

## APPENDIX ONE: WRITING FUNDING PROPOSALS FOR FIELDWORK

Writing a funding proposal is hard work. Funding is never guaranteed and always highly competitive. The work and long wait involved in a funding proposal will more often than not end in a rejection letter from the funding agency. So why should one subject oneself to this?

The reason is simple. You need money to do field research. And well-funded projects can produce better results than poorly-funded projects. In terms of your career, well-funded projects also bring money and student support to your home institution. They also are necessary to underwrite team research and to enable you to train new fieldworkers.

I have received as Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI more than six million dollars (US) in funding since 1984, with an overall 'hit rate' of 70%. That is, 70% of all my grant proposals have been funded. I have received funding from the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the Economics and Social Research Council, and the European Union. This has not all been for field research, but it has given me a solid basis for the advice I want to offer in this section.

At the same time, as I once heard Peter Ladefoged say, I have been turned down for more money than most people ever ask for. The 30% of proposals that I have had rejected, however, have, due to useful feedback from referees and program officers, made me a better grant writer.

The first step in preparing a proposal is to identify an appropriate funding agency. Agencies differ widely in the kinds of research that they fund, the kinds of methodologies that they favor, the amount of additional personnel, indirect costs, etc. they will fund. And they differ in their constraints on the form of proposals. So before writing a proposal, familiarize yourself with the agencies most likely to be interested in your proposal.

All funding proposals will be evaluated by at least the following criteria:

- (i) Track-record of the PI – do they deliver what they promise? Are they active, publishing researchers? Is their work respected as of high quality?
- (ii) Evidence of preliminary preparation, e.g. contracts and permissions obtained ahead of proposed project start date, etc.
- (iv) Budget – is it reasonable, non-lavish, yet well thought out, covering all likely expenses (from batteries to hotels), etc.?
- (v) Criteria for success – how will the scientific community know when the project is a success? How and when will project personnel, including the PI, know this? How will the funding agency know this? What are the follow-up plans if things do not go exactly according to plans (they will not)?
- (vi) Deliverables – has the PI promised too little or too much from what they expect to learn from this project (publications, websites, blogs, community contributions, etc.)?
- (vii) Intellectual quality of the proposal – the reviewer wants evidence that the PI is fluent in his speciality and the matters to be investigated and that the PI has outlined an interesting problem that the referee would like to know the answer too (ideally) and has contextualized it appropriately within the field of study.

With regard to your track record, if you are a new PhD with few or no publications yet, reviewers will be willing to give you the benefit of the doubt, depending on how long it has been since you received your PhD and how well-written the current proposal is. The larger and more ambitious your project, the more reviewers will require from previous publications of the PI. Your track record, as mentioned, will also be extremely important. If the PI says 'We will publish the results of our findings in **Language**, **NLLT**, and **Linguistic Inquiry**', the readers will ask if they have ever before published in these journals.

It is also important that once the PI has identified a funding agency, that they contact the relevant administrative personnel of the agency to discuss their potential project with them to confirm that this agency is interested and to request advice on what the agency looks for in a successful proposal. Occasionally, it is even worthwhile to travel to the headquarters of the agency to meet the program officer in person or to the relevant professional meetings, e.g. the Linguistic Society of America annual meeting, where linguistic funding agencies and program directors often agree to meet with potential PIs.

It is also useful to bear in mind that for many agencies, at least in the USA, the submitter has the right to request that some individuals *not* be asked to review the proposal or that some individuals be requested to review the proposal. If you know someone hates your type of research (or, worse, hates you), then you should say simply 'I prefer that the following people not be asked to review my work.'

