Grammar in the Age of Ecology

ROSALINA T. BUMATAY-CRUZ

With apologies to Gabriel Garcia Marquez, I so entitle this paper, inspired by a review of *Love in the Time of Cholera* that describes the novel as "a creative amalgam of two starkly contrasting elements: the sacredness of love and love's embodiment in often horrific, everyday experience. Ultimately, the transcendental power of spiritual love emerges ..." (Couteau 1988). The amalgam I am about to create, however, is of two contrasting grammars: the sacred cow of schoolroom grammar and grammar's embodiment in everyday language situations. As to which grammar emerges the more powerful... I leave the judgment to the reader.

Purpose of the Study

The study aims to discover whether a case can be made for two grammars—one, a rule-governed, analytical school grammar, and the other, a culture-based layspeaker's grammar. The assumption is that there are two grammars located in two sites: "schoolroom grammar" found in the groves of Academe, and "layroom grammar" found in the common daily grind of the world outside. Each grammar serves overlapping purposes, although they have their own dynamics. Both grammars lay the rules for facilitating communication in a language, but wheras school grammar merely describes and explains such rules, layroom grammar uses those rules to reveal or change our perspective of the world.

Situation and Problem

In the Philippines, the (un)grammatical use of English is a gold mine for interesting discoveries about the attempts of learners to conduct discourse in a second language. Observed from a vantage point as teacher

and language researcher, the grammatical habits and practices of English language learners raise the following questions that particularly arise in a multilingual context:

(1) How do the functions, norms, and values of language operate in Philippine society?

(2) What and where are the different kinds of grammar located?

(3) How can dynamism be brought to the study of grammar?

Significance

The study looks at different grammatical approaches to the study of language in order to locate areas for appreciation as well as foci for instruction in English.

Organization

First, Jan Mukarovsky's views on aesthetic function, norm, and value will be reviewed in relation to language. Next will be a cursory look at the grammar, as seen in two loci—the schoolroom and the layroom. In this connection, the kinds of grammar will be reviewed. Finally, this study will locate the dynamism from where grammar study can imbibe its vigor.

Language Function, Norm, and Value: The Mukarovskyan Model

Suvin (1977) summarizes Mukarovsky, Czech linguist of the Prague School functionalist perspective, on the dynamics of verbal art:

History and society are not an external yardstick to be applied to the literary work: on the contrary, they enter into… constitute… its very structure and texture.

This was the gist of Mukarovsky's reply to the Formalist Shklovsky's textile metaphor through which the latter expressed literary interest in "types of yarn and techniques of weaving and not in the state of the international wool market or the politics of the monopoly corporations" (Suvin 1977). Disagreeing, Mukarovsky insisted that "the weaving

techniques necessarily reflect the needs and pressures of exactly the international wool market and all its factors" (Suvin 1977).

Language Function

The international market, social class, ethnicity, government, academe, language, recently even ecology, and all other extra-esthetic factors in the collective consciousness enter the domain of the esthetic at any particular time and place. The substance of literature (cf the material or content of literature)—language—has six functions, according to Jakobson's classic model of communication. They are shown here with their corresponding elements or foci of communication:

Function of Language	*Element of Communication*
1. Emotive/expressive	Addresser
2. Conative/appellative	Addressee/second person/ imperative and vocative cases
3. Referential/representative	Content/information/ message per se
4. Poetic/esthetic	Context (linguistic)/message or language for its own sake
5. Metalingual	Code
6. Phatic/relational/social	Contact

The emotive function of language is the role of language in expressing a belief, idea, feeling, perception, attitude, or any similar psychological experience of the world, and thus the communicative element in focus is the addresser (speaker/writer).

The conative function of language refers to the role of language in getting results from the addressee, in line with the addresser's command or appeal to share one's belief, awareness, interest, concurrence, or action, among other goals. Thus, the communicative element in focus is the addressee (listener/reader).

The referential function of language is the use of language to convey some message or information. Thus, the element of communication in focus is the formal (if there is no such thing as "objective") content itself.

The poetic function of language refers to the esthetic or literary use of language for its own sake—"it is responded to for what it *is*, and not for what it is *for*" (Garvin 1964, vii). According to Mukarovsky, "the esthetic consists in the fact that the listener's attention, which has so far been turned to the message for which language is a means, is directed to the linguistic sign itself, to its properties and composition … to its internal structure" (Mukarovsky 35-36). In the poetic function, the communicative element in focus is the language itself, or the linguistic context.

The metalingual function of language is the use of language itself to describe language. In this role, language relies on its own resources as a linguistic code itself to define its own terms or explain its own language. Here the focus is language as a linguistic code.

Finally, the phatic function of language refers to the use of language to establish an atmosphere or maintain social contact rather than exchange information or ideas (Crystal 1980, 264). The term "phatic communion" was introduced by the anthopologist Bronisalaw Malinowski (1884-1942) to establish rapport, relate to others, or maintain connectedness by way of comments on the weather, inquiries about health, or other minute topics while waiting for the bus or a meeting to start, or when seeing someone by chance on the street. The element of communication in focus is the immediate maintenance of social contact.

Each function may be dominant in a literary work, but the particular combination of at least the three functions—referential (context-dependent), conative (historical addressee), and metalingual (vocabulary plus rules plus socio-historical character)—"marks the ineluctably socio-historical character of every literary work" (Suvin 1977). With respect to language, the referential, conative, and metalingual functions similarly mark its socio-historical character.

In the Philippines, where working abroad or in call centers is, for many, an economic necessity and a question of survival, mastery of the English language is necessary in order to understand referential content or

information and to use the conative second person direct address with the right intonation pattern and phonetic production in order to be understood. There is nowadays a felt and growing need by jobseekers and board examinees not only for grammar refreshers but also, on the part of those planning to work abroad, for accent reduction or neutralization lessons (the latter especially for those planning to work abroad as well as those with heavy regional accents).

Decades of national language activism, along with anti-Americanism (and thus anti-English propaganda) have slowed down progress in English proficiency. Ten years from now, the Philippine advantage on that score could be overtaken (if it is not so, already) by other Asian countries which recognize the value of English for business, technology, scientific research, and communication in a global context. For example, in Korea, where premium is also placed, as in the Philippines, on educational attainment, universities and language schools offer great opportunities for English language exposure through video and audiotape recordings of native English speakers in action. Their better equipped universities have televisions sets and audio equipment in EACH language classroom. These are aside from the native and native-like speakers of English whom they hire to teach in these sessions or give conversation practice via telephones. In contrast, even top Philippine universities have only one or two language laboratories; thus, professors could bring their students to these rooms only once or twice a semester, since reservations for all other language English professors and classes also need to be accommodated.

