on what James Lockhart and I have come across in years of reading notarial texts as well as the sources that contribute directly to *ADN*.

Canger writes, "it is very tempting to regard Karttunen's dictionary as a regular all-around dictionary and attempt to use it as such" and that "the many other uses that such a dictionary invites and should promote are less adequately served." But the introduction to *ADN* states explicitly the uses for which it was intended and certainly does not invite misuse.

Now to the minutiae: Canger quotes Olmos and immediately moves on to Carochi about the glottal stop as a plural marker in a way that seems to insinuate that the final *-h* was an invention of the friar-grammarians. But that Olmos could not really hear final glottal stops does not mean that they are fictitious. All the evidence from the sixteenth-century grammarian Rincón, Carochi (who amplified Rincón's list of minimal pairs), and the writer of the Bancroft Dialogues down to today is that the segmental glottal stop (with all its variations in phonetic realization) was and is a reality for native speakers of Nahuatl.

Canger also asserts that there is no phonetic distinction between certain adjacent vowels and the same vowels separated by a homorganic glide, limiting her comment to *ia/iya* in her review. She then complains that *ADN* does not have all possible variants with and without the glide. She acknowledges that, "Most—but not all—of these indeterminable cases are accompanied by a com-

ment stating that they are in fact indeterminable," but she finds this unsatisfactory when the alternative forms are not listed in *ADN*. The reason for this is that the alternatives she misses never occur in the attestations on which *ADN* is constructed, and I did not invent entries. Indeed there are holes in the dictionary derived from gaps in the attestations, and not just in the matter of *ia/iya*, but one can feel confident that entries in *ADN* are backed by attestations and never just by speculation, which I think is a virtue.

Next comes a section in which Canger regrets that I either accept Carochi or do not, not taking into account that Carochi was only one of my sources. One of her examples is *iztlacatīhua*, where by Carochi's general rule the vowel before *-hua* should be long, but where there is a macron missing in Carochi. Here she says disapprovingly that Andrews and I both "assume a mistake in Carochi's marking" and write a long vowel. But there is only a single attestation of this word in Carochi, and Carochi often omits macrons when he is not specifically discussing contrastive vowel length. When we turn to Tetelcingo we find the reflex of a long vowel, just as Carochi's rule predicts that we should. Both Andrews and I have gone by Carochi's rule and Tetelcingo's attestation, nor do we consider the omission of a macron a "mistake" in Carochi in the way we would consider an accent mark over a letter representing a long vowel to be.

Canger's next example is *ihxītiā*. In this case Carochi explicitly states that the vowel before *-tiā* is short, which is contrary to the general rule about vowel length before *-tiā* causatives, and that contradiction deserves a note. But despite what Carochi says, the other sources have a long vowel, in accordance with the general rule that Carochi himself states.

Next, having reproached me for straying from Carochi in the two preceding cases, Canger laments that I "unquestioningly follow" him in *netēcuitlahuiliztli* because by a "less explicit rule" the vowel before derivational *-liztli* should be long. But what is this "less explicit rule," and why don't the attestations across the sources for *ADN* go by that rule and have a long vowel? The Bancroft manuscript provides examples where the vowel in question is explicitly marked with a breve, and the vowel is consistently short in Tetelcingo.

Then we come to an "unformulated rule" applying to *māmāliā* and *zōmāliā*. It is not that I agree with Carochi about the long *ā* before *-liā* in the first instance, because this verb occurs repeatedly in the Bancroft manuscript with the vowel marked long, and there is the reflex of long *ā* in Tetelcingo. I explicitly discuss the length of the vowel in the second verb. Dictionary users can make up their own minds.

Canger takes me to task for "following Carochi's way of writing" some derivatives of the verb *cuā* with a short vowel, contrary to the "strict interpretation of a statement by Carochi" that leads Andrews to write a long vowel there. My commentary on this matter that Canger misses is under the main verb *cuā* in *ADN*, to which all derived forms are cross-referenced.

I am said to go against Carochi in marking stem-final vowels long before the nonactive suffix *-lō*, even when preceded by two consonants or when the preceding syllable contains a long vowel. I have discussed this in the two entries for verbs attested in Carochi to which this rule applies; the other entries Canger

mentions are attested in sources other than Carochi, and the attestations have long vowels. As I state in *ADN*, this rule of Carochi's seems to deal with limited contextual neutralization of vowel length, and the other sources do not seem to recognize it. So where there is an attestation in Carochi, I include a comment; where the attestations are from other sources, and contain no contradictions, I do not.