*Appendix 2: Ethics statements from the Linguistic society of America and the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology*

Linguistic Society of America: (<http://www.lsadc.org/>):

***"Human Subjects in Linguistic Research***

*Studies of a human language often depend upon a continuing relation with speakers of the language. Such a relation comes to be defined as much by the speakers as by the linguist. Their patterns of life govern when work can be done. Their expectations, and those of their community, shape what is to become the results of the work. Understanding of the nature of linguistic inquiry grows in the course of the relationship. Sometimes lifelong friendships are established.*

*Such work must be conducted with respect for those who participate, with sensitivity as to their well being, and with concern for consequences of publication or sharing of results.*

*Certain considerations may make the study of a language different from much research in the sciences and social sciences. One asks many questions in discovering the features of the language, of a kind the collaborator learns to expect and even anticipate. They are seldom of a sort that can be disturbing or injurious. Moreover, fruitful work may depend upon the linguist learning and observing the norms of politeness and friendship expected by those with whom he or she is talking. Those who participate in such a work often do so with pride in their command of their language and may wish to be known for their contribution. Not to disclose their names would do them a disservice. Native Americans sometimes justly criticize earlier work with their language for not having adequately proclaimed the contributions of the Native Americans themselves. Fairness to speakers of a language is very much a matter of understanding their viewpoint, and what is appropriate in one situation may not be in another.*

*Such considerations make it difficult to apply general rules in a mechanical way."*

Max Planck Institute (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/files/ethics.html>)

*"The following guidelines are binding on all members of the department. They cover relations between the fieldworker and native speakers of languages under investigation and / or the communities in which those languages are spoken. They do not cover the following aspects that might nonetheless be relevant to the work of the department but which should be covered elsewhere:*

*a) Matters relating to scientific plagiarism and falsification. These are covered by the Max Planck Society's publication Rules of Good Scientific Practice / Rules of Procedure in Cases of Suspected Scientific Misconduct.*

*b) Matters relating to the collection of genetic samples. Where members of the department are involved in the collection of genetic samples, the ethics policies of the Department of Evolutionary Genetics must be followed. Researchers should note, with respect to point 1 below, that additional official permission to collect genetic samples will be needed in many parts of the world, in addition to permission to conduct*

*linguistic work.*

*c) Matters relating to work with children. The policies set out below must be followed as far as possible in relation to work with children, but other ethical issues relating specifically to the status of children must be taken into account, including but not restricted to the need to obtain the consent of their parents / guardian(s). Members of the department are required to adhere to the highest ethical standards in their research. In particular, they must show respect for the individuals, communities, and cultures with which they work. The following are designed to implement this general recommendation more specifically.*

*1. Members of the department must comply with all legal requirements for the conduct of their research in the relevant area. This includes but is not restricted to obtaining necessary visas, residence permits, and research permits, from both national and local authorities, and complying with requirements on the collection and dissemination of materials.*

*2. Members of the department must ensure that they have the informed consent of the individual(s) and community(ies) concerned to carry out the research in question and to disseminate the results of that research. In this connection, it is essential to note that consent must be informed. In particular, explanation must be given of the uses to which the material will or might be put and of the access that will or might be made available to the material. Under appropriate circumstances, individuals or communities may place restrictions on the use or accessibility of material, and such restrictions must be adhered to. Researchers will often have to rely on their own judgements as to which individuals or*

*communities must be asked for their consent, but such judgements should be formed in a responsible and accountable manner. Researchers should note that informed consent may need to be obtained not only from the source of material (e.g. the narrator of a story) but also from others who are affected by that material (for instance, persons who are mentioned in the story). Under no circumstances should individuals or communities be subjected to coercion to give their consent; researchers will need to be sensitive to local circumstances in this respect.*

*3. The agreement between the researcher and the individuals / communities involved in the research must be documentable, i.e. if a question arises as to the validity of the agreement the researcher must be able to produce evidence of that agreement. In some cultures and circumstances a written agreement will be appropriate, whereas in other cases some form other than a written agreement will be needed.*

*4. Especially given the increasing importance of intellectual and cultural property rights, individuals or communities participating in research should be informed that the institute and the researcher seek the right to store, use, and disseminate (with restrictions where appropriate) the material in question, but do not assert ownership of the intellectual or cultural materials entrusted to the institute or the researcher. When stored and disseminated, such materials should always make due acknowledgement to their authors and performers. Authors / performers should be named explicitly only where their informed consent to this has been obtained; otherwise, an anonymous acknowledgement is appropriate. It is appropriate for the researcher to pay the individuals involved in research for their time and travel and other out-of-pocket expenses. It is not appropriate to make payments that might be construed as payments for the transfer of ownership.*