Besides its function of preparing Filipinos for international competitiveness, English in the Philippine setting performs its function as the other official language in lawmaking, government documents, executive orders, congressional sessions, judicial decisions, being the medium of instruction, and others. It also plays an unofficial role as the second language for many. Actually, it is even a third or fourth language for those who speak a native language other than Filipino, although in professional terminology it is still regarded as "second," considering its functional importance. For an increasing number of speakers who have not mastered it, it serves as a creole or even pidgin language of communication, with such a lower level of competence being blamed partly on degenerating standards in second language instruction.

Language Norm

Language norms are derived by the public, either explicitly or implicitly, from language commissions, educational institutions, media, and social practice. Dictionaries and grammar books merely record these observed norms. What Mukarovsky says of the esthetic norm is true of language norms: "A deliberate effort may contribute to the clarification and systematization of the norms, but not to their creation: the source of the norms is the joint life of the society" (p.45).

Of the norm-builders, the school wields the strictest clout through punitive action in academic grading. However, media and social pressure (e.g., from peers and cause-oriented groups) are the most influential, on account of their scope and ubiquitousness, aided by electronic and technological advances in communication and travel. In Paris, *L'Academie francaise* so tightly polices the entry of foreign words into the French language, that almost always, French equivalents are issued as soon as any English technicalese arrives. The populace is encouraged to use the new native term, and violators are scorned. It is ironic that while France was midwife to the revolutionary birth of *liberte, equalite, et fraternite* for the rest of *humanite*, it now assumes a totalitarian Big Brother role in the free enterprise of linguistic loans (i.e., loan words or word borrowings) among world languages.

Fortunately for Philippine speakers of English, or unfortunately for the defenders of grammatical English - depending on which side of the codeswitching/no-codeswitching game one takes - the use of English for national/local purposes has been Philippinized. This means that the former subjects of the (American) English empire have struck back. Part of the norm for Philippine English is Taglish (codeswitching between Tagalog or Filipino and English), favored by the young generation and other nonpurists such as the bank and service sectors which include Taglish as a language choice in automated tellers and telephone inquiries. Not only codeswitching, but coinage (e.g., *presidentiable, senatoriable, giftable, trapo*), textese, and habitual grammatical trespasses on English abound.

Australian English ("Strine") and other varieties of English around the world also have their share of interesting coinage, adding to the lexicon terms such as the following (Conway 2004):

Afro pessimism	(the feeling that aid is futile)
angel gear	(neutral in a car when coasting downhill)
appointment tv	(shows for which one sets aside time specifically to watch)
aspendicitis	(the inability to control spending)
autocutie	(attractive newsreader)
beer goggles	(through which people become increasingly attractive as alcohol intake rises)
chew'n'spew	(low quality restaurant)
emotional correctness	(being seen to feel the same as others)
feral	(unkempt greenie)
glum bum	(pessimist)
leisure sickness	(fatigue or pains experienced at weekends or on holidays)
rat tamer	(psychiatrist)
sik	(excellent)
silver surfer	(a Web user of advanced years) [the term is "Weblish" or Internet talk]
stained glass ceiling	(promotion cut-off level for church workers)
yummy mummy	(an attractive woman with children)

Conway (2004) reports that new entries are drawn from a computerized Bank of English containing 524 million words—enough for a non-stop conversation lasting five and a half years. "Whether they make it depends on how widely and frequently they crop up," says Ruth Wajnryb, linguist consultant to the *Collins Australian Dictionary*. These coined terms reflect the influence of politics, economy, work, leisure, television, social life, international aid, and other aspects of modern culture on the dynamism of language.

Another interesting area in the dynamics of norm-building in Philippine English is texting language or "textese." Note, for instance, the

productivity of the phonological unit [et] (consisting of two sounds: the vowel long *a* and the consonant *t*), written as *-8*:

8	*(ate)*
classm8	*(classmate)*
d8	*(date)*
gr8	*(great)*
K8	*(Kate)*
l8r	*(later)*
w8	*(wait)*

The language phenomenon of text spelling is worldwide, on account of the "boom in mobile phone text messaging" (Conway 2004). "Strine," for example, includes the following texting acronyms:

AFAIK	*(as far as I know)*
GAL	*(get a life)*
IMNSHO	*(in my not so humble opinion)*
IYKWIMAITYD	*(if you know what I mean and I think you do)*

Whether codeswitching, coinage, and textese are good or bad for Philippine English or other varieties of English around the world, one does not legislate, prescribe, or proscribe, coming from a language-oriented field.

But perennial lapses in pronunciation, spelling, word and sentence formation in an English class underline the need for proficiency in English, resurrecting the importance of grammar. The list below includes only those misused words and sentences that come up EVERY semester in my own teaching experience, such that a teacher feels there is nothing more to teach if no one makes any lapse in any of the following grammatical items:

Pronunciation/Phonology

category, cemetery, committee, preferably, professor, semester, testimony

Spelling/Orthography

> *accommodation, advice* (noun), *cemetery* [again], *concede, costume, custom, ecstasy, embarrass, in spite of, occasion, occur, occurs, occurred, occurring, occurrence, precede, privilege, proceed, secede, sympathy*

Form of the Word/Morphology

> *beside(s), equipment, furniture, jewelry, luggage, stuff* (noun) [without -s], *parenthesis/-es*

Lexicon/Idiomatic Use of Verbs and/or Prepositions

> *based on, concerning* (without *about*), *cope with, discuss* [without *about/on*], *familiarity with, result in, tackle* [without *about*], *with regard to*

Sentence Construction/Syntax

> … have eaten/had eaten.
> I hope you will ….
> I wish you would …;
> The criteria are …
> … *kept yakking* [not *yakking and yakking*]

In determining the form of language, as with the words and phrases above, reference is always made to some linguistic norm, the dynamics of which is similar to the those of the esthetic norm, which Mukarovsky describes as

> the general consensus, the spontaneous agreement, of the members of a certain community that a given esthetic procedure is desirable and not another. This consensus manifests itself subjectively in the given case only as a mere feeling of approval or disapproval of the specific cases with which the individual comes in contact in life; very frequently, this feeling cannot be formulated, much less justified (44-45).