Next we come to a list of five verbs ending in *-huiliā*, all of which, as it is stated in *ADN*, are attested only in Zacapoaxtla. Canger singles out one, in particular, for criticism, namely, *tlahcuilohhuiliā* 'to reply to someone in writing'. I have supplied the glottal stop at the end of the third syllable and said so in the entry; the reader is thus warned. I supplied the glottal stop after considering the possible derivations of this form and deciding that the most likely was a denominational derivation from the noun *tlahcuiloh* 'writer, scribe' with the verbal derivational suffix *-huiā*—i.e., 'to make use of a scribe' (to reply in writing), with the whole in the applicative *tlahcuilohhuiliā* 'to make use of a scribe with respect to someone else', i.e., to reply to someone in writing. But there remains the alternative that it might be derived directly from the verb *ihcuiloā*, whereby the stem vowel *o* would undergo compensatory lengthening with loss of final *ā* before *-huiliā*. I am more than willing to be led into better understanding of Zacapoaxtla verbal morphology, but I am unconvinced that I have misled users of *ADN*, since I have indicated that these forms are from Zacapoaxtla and warned the reader about such forms in the introduction, and I can identify verbs as applicatives of other verbs and refer back to them only if the putative source verbs exist as entries in the dictionary. Is there really a better way of handling them?

Canger claims that *-ticah* and *-toc* constructions are calques on Spanish constructions, and I thought so too, until I tried to compile evidence to support that position. Then I discovered that they are abundantly attested in the seventeenth century as well as today. The rejoinder might be that the early ones are "different." Yet I can find no difference between the use of the early attestations and most of the most recent ones. How can we draw a line and say when they became different? What evidence can we bring to bear that the stative sense Canger posits for older sources has gone over to the calqued sense she posits for today? This would be a topic for a fine paper by someone with a background in colonial-period Nahuatl documentation as well as modern Nahuatl dialectology, and I hope someone will take it up.

Canger's assertion that "Spanish does NOT distinguish clearly between nouns and adjectives" is simply querulous. Her assertion that one can tell a Nahuatl noun from a Nahuatl adjective because the former takes an absolutive suffix and the latter does not is wrong. First of all, there are Nahuatl nouns that quite idiosyncratically do not take an absolutive suffix (*chichi* 'dog', *huēhueh* 'old man', *ilama/ilama-tl* 'old woman'). Second, there are Nahuatl words that cry out for an adjectival gloss in English that DO take an absolutive suffix, such as *cual-li* '(something) good'. Third, there are a number of classes of derived deverbal nouns/adjectives that do not take absolutive suffixes. These include those listed

by Canger as made with adjective-forming suffixes and a number of others, such as the "preterit-agentive" derivation, which I am sure Canger would unhesitatingly accept as nouns. Hence, the presence or absence of an absolutive suffix in no way distinguishes between nouns and adjectives in Nahuatl.

One *ADN* entry Canger selects for criticism is *xoxōhuic*, which is attested in both Tetelcingo (which generally agrees very closely with the Bancroft manuscript, Carochi, Clavijero, and Paredes) and in Zacapoaxtla, admittedly peripheral. The attestation that is different is that from Xalitla, Guerrero, pretty far from the center. Canger identifies this Xalitla variant as "the common Classical Nahuatl word." But among the sources for *ADN*, this attestation is not from "Classical Nahuatl" but from Xalitla, and so it is identified.

As to Canger's next complaint, concerning *-hua* and *-hui* variants, I am driven to point out that both *-hua* and *-hui* forms are attested, that each entry identifies the source of the attestation, that if a *-hua* form is attested in the sources for *ADN*, there it is, source(s) identified—similarly for a *-hui* variant.

As to the use of *tēcciztli* to mean 'eggshell' as well as 'shell' in general, I do not see why Canger feels she must second-guess me. The English glosses that I have written are based not only on Molina or on modern glossaries such as the one she speculates to be my (bungled) source, but on what I have learned of colonial-period usage as well. However, I have gone back to seventeenth-century documents in which *tēcciztli* occurs, and I must say in all honesty that there is no instance in which the referent is unambiguously an empty eggshell. However, were one to ask what snails, shells of other mollusks, and eggs have in common, the answer would seem to be shells. Perhaps in another edition of *ADN* I would be more cautious about that generalization. Which brings us to *mōlcaxitl*. Since writing the gloss for *ADN*, it has become clear from closer attention to the Bancroft manuscript that early in the colonial period, the word simply meant 'soup bowl', which is the literal sum of its parts. In Mexico today, the *molcajete* is a cup of volcanic stone in which vegetables and seeds are pounded and mashed. Whether now it is strictly the cup or the cup and the stone *mano* together, I am not prepared to quibble, but in a new edition of *ADN*, I would definitely expand the gloss by a phrase to take in 'soup bowl'.