*5. Members of the department must, wherever possible, ensure that they contribute to the communities in which they work. Exceptions to this policy can only be considered in*

*truly unusual circumstances where implementation of the policy is impossible, and such exceptions require detailed justification and the approval of the department director.*

*Contributions to the community would include but not be restricted to:*

*a) documentation of the language in a way that is accessible to the community, for instance through the preparation of primers or printed or audio recorded collections of traditional stories;*

*b) development of a writing system for the language;*

*c) training of members of the community in appropriate ways, for instance in text transcription, linguistic analysis, literacy, audio and video recording.*

## Appendix Three: Phonology Questionnaire

*Caveat:* This questionnaire is not intended to be even nearly exhaustive. It is simply a list of some suggestions from my own fieldwork as to what I have found useful. It is not really for beginners, however. I intend it to serve as a framework, a useful prod, for writing detailed phonologies of languages, something missing from most grammars (though the detailed phonologies of the OUP x series, edited by Jacques Durand is a useful model). Like all questionnaires, as Nikolaus Himmelmann has pointed out to me, this one has the disadvantage of asserting categories when in fact many of the categories themselves need to be argued for and established independently. So it certainly isn't meant to be followed slavishly. Hopefully, however, it will provide useful suggestions for the 'phonologically challenged' fieldworker.

## 1. Segmental phonology

1.1. List the distinctive segments of the language. Give rules of allophonic distribution. Summarize the (articulatory) phonetic realization of each segment.

1.2. What are the nonallophonic restrictions on the distribution of these segments? For example, do any segments appear exclusively in loan words? Are any subject to sociolinguistic or cultural restrictions (e.g. "Do not use /x/ in the presence of foreigners")? Are there differences in the segmental inventory according to gender (e.g. men use /s/ where women use /h/ or variation in points of articulation between women and men)?

1.3. Are some segments restricted as to which word class they may appear in (e.g. /b/ only in Nouns and Adjectives)?

## 2. Syllabic structure

2.1. What are the syllable types (e.g. CCV, CV, CVC, etc.)?

2.1.1. Describe any restrictions on syllable distribution. Are some syllables allowed only in word/phrase-final position (or medial or initial)?

2.1.2. Discuss the evidence for these syllables.

2.1.2.1. Phonotactics:

Are consonant sequences allowed? Where? Do allowable consonant clusters vary according to where they appear in the word (e.g. **st** only in word-initial position, but **ts** in word-final position)? Are there any restrictions as to the type of vowel/semivowel which may precede/follow consonant clusters?

Are there word-final consonants?

Are vowel sequences permitted? Where? Do allowable vowel clusters vary according to where they appear in the word (e.g. **ai** only in word-initial position, but **ia** elsewhere)? Are there any restrictions as to the type of consonant or semivowel which may precede or follow specific vowel clusters?

How many vowels or consonants may appear in a single cluster, if clusters are allowed? In adjacent vowels are there restrictions on vowel features (e.g. all the vowels have the same value for height, roundedness, etc.)? Are some sequences banned (e.g. **aa**)?

2.1.2.2. Phonetic evidence

Is there phonetic evidence in favor of syllables (e.g. chest pulses)?

2.1.2.3. Do native speakers segment words into syllables in slow speech?

2.1.2.4. Do phonological rules crucially refer to syllable structure, e.g. stress placement, nasal spreading, tone distribution, etc., as in (i) and (ii):

- (i) Stress the rightmost (C)VC or (C)VV syllable in the word, otherwise stress the penult?
- (ii) Lower tautosyllabic, adjacent high tones to mid tones in (C)VV syllables.

## 2.2. Interpretation of glides

2.2.1. Do semi-vowels, such as [y] and [w], appear in both or either syllable-initial and syllable-final positions?

2.2.2. If the language allows vowel sequences and semi-vowels, may the first vowel be [i] or [u]?

2.2.3. In vowel or semi-vowel sequences, are any of the following orders prohibited? Preferred? (X and Y are variables and thus may represent any segment type):

- X *iy* Y
- X *yi* Y
- X *uw* Y
- X *wu* Y
- X *yu* Y
- X *uy* Y
- X *wi* Y
- X *iw* Y
- etc.