For example, "result TO" and "with regardS to" have been listed by some linguists and sociolinguists (e.g., Andrew Gonzalez and Ma. Lourdes Bautista) as Philippine English, thereby granting Filipinisms or local idioms

like these some degree of conformity with the norm for English as used by Philippine speakers, much as they are still treated by the "language police" as deviations from the norm.

Thus, whether codeswitching, coinage, textese, and Filipinisms are good or bad for Philippine English or other varieties of English around the world, one reserves judgment, and does not legislate, prescribe, or proscribe, but would politely decline the (dis)honor, knowing only too well, coming from a language-oriented field, that

> for the realization of language, a community of speakers [*masse parlante*] is necessary. Contrary to all appearances, language never exists apart from the social fact, for it is a semiological phenomenon. Its social nature is one of its inner characteristics.
> …
> But the thing which keeps language from being a simple convention that can be modified at the whim of interested parties is not its social nature; it is rather the action of time combined with the social force. If time is left out, the linguistic facts are incomplete and no conclusion is possible.
> …
> Language is no longer free, for time will allow the social forces at work on it to carry out their effects. This brings us back to the principle of continuity, which cancels freedom. But continuity necessarily implies change, varying degrees of shifts in the relationship between the signified and the signifier (Saussure 77-78).

Regardless of the purity vs anti-purity argument, all minds have more than one grammar inside them; i.e., the language faculty can assume different states in parallel. Cook (2003) reports that Chomsky often comments that every person is multilingual in a technical sense, switching between speaking different dialects or registers, and in effect choosing between two grammars. For example, people like Virginia Woolf drop their first person pronouns (i.e.,use "pro-drop"/null subject) in diary writing, but not in their public prose style.

In short, people are bigrammatical in that they have elements of two grammars in one mind—bilingualism occurs "whenever two properties exist

in a language that are not statable within a single grammar" (Roeper qtd. in Cook).

Cook notes that Chomsky sees bilingualism proper as the extreme end of a continuum of grammatical variation inherent within all speakers. This simultaneous existence of two grammars or parameter settings is observed in the language development of children who switch from one parameter setting to another: for example, one day they have null subjects in their speech, but the next day they do not.

However, Cook (2003), with his multi-competence theory, takes the opposite perspective. He argues that if the architecture of the mind involves two languages (giving children the potential to become bilingual or the ability to know more than one language, even if this ability declines after childhood), but we idealize the monolingual native speaker, then we falsify the architecture. It is as inaccurate as studying human breathing by looking at those with one lung rather than two. A person is a monolingual only because of the accidental fact of having encountered only one language, disabling such a person from realizing the bilingual or multilingual potential. Therefore, the universal grammar theory should take multilingualism as the norm. "Multiple grammars in the mind are not the exception but the norm, prevented only by accidental environmental features" (Cook). Universals can be established by studying the minds—not of people who know one language—but of only those people who have fulfilled the multilingual potential of the human language faculty. This position then treats the multilinguals of the world as the norm, not the monolinguals (Cook).

Language Value

Reviewing the rhetorical theories of Cicero, St. Augustine, Quintilian, Locke, the Enlightenment, the Romantics, and Todorov, MacPherson (1997) observes that there is a direct connection between how rhetoric and language are valued, depending on the political era. If language is valued or used as an art—to be beautiful and pleasing—then the value of words, in a world of science, is small. In a world where communication is mediated through television and mobile phones, the value of words can be great. If language is used to instruct and pursue knowledge in a democracy, it is valuable; and language used "figuratively" in order to enhance such pursuits,

is then better because it is more effective or appropriate. Moreover, rhetoric then is a valuable tool, in a world in which society seeks particular truths, rather than empirical proof.

In the Philippines, the value of English lies in its status as an official language of government, commerce, media, and education. Moreover, in Philippine society, to speak English and speak it well (i.e., with good grammar and pronunciation) is, rightly or wrongly, considered a mark of intelligence, quality education, and good breeding. Proficiency in English also serves as a passport to social mobility, particularly where interviews, board examinations, business presentations, and even beauty contests require effective expression and discourse in English. Speaking or writing in it is not incompatible with nationalism, as proven by a list of ardent nationalists who spoke and wrote in it: Recto, Tanada, Diokno, Manglapus, and Ninoy Aquino, among others. The temporary setback it received from radical nationalists and advocates of Filipino from the 1960s onward never did detract it from its position as a second language. Nevertheless, a formidable catching up is overdue, and teachers of English grammar are working against time, facing up to the Herculean task of cleaning the Augean stables that reek of carabao English.

Kinds of Grammar

Language norms are manifested in the living grammar of a language. The choices in spelling, sounds, words, and sentences as they are currently used by the language community, taught in schools, and recorded in dictionaries and grammar books indicate the presence of a norm that serves as a point of reference for other speakers and writers of the language. Sometimes more than one norm exists; thus, one hears, for example,

(1) "between you and me" alongside "between you and I"—in the case of written and spoken English, respectively;

(2) "different from" alongside "different than" and "different to"—in the case of teachers, American English, and British English, respectively; and

(3) "no later than" alongside "not later than"—in the case of formal and informal English.

While the prescriptive grammarian will allow only the first entry in each number, the descriptive grammarian will record all the instances above. Riley and Parker cite two other grammars: generative or transformational generative (which focuses on sentence transformations from "deep structures" or simpler, kernel structures called DS now to remove the connotation of being deep or difficult); and performance or discourse grammar (which focuses on linguistic and extralinguistic contexts - other factors around and beyond a sentence, so that the sentence is studied not in isolation, as is the case with generative grammar, nor apart from its meaning seen in context). Thus, there are four grammars: (1) Prescriptive, (2) Descriptive, (3) Generative, and (4) Performance. Within each are specific kinds of grammatical analyses, so that these kinds of grammar are actually groups of grammar. The first three have their loci in the schoolroom; the last, Performance (or Discourse or Functional) grammar, while it is the latest and the most popular in the schoolroom, is located in the layroom (i.e., the world outside).