I am grateful for the reference to *yexi.nin* in Molina. I did not know it. *Pipina* is missing from *ADN* because it is missing from the Nahuatl-to-Spanish side of the Zacapoaxtla dictionary. In making the data files for Zacapoaxtla, I matched the material from the Nahuatl-to-Spanish side with what was in the Spanish-to-Nahuatl side. Therefore, I missed anything that was only in the Spanish-to-Nahuatl side. I hope there was not much. This, too, should go into a second edition, and I am grateful for having it brought to my attention.

By Canger's principle that things ending in *-tic* should have adjectival glosses, *tlahōlcuauhtic* should not be glossed as 'strong commanding voice', and my gloss is more in keeping with Canger's own dictum.

Finally, the verb *yā*, which has the present form *yauh* and the preterit form *yah*: there is no way to provide this verb with a regular paradigm. I treat it as suppletive, and Canger posits a different base form. But from her form, too, she

must do something arbitrary about vowel length and syncopation. We have two different analyses, and at this point I see no way to choose between them. But does my suppletive analysis do a disservice to users of *ADN*?

I hope *ADN* is serving its users well. I hope they are reading the introduction, understanding it, and not misusing the dictionary. And I hope there will be a second edition with improvements and corrections. Canger has provided welcome material for some substantive changes. But our philosophical differences remain. The remedy for it is for Canger to undertake her own dictionary project, for which she has ambitious plans. If that comes about, we will all be the richer.

FRANCES KARTTUNEN, *University of Texas, Austin*

EIGHTEENTH ALGONQUIAN CONFERENCE

The Eighteenth Algonquian Conference was held October 24–26, 1986, at the Fort Garry Hotel in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Of the forty-seven papers given, twenty-five were on topics of linguistic interest. They are as follows:

- William Cowan, Carleton University: "Ojibwa Vocabulary in Longfellow's *Hiawatha*."
- Donna Starks, University of Manitoba: "The Concept of a Dialect: The Case of Woods Cree."
- Barbara Burnaby, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: "English Language Curriculum Development for Algonquian-Speaking Children."
- Robert Leavitt, University of New Brunswick: "Fluency Is Not Enough: Re-assessing the Goals of Native Language Instruction."
- J. A. Bennett and J. W. Berry, Queen's University: "The Syllabic Script in Northern Ontario."
- J. Peter Denny, University of Western Ontario: "Algonquian Word Formation Is Leftwards Modifying."
- M. R. Cote, T. J. Klokeid, and S. Ratt, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College: "The Morphological Structure of Conditional Sentences in Cree and Saulteaux."
- Wayne Leman, University of Oregon: "Cheyenne Obviation Pitch Alternations."
- Vincent Erickson, University of New Brunswick: "And to God Speak Penobscot: Father Demillier's Observations on the Algonquian Languages of Maine and New Brunswick."
- John Hewson, Memorial University of Newfoundland: "Are Algonquian Languages Ergative?"
- J. Randolph Valentine, University of Texas, Austin: "Report on a Survey of Ojibwa Dialects."
- Ives Goddard, Smithsonian Institution: "Prepositional Phrases in Massachusetts."
- David Pentland, University of Manitoba: "Names as Data in Historical Dialect Studies."

- Elena Leman, University of Oregon: "Cheyenne Reduplication."
- Robert Papen, Université du Québec à Montréal: "Linguistic Variation in the French Component of Métif Grammar."
- Dale W. Russell, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign: "Person Agreement in Cheyenne: A Reanalysis of Post-Stem Suffixes."
- Audrey Dawe-Sheppard, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia: "The Imperative/Jussive Distinction in Micmac."
- Don Deblois, Canadian Museum of Civilization: "Micmac *ayej*—Particle, Noun, Verb . . . ?"
- Amy Dahlstrom, Smithsonian Institution: "Narrative Structure in a Fox Text."
- Roger Spielmann, Amos Osowan School, Winneway, Québec: "Algonquian Conversational Analysis: A Preview."
- Diane Daviault, Université de Montréal: "La morphologie verbale dans une grammaire algonquienne du XVIIe siècle."
- Pierre Swiggers, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven: "Compounding in Blackfoot."
- George Aubin, Assumption College: "A Text in Golden Lake Algonquin."
- John Nichols, University of Manitoba: "The Invention of the Cree Syllabary."