2.3. What are the allowable sequences of segments within the syllable, according to their articulatory classification or generalizable acoustic properties? For example, are there ordering restrictions such as the following (just as a few suggestions):

- (i) The onset of a syllable may begin with any consonant, but the second member of a complex onset must come from a more restricted class of segments (e.g. voiced continuant)?
- (ii) In a complex nucleus, the first vowel must be a high vowel.
- (iii) In a complex coda, the order of consonants is more (or less) restricted than in complex onset.
- (iv) The order of consonants in the coda is the mirror-image of the order in the onset.
- (v) etc.

2.4. If the nucleus contains a diphthong, can it also contain another vowel?

2.5. If the language has CVC syllables, can V be a diphthong? If so, are there any restrictions on the following C?

## 3. Tone

3.1. Does the language have contrastive pitches which distinguish lexical meanings of words?

3.2. Do contrastive pitches have a fairly constant  $F_0$  or does their  $F_0$  rise or fall or 'undulate' significantly?

3.3. If  $F_0$  of pitches varies, yet is significant in distinguishing lexical items, does the variation correlate with position in the word, preceding or following segments, preceding or following pitches, or the word's position in the sentence or discourse?

3.5. Can consonants bear tone or only vowels? Which consonants? Under what circumstances (e.g. 'w and y bear tone following a rule of asyllabification').

3.6. Does consonant voicing affect tone? How?

3.7. Does vowel quality affect tone? How?

3.8. Can tone patterns of individual words vary arbitrarily or do there appear to be *tonal melodies* assigned on words or classes of words (e.g. High Low Mid for one class of nouns, HLH for another, LHL, etc.)? Do the tonal melodies change according to the number of syllables?

3.9. What happens to a tone if its associated segment is deleted? For example, does the tone delete or appear on another syllable?

3.10. If the language does not allow contour tones (those with an underivable but constant change in pitch, e.g. rise and fall) on short vowels or sequences can they arise from morphological or phonological processes? Consider the Pirahã example in (i):

- (i) tti    ʔísitoí    ʔogabagaí → tti ʔísitōogabagaí  
       I        egg    want

In the case of (i), in normal speech the direct object and the form form a close phonological unit, deleting a verb-initial glottal stop and the noun-final vowel. Notice that the tone does not disappear, however. In the example in (i) no mark over a vowel indicates low tone and the acute accent marks high tone. The wedge over the first /o/ to the right of the arrow indicates that it bears both a low tone and high tone simultaneously. This is in my analysis the result of the high tone remaining even after its original vowel host, /i/, has been deleted. This is otherwise prohibited in the language.

3.11. Can a tone ever *shift* to the right or the left in a word? Across words? Can one tone ever replace another, e.g. in (i) immediately above?

3.12. Is there complementary distribution among the tones, e.g. H → M/\_\_\_ L

3.13. Are the frequency distances between tones (especially in a language with three or more tones) fairly constant or are some tones closer in frequency than others (e.g. tone Mid and tone High being closer in average frequency than tone M and tone L, in a three tone system)? Is frequency distance affected by how many different tone levels are present in a given word or phrase?

3.14. Is tone affected by phrasal intonation? How?

3.15. Does the language have other channels of discourse that exploit *linguistic* tone, e.g. whistle speech, drum communication, hum speech, etc. Please describe this in detail, as well as the social/cultural restrictions on its use.

#### 4. Intonation

4.1. What is the most common intonational pattern (e.g. rising, falling, fall-rise, rise-fall, etc.) at the end of utterances?

4.2. How are different intonational patterns distinguished? By end points? By beginning and end points? By relative height of the entire intonational phrase? By beginning, middle, and end points?

4.3. What functions does intonation serve? For example, does it distinguish:

- syntactic phrasal types (e.g. interrogative, declarative)?
- illocutionary acts (e.g. indirect request vs. direct request)?
- other?