The first four grammars will be discussed by way of summarizing *English Grammar: Prescriptive, Descriptive, Generative, Performance* by Riley and Parker (referred to for the most part, unless otherwise indicated). Then with the fourth grammar, Performance, the heart of the matter will be discussed, which is grammar in the age of ecology.

Origin of the Word Grammar

The word *grammar* comes from the Greek *gramma*, meaning " (alphabetic) letter," and is a derivation from *graphein*, meaning "to draw or write." [This definition of a term has just employed the metalingual function of language, discussed earlier.] The plural form of *gramma, grammata*, came to mean the "rudiments of writing," and later, the "rudiments of learning." Finally, the adjective *grammatike* was combined with *techne* meaning, the "art of knowing one's letters" (Dykema in Patterson 23).

A Brief Comparison of the Four Grammars

Riley and Parker (1998) compare the four grammars in terms of purpose, domain, and analogical equivalent (2-4):

Prescriptive, normative, or school grammar prescribes language with its domain, the dialect of prestige. It is analogous to Etiquette.

Descriptive or structural grammar describes language with its domain, all dialects and variations of any given language. It is analogous to botany.

Generative, transformational, generative transformational, or GT grammar describes the (relatively static) speaker with its domain, all languages. It is analogous to biology.

Finally, performance, rhetorical, or discourse analytical grammar also describes the (relatively dynamic) speaker with its domain, language in context. It is analogous to psychology.

Pre-Prescriptive Grammar (500 BC-1650)

Before the Prescriptive period, there were three periods:

(1) The Classical period (500 BC-500 AD) developed the first alphabet (Greek), though not necessarily the first writing system. The grammar focus was on parts of speech (noun, verb, interjection, participle, etc.); their characteristics (person, number, gender, case, tense, voice, mood, etc.); parsing (breaking up a sentence into words and identifying their parts of speech and functions as subject, object, modifier, etc.); verb conjugation; and pronoun declension.

(2) The Middle Ages (500-1500) elevated Latin to its important position as the language of learning, literature, government, and the church. Aelfric viewed his *Latin Grammar and Colloquium* as a suitable student's introduction to English grammar, thus foreshadowing the Latin-modeled English grammar of the prescriptivists. **Speculative grammar** (from *speculum*, "mirror"), with its idea of language as the mirror of reality, was introduced by the *modistae* (from the medieval scholars' treatise *De modis significandi tractatus*, "Treatise Concerning the Modes of Signifying"), who related language to the natural world by asking, "How do words match [the] mental perceptions of things?"

(3) The Renaissance (1500-1650) saw not only a revival of classical texts read in the original Latin and Greek, but also an interest in the vernacular languages (European, Asian, African, and American), giving rise to vernacular nationalism and thus laying the ground for eighteenth century prescriptivist attitudes. The introduction of printing further increased the demand for literacy and education (including foreign languages) through texts, grammars, and dictionaries, all of which brought the healthy fever to the Philippines during the Spanish times. The **rationalist grammar** of the Port Royal school, with its interest in propositions divided into concepts and judgments (corresponding to subjects and predicates), was developed by the Solitaires, hermits of the Port-Royal abbey in France. Its classic sentence

Invisible God created the visible world

contains three propositions: "God is invisible," God created the world," and "The world is visible."

Prescriptive Grammar (1650-1800)

In England, the Royal Society, established to further scientific interests, created a 22-member committee including Dryden, to "standardize," "refine," and "ascertain" (i.e., fix it to prevent further change) English. Defoe and Swift tried to sustain this academy, but the ascension of the Hanoverian George I who spoke only German, and the fear of linguistic regulation encroaching on individual liberty, led to the natural death of the interest. Nevertheless, Samuel Johnson produced his famous *Dictionary of the Emglish Language*, while Robert Lowth came up with his influential *Short Introduction to English Grammar* (which followed deductive rule-setting instead of inductive rule-inferencing from observed linguistic behavior, as preferred by other prescriptivists like George Campbell and Joseph Priestley).

In the United States, Lindley Murray, who acknowledged Lowth, Johnson, and Priestley as his sources, published *English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners.*

Some prescriptivist rules, which many who studied grammar in the Fifties and Sixties might remember with excellence and fondness, are the following:

1. Don't end a sentence with a preposition.
2. Don't split an infinitive.
3. Use *shall* with first person; *will* with second and third.
4. *Lie* is intransitive; *lay* is transitive.
5. Use *like* as a preposition; use *as* as a conjunction.
6. Use nominative case after the verb *be*.
7. Don't use double negatives.
8. Don't use *ain't*.
9. Use subjunctive for hypothetical situations.
10. Don't omit the relative pronoun.
11. Don't omit *that* introducing a noun clause.

Descriptive Grammar (1900-1950)

In studying how Old English, Middle English, and Modern English differ from one another through time, the approach is known as **historical grammar**. In establishing the similarities and differences in words and word order in various languages, as well as their sound and meaning correspondences to determine relationships, the approach is called **comparative grammar** (Eastman).

Riley and Parker delineate the eighteenth century as the time when language study became "scientific," beginning with William Jones' discovery in 1786 that Sanskrit belonged to the same genetic Indo-European language family as that of Latin and Greek. This was followed by other historical and comparative studies such as (Jacob) Grimm's Law, in which sound correspondences were found between Indo-European (IE) language subfamilies. For example, in the Hellenic subfamily (Greek) and Italic/Latin subfamily (including Spanish and French), *p*, *t*, and *k* became *f*, *th*, and *k*, respectively, in the Germanic subfamily (including English and German). Ferdinand de Saussure in Geneva and Paris advocated synchronic studies in which each language was regarded as a system or structure, whose

psychological unit was the sign, while Leonard Bloomfield and Edward Sapir developed their respective brands of psychological behaviorist and anthropological culturist **structuralist grammar**. This scientific, theoretical side of language studies had an applied side, with descriptivist studies on context-dependent "appropriate/inappropriate" usage, in contrast to rule-dependent "right/wrong" prescriptions. Among them were George Philip Krapp, Charles Fries, and the NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English) grammar books on standard and nonstandard English usage that varies among social groups, as well as on parts of speech, constituent structure, and phrase and sentence patterns.