These and the other papers given at the Conference will be edited by William Cowan and published by Carleton University. The Nineteenth Algonquian Conference will be held the last weekend in October at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. For information, please write Dr. Ives Goddard, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

WILLIAM COWAN, *Carleton University*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Copying Beyond Fair Use: The code on the first page of an article in this *Journal* indicates the copyright owner's consent that copies of the article may be made beyond those permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law provided that copies are made only for personal or internal use, or for the personal or internal use of specific clients and provided that the copier pay the stated per-copy fee through the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., Operations Center, 27 Congress Street, Salem, Massachusetts 01970. To request permission for other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale, kindly write to Permissions Department, The University of Chicago Press, 5801 S. Ellis Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60637. If no code appears on the first page of an article, permission to reprint may be obtained only from the author.

Manuscript Acceptance Policy: While it is *IJAL* policy to require the assignment of copyright on most *Journal* articles, we do not usually request assignment of copyright for other contributions (notes, reviews, abstracts, etc.).

Although the copyright may remain with the author it is understood that in return for publication, the *Journal* has the nonexclusive right to publish the contribution and the continuing right, without limit, to include the contribution as part of any reprinting of the issue and/or volume of the *Journal* in which the contribution first appeared by any means and in any format, including computer-assisted storage and readout, in which the issue and/or volume may be reproduced by the publisher or by its licensed agencies.

The Centre for Research and Teaching of Canadian Native Languages at the University of Western Ontario has been granted seed funding from the Academic Development fund of the University to establish a series of monograph-length studies of Canadian native languages and cultures. The focus of the series is to be analysis integrating linguistic and anthropological perspectives, emphasizing the interpretation of textual materials. All manuscripts submitted will be refereed by specialists. For further information on this series, and especially to submit and/or recommend manuscripts for consideration, please write: Dr. Margaret Seguin, Centre for Research and Teaching of Canadian Native Languages, Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2.

Beginning with volume 6 (1987), the editorial program of *Multilingua: Journal of Interlanguage Communication* will be redirected toward the discussion of research on social and cultural problems of communication in multilingual, multicultural settings. Emphasis will be placed on constraints imposed on the choice of linguistic system by the type of social activity in which the verbal interaction takes place. Papers on the following range of topics are invited: cross-cultural differences in linguistic politeness phenomena; strategies for the organization of verbal interaction; variety in what is traditionally regarded as one culture; conversational styles and the linguistic description of nonstandard, oral varieties of language; communication breakdown in interethnic, multicultural interaction; formal and functional differences between standard and nonstandard language varieties; and cross-cultural problems in translation. Contributions will be considered in the form of empirical, observational studies, theoretical studies, theoretical discussions, presentation of research, short notes, reactions/replies to recent articles, review articles, and letters to the editors. For more information, please write Richard J. Watts, Editor, *Multilingua*, Englishes Seminar, Universität Bern, Gesellschaftsstrasse 6, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland.

Columbia Quincentennial Fellowships at The Newberry Library are offered during the academic year 1987-88 for scholars working on topics related to the Transatlantic exchange of ideas, products, and peoples in the period 1450-1650. Projects for work in residence at the Newberry must be synthetic or interdisciplinary in approach, or represent new fields of study for the applicant, or aim at the creation of new classroom materials, teaching units, or courses. Preference will be given to projects that display potential for prompt classroom application at the college level. Stipends of \$800 per month are offered for

periods up to four months. These fellowships are offered in conjunction with a program of summer institutes on the *Transatlantic Encounters* theme. Participants in these institutes are eligible for the *Quincentennial Fellowships*, but prior participation in an institute is not required for application. Fellowships may be used prior to or following an institute, but may not be used to support participation in an institute itself. For Fellowship application forms, and information about the institutes, please write to: Transatlantic Encounters Program, The Newberry Library, 60 West Walton Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

Summer Quechua Institute—An intensive course for beginners in Cuzco-dialect Quechua, stressing aural, speaking, and grammatical structure, will be offered at the University of Chicago from June 22 to August 29, 1987. Instruction by a native speaker. For tuition and other information, write: Bob Holden, Center for Latin American Studies, University of Chicago, 5848 S. University Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60637.

An International Conference on the Basque Language will be held in San Sebastian (Donostia), Basque Country, Spain, from August 30 to September 4, 1987. The Conference is included in a set of 34 meetings, to be celebrated within the II World Basque Congress—Euskal Mundu-Biltzarra, sponsored by the Basque Government. The program will consist of invited and contributed papers and will last five days. For more information, write: II World Basque Congress Secretariat, Paseo de la Senda 15, bajo. 01007 Vitoria-Gasteiz, Basque Country, Spain.