4.4. Is intonation affected by tone, stress, syllable patterns, or other phonological phenomena? How?

4.5. Does intonation affect tone, stress, syllable patterns, or other phonological phenomena? How?

4.6. What is the largest grammatical unit for which you can identify a distinct intonational pattern? Phrase? Sentence? Paragraph? Discourse?



- 4.7. Does intonation serve to unite two or more phrases in parataxis?
- 4.8. Can intonation mark subordination/superordination relations between clauses?
- 4.9. Are there *step accents* in the language, i.e. where the highest pitch of one intonational contour appears immediately prior to the stressed syllable, which itself bears a relatively low pitch? Are other correlations between stress and intonation placement observed? Describe these carefully, paying attention to the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of the utterances as you do so.
- 4.10. What are the quantitative variations allowed in basic intonational contours? That is, can the same contour appear with more or less prominence by manifesting greater pitch distances between its distinctive points? When? What is the  $F_0$  evidence like?
- 4.11. Is it more common for frequency to decline at the end of utterances? How many syllables or words are in the domain of this declination? Is there an accompanying rhythm (slow down, speed up, etc.)?
- 4.13. How can the different intonational contours be affected in their overall ranges of pitch, amplitude, duration, etc. by different ways of speaking, e.g. 'speaking up', whispering, etc.?
- 4.14. How is intonation manifested across different prosodic channels (e.g. whistle speech)?

## 5. Stress

- 5.1. Are some syllables in the language more prominent (for example, by using more acoustic energy, e.g. louder, higher pitch, longer, etc.) than others?
- 5.2. Do such syllables appear in every word?
- 5.3. Is this prominence predictable? How?
- 5.4. Are there different patterns of prominence on different classes of words, e.g. nouns vs. verbs (if there are, describe them)? Or is it constant across all lexical categories?
- 5.5. Are there secondary (tertiary, quaternary, etc.) stresses?

For example: *multiplication*

*2ary 1ary*

- 5.5.1. Do  $n^{\text{ary}}$  stresses occur at regular intervals? How are these intervals determined (e.g. every other syllable in the word from left-to-right, etc.)
- 5.5.2. Can primary or secondary (etc.) stresses ever appear on adjacent syllables in a word or phrase?
- 5.5.3. Does the stress of one word/syllable ever seem to move away from the stress of another word when it would otherwise be adjacent? Which of the otherwise adjacent stresses shifts, the one on the left or the one on the right? (e.g. *Thir'teen* + *'women* → *'Thirteen 'women*)?
- 5.6. Are 'heavy' syllables more frequently stressed than nonheavy syllables (e.g. (C)VC, (C)VV, vs. (C)V)? Under what circumstances, if any, can a lighter syllable bear primary stress if primary stress is normally restricted to heavy syllables?
- 5.7. What are the acoustic correlates of stress (e.g. loudness, pitch, length)? Are the correlates constants or variable across utterances or across speakers?
- 5.8. Do any (morpho)phonological processes interact with stress in a systematic way? What is the nature of this interaction (e.g. segmental lenition, voicing, vowel harmony, vowel reduction, etc.)?
- 5.9. If heavy syllables bear stress, what happens if the syllable-final consonant or vowel of the stressed heavy syllable is deleted?

- 5.10. If stress shifts for any reason, in which direction does it shift, leftwards or rightwards? Is its 'final destination' predictable in such stress shifts? How?
- 5.11. Does stress behave identically in longer and shorter words or utterances?
- 5.12. Is there any evidence of native speaker sensitivity to stress, such as correcting you misplacement of it, tapping on stressed syllables as they say the word (Ladefoged, Ladefoged, and Everett ()), etc.?
- 5.13. How does (or does) stress interact with tone? Does stress shift also cause tone shifts? Does stress placement perturb (raise, lower, metathesize, etc.) tones?