Those who grew up in the Fifties may well remember the descriptive grammar that analyzed sentences by drawing Kellogg-Reed baseline diagrams (which were fun for many), placing subjects, predicates, and objects in slots along a horizontal line divided by vertical and slanting lines, along with modifiers on embellishing super- and sub-lines extending from the baseline).

Generative Grammar (1950-present)

Eastman notes that transformational-generative grammarians led by Noam Chomsky approach grammar differently by regarding language as the knowledge human beings have that allows them to acquire any language. It is a kind of universal grammar that analyzes the principles underlying all various human grammars.

Riley and Parker divide generative grammar into two historical stages: (1) standard theory (1950-1980) and (2) government and binding theory (1980-present).

Standard Theory deals with phrase structure grammar and passive/negative/question/other transformations from deep or underlying structures to surface structures (DS and SS, later D-structure and S-structure, and more recently LF and PF or Logical Form and Phonetic Form, respectively). Sentence structures are analyzed into tree diagrams, sometimes more conveniently presented as a series of linear symbols. For example,

S → NP AUX VP

where S is a sentence that "is rewritten as" or "rewrites as" a Noun Phrase plus an Auxiliary plus a Verb Phrase. This is a possible form for any combination of lexical items that fit the requirements; thus one can generate the sentence "You are reading" or "She has gone."

Or, a sentence in the active voice may have the following structural description (SD):

NP1 VP NP2 to NP3 (or: 1 2 3 4)

To this may be done a transformation, resulting in the structural change (SC):

NP1 VP NP3 NP2 (or: 1 2 4 3)

This is what happens in Indirect Object transformation, where *John gave a book to Mary* is transformed to *John gave Mary a book*. In this sense, grammar points the way to stylistic choices.

Government and Binding (GB) Theory deals with X-bar syntax, movement and constraints on it (including "move a," "empty nodes," "traces, and "cycles"), binding (including conditions on anaphors, pronominals, and lexical NPs).

In 1995, Chomsky published *The Minimalist Program* in which minimalism, as a "program" or plan rather than a clearly articulated theory, aspires to do away with the syntactic paraphernalia just enumerated, in order to come up with the "simplest possible rule system for generating the sentences of a language" (Riley and Parker 218) - and hopefully produce a universal grammar.

Performance Grammar/Discourse Analysis

Riley and Parker (231-232) point to a two-fold legacy of generative grammar:

1. Language is a rule-governed system (not a set of random habits).

2. Competence/knowledge underlies performance/behavior.

They note that its appeal lies in its emphasis on English and on sentences (and not words or sounds). However, disillusionment lies in the fact that the theory is not easily accessible to applied researchers who are more interested in discourse (and not isolated sentences). Thus, the rise of performance grammar or discourse analysis.

The following comparison of Cognitive Linguistics (CL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a close paraphrase of Stockwell (1).

Both CL and CDA sprung from interdisciplinary studies with linguistics at the core.

Cognitive Linguistics (exemplified in Fauconnier, Gibbs, Johnson, Lakoff, Langacker, Sweetser, Turner, etc.), is *experientialist* (thus, *anti-objectivist*) in describing the relationship between the world, on the one hand, and language and thought, on the other. It has implications for reference, anaphora, deixis, pragmatic force, categorisation, lexicalisation, and lexical semantics.

Rejecting Cartesian dualism and reuniting mind and body, CL sees language, thought, and conceptualization as *embodied*. Embodied Experience is expressed in metaphorical structures (idealised cognitive model or *ICM*), seen in both conventional and novel metaphors and expressions. An ICM is an experientially-accumulated knowledge structure that is always openTo new information, connected with other domains of knowledge in a network, and present in cognitive activity. It is a new version of the "frames" and "schemas" of knowledge developed in Artificial Intelligence research of the 1970s. Conventional communication involves shared (perhaps *universal*) ICMs and *image-schemas*, through which we structure our understanding of the world and of new concepts. Thus, knowledge of the world is *constituted* through and by these *conceptual metaphors*, to the extent that even newly-encountered or abstract concepts are isomorphically understood in terms of them.

Critical Discourse Analysis (in Birch, Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard, Fairclough, Fowler, Hodge, Kress, Toolan, Trew, etc.) uses Hallidayan *systemic functional linguistics* to examine the rhetoric and *ideology* of institutions (e.g., media, government, politicians, regulatory bodies, and popular influential texts including fictional romances and billboard

advertising). From the *linguistic criticism* of the late 70s and 80s, it has broadened into *social semiotics* and critical linguistic approaches to all kinds of discourses. Fairclough's analysis is explicitly Marxian and emphasizes the responsibility of academic practice in unearthing latent ideologies underlying controlling hegemonic institutions. Its tripartite analytical framework includes (1) spoken and written *text* analysis, (2) the analysis of the *discourse practice* of production and interpretation, and (3) a politically situated analysis of *social practice*. Unlike traditional language studies, CDA regards the dimensions of communicative experience (context, power relations, and background knowledge) as part of a holistic integrated study.

In the 1970s, many CL and CDA practitioners studied transformational generative grammar and language universals which they later refuted. But CL practitioners in particular, still search for universal or totalizing linguistic and conceptual structures. CDA, borne of left-wing politics and systemic functional grammar, exposes conservative or anti-democratic ideologies in texts, but carries a healthy awareness of "distortions" of a preferred reality.

Stockwell states that both CL and CDA are interested in suggesting deep structures that are manifested in linguistic expressions:

1. CL looks at utterances and sentences that express conceptual metaphors (e.g., "He blew his top" is an example of the metaphor that ANGER IS A CONTAINER OF HOT LIQUID; "She rejected his advances" is an example of LOVE IS WAR.).

2. But CDA focuses on how individual utterances and sentences are expressions of ideological discursive practices (as seen in analyses of women's magazine articles, tabloid newspaper reports, university regulations, etc.).

Both CL and CDA regard linguistic conventions as social practice, and linguistic usage as "constitutive" (Fairclough's term) of social practice:

1. CL makes explicit the conceptual metaphors of everyday usage, and is thus descriptive. It is a simple methodological tool that can be used ideologically.

2. On the other hand, CDA shows how hegemonic institutions structure or reinforce conventional thinking, and is thus interventionist, making explicit an awareness of control in order to resist it critically.

Both CL and CDA are anti-objectivist in their view of the conceptually constitutive power of language. Both re-emphasize "experientialism." However, they differ in its definition and thoroughness of assimilation:

1. CL experientialism situates conceptualization in the body, and emphasizes the "embodiment" of experience in idealised cognitive models (ICMs). Thus the concept TIME is figured as the human-scale and tangible SPACE; EMOTIONS are metaphorically DIRECTIONAL in prepositions of being UP, DOWN, HIGH, or LOW in relation to the body. The individual learns Categorical and conceptual conventions of the language system experientially. Although there is an element of a social theory here, the focus is on the individual and the mental space being imprinted with the cultural convention. CL rejects abstract objectivism but not collective categorization or "membershipping," although its kind of categorization is protoypical (rather than absolute), with roots in experience/thebody.However, CL does not consider that categorization may vary, depending on case to case criteria. Its principle of the basicness of categorization is Analogous to Chomsky's universal grammar for natural language syntactic Structures.

2. CDA understanding of experience is more dynamic and interactive.Ideologies are content-like entities seen in formal features similar to the Frame, schema, and script. Fairclough's "members' resources" (MR) are accumulated knowledge structures which people have in their heads and draw upon when they produce or interpret texts. These knowledge structures include their knowledge of language, representations of the natural and social worlds, values, beliefs, assumptions, and others. These MRs are like CL's experientialist ICMs, prototypical mental structures in People's heads from which they draw upon to produce and interpret texts. They are thus cognitive, but they are social in the sense that they have social origins.

Stockwell points out where CL and CDA diverge:

1. CL analysis consists of lists of sentences (either invented or recalled from memory by the writer) set into a scheme of conceptual metaphors. General principles are established, cognitive linguistic universals are identified, and scientifically recoverable, replicable, and explanatory interpretations are given. Actual language is an exemplification of the framework.

2. In contrast, CDA takes actual language (usually texts rather than sentences) as an occasion for an institutional critique specified to its historical point of use. Three of Halliday's systemic functions or values are considered: *experiential* values (content, knowledge, and belief), *relational* values (enacted social relationships), and *expressive* values (evaluation and subjectivity). The last two values include the important stylistic features of formality and modality not covered by CL.

Dynamism from the Layroom to the Schoolroom: Grammar and Ecology

Jackendoff, in "Language in the Ecology of the Mind," defines verbalization as the linking of an "outer" or "public" expression with an "inner" or "private" message (the concept, thought, or what speakers communicate to each other using language). The experience of thinking is often done in terms of verbal images ("talking to oneself") which have the *form* of public expressions, but these (images/expressions) are *not* the "inner" form in which the actual thought takes place. A bilingual who thinks the same thought in different languages makes the two verbal images the "same thought" in that they are linked to the same "inner form."

"Inner forms" or thoughts are *never* conscious *per se*—rather, what appears in consciousness are the "outer forms" that are linked with thoughts. Most often these are in verbal images; some are in a nonlinguistic modality, as those in Picasso or Mozart. Thought is also attributable to animals, but they cannot be conscious of their thinking, unlike humans in their modality of verbal imagery.

It is this modality that gives humans a conscious access to their own thinking that goes on "behind the scenes" (intuition). Because public linguistic communication allows greater interpersonal coordination of thought than is possible among animals, humans can produce history, science, law, and gossip.

In the same way that verbalization links an outer, public expression to an inner, private form, so too can grammar and environment each be divided into their respective outer and inner forms, as discussed below.

Patterson identifies the forms of grammar situated in a five-spaced locus—inside one's head or native intuition for language; in linguists' highly specialized writings; in particular contexts of situations that call for appropriate and correct usage; in the mechanical memorization of grammar rules; and in individual style.

Grammar 1, on the outside a formal arrangement of words in patterns that convey meaning, is located "in our heads." It is what tells us how to order words when we want to ask a question or give a command, so that it can be communicated successfully as indeed a question or a command. Knowledge of Grammar 1 helps teachers distinguish among the dialects of their students and appreciate the particular uses of these varieties.

Grammar 2, found out there in books written by the experts, is in the form of a descriptive analysis a language and its properties. The inner form of the grammar lies in the integrity of its theoretical descsription. It is done by the generativists, minimalists, systemic functionalists, neurocognitivists/stratificationalists, lexical functionalists, constructivists, integrationalists, those who do categorial grammar, head-driven phrase structure grammar, link grammar, role and relational grammar, tree adjoining grammar, word grammar, integrational linguistics, corpus linguistics, etc.

Grammar 3 takes the inner form of "linguistic etiquette" or rules of correctness found among English teachers and their students. It is usage more than grammar, as it is based on the "outer" or external setting which may be social, geographic, ethnographic, cultural, or otherwise. Grammar 4, found out there in grammar school, and takes the "inner" form of rules

that require much memorization but not enough language use to convey idea and purpose. It is not related to Grammar 2 of linguists.

Grammar 5 is grammar in its best form is seen in literary and other discourses out there that reveal effective inner, stylistic features. These works help students use their metalinguistic knowledge of Grammar 1 in order to convey idea and purpose, and to use language in figurative manner, like a verbal clay to be molded, probed, shaped, reshaped, and enjoyed (Patterson).

Grammar 4 as a form of grammar belongs to Prescriptive Grammar, since it deals with grammar, punctuation, and other rules learned by rote but not necessarily with understanding. Grammars 1, dealing with sentence patterns one and thus enables one to produce basic sentences, belongs to Descriptive Grammar. So does Grammar 3, which deals with correct or appropriate usage in formal, informal, geographic, and other settings. Grammar 2 belongs to Generative Grammar and other highly specialized grammars. Grammar 5 belongs to Performance/Discourse Grammar, since it deals with the use of grammar in a stylistic and socially communicative modality.

The relation between grammar and ecology will be shown after the following brief definition of ecology.

Ernst Haeckel (Noth) coined the term *ecology* in 1866, and defined it as the "science of the relations between the organism and the environmental outer world." or recently, "of the interrelations between organisms and their environment." The opposition between an outer and an inner world is rejected by others because organisms have both an exterior and an interior environment. Environment, according to Uexküll (Nothe), is not Haeckel's "outer world," but rather a subjective *Umwelt*, consisting of an inner world seen through organism's perception of and practical interaction with the environment. *Umwelt* is thus the way in which the environment is represented to the organism's mind, defining the scope of the organism's interaction. The organism's inner world contains a cognitive model of its *Umwelt, such* that the organism is not just a recipient, but a constructor of its own environment (Noth).