## 6. Morphophonology

- 6.1. Do affixes affect stress or tone patterns in words?
- 6.2. Do the affixes which do and do not affect stress (if there are such distinctions among affixes) fall into natural semantic, phonological, or morphosyntactic classes (e.g. syllable structure, inherent tone, prefixes vs. suffixes vs. infixes, derivational vs. inflectional, etc.)?
- 6.3. Do segmental rules (e.g. devoicing, assimilation, vowel-harmony, deletion, etc.) affect affix shapes? Which and how? Again, what are the differences between affixes which are affected vs. those which are not?
- 6.5. Does the language have clitics? (Like affixes, these are phonologically dependent on another word, never appearing alone. Unlike affixes, a single clitic can appear on a wide variety of word types, e.g. N, V, A, P).
- 6.6. Do these clitics appear in various locations within the sentence or do they cluster in a given position?
- 6.6.1. If clitics appear in different positions, does their placement depend on phonological (e.g. stress) or syntactic (e.g. a clitic must appear on the word to the immediate left of the word with which it forms a syntactic constituent. Consider English, where ( )s = phonological boundary and [ ]s = syntactic boundary: ([I][ll] (go)).
- 6.6.2. If clitics cluster in a given position, which clitics may cluster and where this takes place in the phrase or sentence (e.g. 'all clitics expressing tense and mood appear following the first constituent of the sentence).
- 6.7. Are some phonological processes peculiar to particular types of affixation (e.g. prefixation, suffixation, infixation, simulfixation, circumfixation, etc.)?
- 6.8. Is there reduplication?
- 6.8.1. Is reduplication monosyllabic, disyllabic, or larger or smaller (e.g. a single vowel, consonant, or mora)?
- 6.8.2. Do the consonant-vowel sequences in the reduplicated morphemes follow a constant order and shape for all reduplicated affixes?
- 6.8.3. Are there subregularities of CV order (e.g. CVC) for one type of reduplication and others (e.g. CVVC) for others?
- 6.8.4. Does reduplication interact with any other phonological processes, e.g. stress, nasalization, vowel-harmony, etc.?

## 7. Other prosodies

- 7.1. Do any other phonological elements take a domain larger than individual segments? Some possibilities are: aspiration, nasalization, labialization, voicing, vowel features, and so on.
- 7.2. Do such elements take larger domains only under certain circumstances? That is, can they 'spread' to surrounding phonological material?

7.2.1. In what direction can they spread?

7.2.2. What can trigger this spreading?

7.2.3. What can block this spreading, e.g. 'nasalization spread is blocked when it reaches a voiceless consonant).

Is there a minimal word size (e.g. no word in isolation can be less than two moras in length)?

## REFERENCES

- Bickerton, Derek. 1990. *Language and species*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. *Rules and representations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1989. "Some notes on economy of derivation and representation." (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics X, edited by I. Laka and A. Mahajan. 43–75.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. *The origin of the species*. (Great Books of the Western World.) New York: Britannica.
- Donald, Merlin. 1991. *Origins of the modern mind: Three stages in the evolution of culture and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Everett, Daniel L. 1985. "Syllable weight, sloppy phonemes, and channels in Pirahã discourse." (Berkeley Linguistics Society Proceedings, Volume 11.) Berkeley: University of California, Department of Linguistics.
- Everett, Daniel L. 1989. On floating feature nodes in Pirahã phonology. (Talk presented at the annual colloquium of Generative Linguists of the Old World.) The Netherlands: Utrecht.
- Everett, Dan, and Lucy Seki. 1985. "Reduplication and CV skeleta in Kamaiurá." *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:326–330.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1975. *The language of thought*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1983. *The modularity of mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1987. *Psychosemantics: The problem of meaning in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gibson, Edward. 1991. *A parallel model of human parsing*. Unpublished dissertation. Department of Philosophy, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1990. *On language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Longacre, Robert. 1964. *Grammar discovery procedures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. "Re reduplication." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:435–482.
- Rodrigues, Aryon. 1953. "Morfologia do verbo Tupí." *Letras* 1:121–152. Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil.
- Tarnus, Richard. 1991. *The passion of the Western mind*. New York: Harmony Books.