There are three models of ecological semiotics or sign-making. The pansemiotic model looks at the relationship between humans and their nonhuman environment: signs perceived in the natural environment are messages given by God or some other supernatural power. The magical model of environment semiotics sees natural phenomena as also messages, but their sender and manipulator, the magician, is a human, while its receiver, at least at first sight, is in the physical environment. Finally, the mythological model of human ecology has been culturally transmitted through narratives which instruct humans about their place in nature and what they can, should, and must do with their natural environment.

The relationship between language and ecology has been explored in many ways, specfically with regard to the influence of language on the environment. The Centre [original spelling retained] for Language and Ecology (2004) focuses on one important area of ecolinguistics: "criticism of discourses which are implicated in ecological devastation, and exploration of alternative discourses." It does not focus so much on "ecological correctness" (substituting the odd word for a more ecologically friendly alternative), as on alternative systems of understanding and representing nature in order to promote ecological harmony.

Stibbe asserts that after Critical Discourse Analysis is used to resist ecologically destructive discourse by exposing the harmful ideology hidden within it, the next step has to be taken. Inevitably, this would be the substitution of constructive discourse promoting a positive ecological attitude. To illustrate, he chooses the following haiku by Uejima Onitsura:

gyozui no / sutedokoro naki / mushi no koe

No place/to throw out the bathwater/sound of insects (Bowers 38)

The economy of expression, which is the nature of a haiku, compels the reader to employ the power of imagination and cultural insight. If Uejima were to throw his bathwater outside, how does the "sound of the insects" enter the picture? Here, the reader starts to think about the Japanese respect for all kinds of life, including small creatures such as insects. The ideology is that life is valuable, and so the reader fills the gap: the persona cannot throw the bathwater, or else the insects will be disturbed or killed.

Thus, "gap-filling" by the reader (Fairclough 2001, qtd. in Stibbe 2004), used in many ecologically destructive discourses, is seen this time to achieve an ecologically constructive discourse which awakens in the reader a harmonious co-existence with even the tiniest of lives in nature. Respect for all life is a key idea in ecology. Thus, the haiku succeeds in its "poetic activism" by summoning the reader's ecolinguistic awareness of the need for harmony.

To Stibbe, "political correctness" or the use of words or grammatical constructions to promote ecologically sound discourses is not the only way to practice positive ecolinguistic awareness. To him, poetic activism is based on the appreciation of what Rorty calls "the power of language to make new and different things possible and important - an appreciation which becomes possible only when one's aim becomes an expanding repertoire of alternative descriptions rather than The One Right Description."

Another example of poetic activism that Stibbe cites is Goatly's analysis of Wordsworth's *Prelude*. Wordsworth represents animals as Experiences (suggesting that they are worth observing and noticing for their own sake), and nature as an Actor or a Sayer (a river murmuring, brooks prattling, torrents roaring, etc.). Goatly thus contrasts Wordsworth's representations of nature with the destructive discourses of technology, and hopes for better:

> The idea that nature can speak to us and that we should be receptive to its messages as Experiencers can, of course, give us another trajectory for our scientific and technological advances, perhaps a more positive one than when technology is used to enhance our power as Actors. (Goatly 2000, 293 qtd. in Stibbe 2004)

What Stibbe stresses as the poetic activism in Wordsworth is not so much the vocabulary and the grammar as the overall Romantic perception of nature as one to be admired, appreciated, and enjoyed.

A third example of poetic activism discussed by Stibbe is William Hedgepeth's *The Hog Book*. This piece of discourse poetically challenges pork industry discourse which devalues the lives of pigs raised with much harm to the ecology. Stibbe notes Hedgepeth's reconstruction of pigs into their NOT being machines, objects, or resources and into their being

creatures, instead, of "boundless charm and enchantment" (Hedgepeth 160).

Hedgepeth's counter-discourse begins the book with the following dedication:

DEDICATED... to the millions of porkers who've gone to their final resting sites inside us ... I'd like to call them all by name, but the list is long and I cannot remember.

The CL or Cognitive Linguistics metaphor of THE HUMAN-BODY-IS-PIG-GRAVE resists the pork ideology of the industry that 'To be a pig is to be pork." Stibbe sees in this dedication Hedgepeth's emphasis on the individuality of pigs, and in the lines below, his use of parody and humor in pork counter-ideology:

"Hog," to many people means any obscenely rotund beast with a tropism for mud who trundles filthily along oinking (Hedgepeth 21).

[In an artificial insemination system] sows are viewed as simple pork machines and boars are vaguely undesirable characters who happen to make sperm...[the system has] the aim of turning out germ-free, computer-recorded pieces of living pigmeat. (Hedgepeth 99).

Stibbe notes Hedgepeth's "new definition of hogness" via intertextual borrowing (Fairclough 101) from psychology regarding the human-pig relationship:

Cultural Hogrophobia...is a socially institutionalised fear of hogness (Hedgereth 6)

We rely upon the hog in many ways for support and for a sense of definition—definition of ourselves, for instance, as presumably superior, handsomer and all-round more legitimate creatures. It's in this way that we subconsciously employ the hog (Hedgereth 200).

Parodying self-help psychology, Hedgepeth claims that coming to terms with hogrophobia leads to the development of a "new hog consciousness" (197) and to the emergence of a "changed and better person" (x). Through intertextual borrowing, this time from the domain of spiritual discourse, Stibbe further illustrates Hedgepeth's poetic activism:

> True 'hogritude'—the mystical essence and condition of being an actual hog—demands extended periods of meditation. (173)

> The all-pervasive essence of Hog had resonated across time and insinuated itself deep into...our collective mind. [We are] awaiting some hopeful opportunity to transcend ourselves...[and pigs provide]...an ideal agent for inducing us to break our narrow containments...and thereby scale new heights of enlightenment and psychic liberation...(198)

Finally, the need for poetic activism becomes clear in the following:

> And so we go on about the routine exploitation of our hogs in the name of Agriculture or Industry & Commerce or Better Pork; and in the end it all contributes to the vast-scale devaluation of life itself, for one cannot deny the legitimacy of another creature without diminishing one's own (Hedgepeth 199)

And so, grammar in the age of ecology has moved on from prescriptive, to descriptive, to generative, and now to performance/discursive practice. The last is specifically ecological discourse coming from the layspeakers' perceptions of their outer world (consisting, for example, of insects and bathwater; rivers, brooks and torrents; and pigs and pork). Their perception of and interaction with the environment—their *Umwelt*—is a subjective inner world that contains a cognitive model in which the layspeakers are both passive recipients as well as active constructors. Their degree of passivity and activism in their interrelationship with this INNER outer-environment is largely influenced by the form of the language they use to define it.