## References (seriously incomplete)

- Beckman, Mary E., 1986, *Stress and non-stress accent*, Dordrecht: Foris
- Chafe, Wallace L., 1994, *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Croft, William, 1995, "Intonation units and grammatical structure", *Linguistics* 33:839-882
- Dixon, R.M.W., 1972, *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Donohue, Mark, 1997, "Tone system in New Guinea", *Linguistic Typology* 1:347-386
- Hayes, Bruce, 1995, *Metrical stress theory*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Heath, Jeffrey, 1980, *Nunggubuyu myths and ethnographic texts*, Canberra: AIAS
- Laver, John. 1980. *The phonetic description of voice quality*. CUP

Pawley, Andrew and Frances Syder, 2000. "The one-clause-at-a-time hypothesis". In Heidi Riggenbach (ed.). *Perspectives on Fluency*, pp. 163-198. Ann Arbor: U. Michigan Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth O., 1984, *Phonology and Syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

Steedman, Mark, 2000, *The syntactic process*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Trubetzkoy, Nikolaj S., 1939, *Grundzüge der Phonologie*, Prague (Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 7)

Yip, Moira, 2002, *Tone*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gussenhoven 2004

Güldemann, 2005 – Shona CHECK

Payne, Doris (ed.). 1990. *Amazonian linguistics: studies in lowland South American languages*. University of Texas Press.

Rappaport, Gilbert C. 2002. Numeral phrases in Russian: A Minimalist Approach, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10: 329-342.

Zwicky and Anderson [from the second edition of the *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, to appear]

Japanese honorifics as emotive definite descriptions

Christopher Potts and Shigeto Kawahara

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Salt 14, 2004

SALT XIV

Held at Northwestern University May 14-16, 2004

Edited by Robert B. Young 322 pages, Cornell Linguistics Circle (CLC)

### **The Independence of Syntax and Phonology in Cliticization**

Judith L. Klavans

*Language*, Vol. 61, No. 1. (Mar., 1985), pp. 95-120.

### **On Linguistics and Politics**

Noam Chomsky interviewed by Günther Grewendorf

*Protosociology*, Vol. 6, 1994, pp. 293-303

Dixon, R.M.W. *Searching for Aboriginal Languages : Memoirs of a Field Worker*

University Of Chicago Press; Reprint edition (July 15, 1989).

Chagnon, Napoleon A. **1996. The Yanomamo (Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology)**, Wadsworth Publishing; 5 edition

Conklin, Beth 2001. *Consuming Grief Compassionate Cannibalism in an Amazonian Society* University of Texas.

**Margaret Mead. Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years**, Kodansha America; Reprint edition (April, 1995)

**Darnell, Regna. 1990. Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist, Univ of California Pr (February, 1990)**

**Darnell, Regna. And Along Came Boas: Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology (Studies in the History of Liguistic Sciences, 86) John Benjamins Pub Co (January, 1998)**

### References

Dixon, R.M.W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durie, Mark. 1985. *A grammar of Acehnese*. Dordrecht: Foris.

----- 1987. 'Grammatical relations in Acehnese'. *Studies in Language* 11.365-399.

----- 1988. 'The so-called passive of Acehnese'. *Language* 64.104-113.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1986. *Topic, focus and the grammar of spoken French*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, UC Berkeley.

----- 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1982. We need (some kind of a) rule of conjunction reduction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.3:557-61.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1999. A typology of the interaction of focus structure and syntax. In E. Raxilina & J. Testelec, eds., *Typology and linguistic theory: from description to explanation*, 511-24. Languages of Russian Culture: Moscow. [available on RRG web site]

Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling and Hölskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. 'Case and Grammatical Functions:

RRG web site: [linguistics.buffalo.edu/research/rrg.html](http://linguistics.buffalo.edu/research/rrg.html)

Blair, Frank. 1991. *Survey on a Shoestring: A Manual for Small-Scale Language Survey*, Dallas, SIL.

Wackernagel, Jacob (1892). 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1: 333-436. Reprinted in vol. 1: 1-104 of id. (1953, 1979). *Kleine Schriften*, eds. Kurt Latte (vols. 1-2) and Bernhard Forssman (vol. 3). Göttingen.

Notes