While schoolroom grammar takes care of the laws of language comprehension and production, be these on the level of rote, habit and usage, or specialization, layroom grammar takes care of the everyday

language which constructs the environment for us - and with which we in turn construct our own subjective environments.

Like Florentino, in Garcia Marquez' *Love in the Time of Cholera*, the shape of our world is defined by two river voyages of language - the first, to persevere in its laws and pass grammar lessons, just as Florentino persevered in his unrequited language of love for Fermina. In the second river voyage of language, we journey into an environment degraded by language, but with the activism to reconstruct our world with a more harmonious interrelationship with it, with language as our tool, just as Florentino journeyed into a desolate landscape and against time, but into love with Fermina by his side. This time, my apologies to Pynchon, whose analogy of the two river voyages of Florentino I have borrowed.

Works Cited

Bowers, Fabion. *The Classic Tradition of Haiku*. New York: Dover, 1996. [Cited in Stibbe 2004].

Byrnes, Heidi. "Position Paper on Curriculum Construction at the Post-Secondary Level." Summit Conference on the Future of Language Learning: New Perspectives on the Acquisition of World Languages. Sponsored by FIPSE. Organized by ACTR, in cooperation with the NFLC. Washington, DC. 27-28 April 2001.

Centre for Language and Ecology. <http://www.ecoling.net/introduction.html> Accessed 28 August 2004.

Conway, Doug. "Strine Spreads Its Tentacles." (Archived). <http://technology.news.com.au/common/story_page/0%2C4057%2C8003253%255E1702%2C00.html> 28 August 2004.

Cook, Vivian. "Universal Grammar and Multi-competence." Draft bits of a chapter for CHUG ed3. Accessed May 2004.

Couteau, Robert. Book review: *Love in the Time of Cholera. Gabriel Garcia Marquez (Knopf)*. Published in Arete Magazine, December 1988 (San Diego, CA: Alden Mills). <http://www.tygersofwrath.com/marquez.htm> Updated 10 May 2004.

Crystal, David. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1980.

DiGiovanna, James. "Tongue Twisting: Author John McWorter Explores the Flexibility of Language." Review: *The Word on the Street*, by John McWhorter (Plenum Publishing). Cloth, $27.95 November 23, 1998. Tucson Weekly's Book Archives 1995-1999 <http://www.weeklywire.com/cgi-bin/pop.pl?p=tw&t=m> Accessed 20 August 2004.

Eastman, Carol. "Grammar." Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2004. <http://encarta.msn.com> Microsoft Corporation. 2004.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman 2001. [Cited in Stibbe 2004].

Garvin, Paul. Introduction to *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Washington DC: Georgetown UP, 1964.

Goatly, Andrew. *Critical Reading and Writing: An Introductory Coursebook*. London: Routledge, 2000. [Cited in Stibbe 2004].

Hudson, Richard. "Word Grammar." UCL Phonetics and Linguistics. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk//index.html/index.html> Last updated 1 July 2004. [See also Hudson, Richard. *Word Grammar.* Blackwell, 1984.]

Jackendoff, Ray. "Language in the Ecology of the Mind." In P. Cobley, ed., *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, 52-65. London: Routledge, 2001.

Language and Ecology Online Magazine. Spring 2004. <http://www.ecoling.net/Feb1.htm>

MacPherson, Skye. "Outline: T. Todorov The Splendor and Misery and End of Rhetoric." Seminar: Studies in Contemporary Rhetoric. California State University,

Northridge. <http://www.csun.edu/CommunicationStudies/class/632/97s/rept/970209.macpherson.html> 2 February 1997.

Mukarovsky, Jan. "The Esthetics of Language." In Garvin, Paul, tr. *Prague School. 1964.*

Nörth, Winfried. "Ecosemiotics." Sign Systems Studies 26, 1998, pp. 332-343.

Orton, David. "Disembodied Activism." Commentary/Book Review: Watchdogs and Gadflies: Activism From Marginal To Mainstream, by Tim Falconer, Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 2001, 277 pages, hardcover, ISBN: 0-670-89417-6, $35. November 12, 2001."

<http://www.elements.nb.ca/theme/resolutions/dorton/book.htm> Accessed 28 August 2004.

Patterson, Nancy G. "Just the Facts: Research and Theory about Grammar Instruction." *Voices from the Middle* 8:3. National Council of Teachers of English. March 2001.

Pynchon, Thomas. "The Heart's Eternal Vow." A Review of Gabriel García Márquez's *Love in the Time of Cholera.* New York *Times*, 10 April 1988. <http://www.themodernword.com/pynchon/pynchon_essays_cholera.html> Accessed 28 August 2004.

Riley, Kathryn and Parker, Frank. *English Grammar: Prescriptive, Descriptive, Generative, Performance.* MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics.* Ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, with Albert Riedlinger. Tr. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Stibbe, Arran. "Poetic Activism and Pigs." *Language and Ecology Online Magazine.* <www.ecoling.net/magazine.html> February 2004.

Stibbe, Arran. "Towards Poetic Activism." *Language and Ecology Online Magazine.* <www.ecoling.net/magazine.html> Feb 2004.

Stockwell, Peter. *Towards a Critical Cognitive Linguistics?* [question mark intended]. School of English Studies, Nottingham University, UK. <www.nottingham.ac. uk/~aezps/research/papers/CRITCOG.PDF> Accessed 15 August 2004.

Suvin, Darko. Introduction to *The Sociology of Science Fiction. Science Fiction Studies* 13, v. 4, Part 3. November 1977.

Sybesma, Rint. Review: de Swaan, Abram. *Words of the World: The Global Language System,* (2001) Cambridge: Polity Press. ISBN 0745627471, 280pp. US$29.95 (hardcover). <http://www.linguistlistplus.com/glot/html/Gi6206/GI6602 BRW.htm> August 19, 2004.