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CALLS FOR PAPERS AND NOMINATIONS

NWave Invites Abstracts

July 12 is the deadline for proposals for the 25th annual conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation, Oct. 17–20 at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

NWave is the meeting closest to the interests of ADS, although it is completely independent. In fact, it reinvents itself each year with a new organizer as well as a new location.

Invited speakers include Jean Aitchison of Oxford, Alan Bell of New Zealand, and William Labov of the USA.

Workshops on statistics, computer mapping, and field methods will be held in the afternoon of Thursday, Oct. 17.

Abstracts should be on one page without the author's name, accompanied by a sheet with the title and author's name, affiliation, and postal and e-mail addresses. An ADS session may be scheduled; indicate your interest in that session if you wish.

Sept. 16 is the deadline for preregistration: $55 (students $35). Add $25 for a workshop.

Send abstracts and registration to Dr. Jan Tillery, NWave Coordinator, UNLV College of Liberal Arts, 4505 Maryland Parkway, Box 455001, Las Vegas Nevada 89154-5001; e-mail gbailey@cc.mail.nevada.edu; fax (702) 895-4097.

Rooms are available at the Sahara Hotel: $85 a night for Oct. 18 and 19, only $42 a night for Oct. 13 through 16. For reservations, call 702/737-2111 by Sept. 13.

Nominate Words of the Year

For one last year, however, John and Adele Algeo will cultivate the new at ADS. So send your nominations for Words of the Year 1996 to them at PO Box 270, Wheaton IL 60189-0270, e-mail algeo@ix.netcom.com; or to our other nominator, David Barnhart, at PO Box 247, Cold Spring NY 10516, e-mail barnhart@highlands.com.

As usual, at our Annual Meeting the New Words Committee will hold a meeting to consider nominations and then present a slate for discussion and vote at a general meeting the next day. For information on previous votes, see the January Newsletter or the ADS Web site (address on cover).

Grammar at NCTE, Nov. 22

On Friday, Nov. 22, from 10:15 to 11:30 a.m., ADS will sponsor Session B.28, "Grammar for English Teachers," at the annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English in Chicago, Nov. 21–24.

Chair: Dennis Baron, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana. Speakers:
- Dennis Baron.
- Lynda Thompson, East Central Univ., Oklahoma.
- Paul Prior, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana.

For membership and convention information, write NCTE at 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801; phone (217) 328-3870.
CHICAGO MEETING, JANUARY 1997: ABSTRACTS NOW DUE!

Yes, August 15 is the deadline for proposals for the ADS Annual Meeting, our historic first with the Linguistic Society of America, at the Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers, 301 E. North Water St., January 2–5, 1997.

Our abstracts will be printed in the LSA program, so we ask that you follow LSA guidelines, viz.: Type size not smaller than 12 point, single spaced, within a rectangle 3 inches high and 7.5 inches wide. Outside this rectangle, write the title and your name, affiliation, and address; and specify any audio-visual equipment you will need. Send the abstract to Executive Secretary Allan Metcalf (address on cover). If convenient, please also send your abstract by e-mail to AAllan@aol.com, for publication in our own newsletter. But this e-version is not required.

Dialect boundaries: Program Chair Walt Wolfram again invites proposals for a special session on dialect boundaries. (See the January Newsletter for further explanation.)

Early decision: One early-decision paper was accepted: “The Pleasures, Perils and Promise of the Language and Gender Class” by Miriam Meyers, Metropolitan State Univ.

Annual luncheon: Richard Bailey, U. of Michigan, will speak on “Philological Eccentrics.”

LSA accommodations: Special rates at the Sheraton Chicago for the 1997 meeting are $78 single or double. Mention the Linguistic Society of America group when calling for reservations at (800) 329-7000 or (312) 329-7000.

ADS Workshops: Preliminary Notice

On Jan. 2, before LSA starts, the ADS meeting will begin with these workshops in advanced statistical and computer techniques for handling and interpreting linguistic data, organized by Dennis Preston of Michigan State. Our next issue will give information on registration.

1) VARBRUL analysis of linguistic variation. Robert Bayley, Univ. of Texas, San Antonio.
   This session will provide a rationale for and demonstration of the VARBRUL computer programs (Pintzuk 1988; Rand and Sankoff, 1990; Sankoff 1988). It will also consider several questions that are likely to arise, including dealing with suspected interaction among factors and choosing between competing analyses.

2) Advanced techniques in the extraction and analysis of vowel formants, with special reference to the interpretation of vowel changes in systems. Bill Labov, Univ. of Pennsylvania. Includes practical advice on computer hardware and software for such work as well as more recent products (e.g., ‘Plotnik’).

3) Advanced computer techniques in the plotting and interpretation of dialect data. Bill Kretzschmar, Univ. of Georgia. He has waded through both standard statistical programs and geographers’ work (e.g., point-pattern, gravity models) to determine the optimum presentation and interpretation formats for Linguistic Atlas and other data.

4) Advanced multivariate analyses of linguistic data. Bob Berdan, California State Univ., Long Beach. He has shown that such techniques as loglinear regression and others (the ‘foundations’ on which VARBRUL, for example, is built) can be extremely helpful in analyzing variation data for which multiple interactions may be expected rather than unusual.

5) Advanced factor analytic procedures in language analysis. Doug Biber, Northern Ariz. Univ. His work with corpora is well-known.

6) Advanced non-parametric techniques in the analysis of linguistic data. Dennis Preston. In his work on ‘Perceptual Dialectology’ he has come to rely increasingly on multidimensional scaling, clusters, and the like to put together patterned occurrences of nominal data.

Tentative schedule for Thursday, Jan. 2: 8:00–10:30: Bayley, Biber, Kretzschmar, Berdan. 11:00–1:30: Berdan, Preston, Labov, Bayley. 3:00–5:30: Biber, Labov, Preston, Kretzschmar.
ADS at MLA

Continuing our presence at the annual meeting of our old comrade the Modern Language Association, even though our main body is deserting for LSA (see Page 3), Program Chair Walt Wolfram approved the following two ADS-sponsored sessions for the MLA annual convention in Washington, D.C. Dec. 27–30.

**First Session**

“:) When You Say That: Usage Standards for Electronic Communication.” *Organizer and Chair: Dennis Baron, Univ. of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.*


**Second Session**


1. “The Loss of Southern Dialect in Americana, Brazil.” *Lora Schwenk, Auburn U.*

2. “Literary Dialect in *The Yorker’s Strata- gem.*” *Marianne Cooley, Univ. of Houston–University Park.*

3. “Rudeness and Politeness at a Court Trial: Two Faces of the Same Coin.” *Marvin Ching, Univ. of Memphis.*

MLA membership and registration are required to attend. For information write MLA at 10 Astor Place, New York NY 10003-6981. Membership office phone (212) 614-6381, e-mail membership@mla.org; convention office (212) 614-6372, convention@mla.org.

Nominate a student for Presidential Honorary Membership! Write ADS President Lawrence M. Davis, English Dept., Wichita State Univ., Wichita KS 67260-0014; e-mail davis@wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu.

Lexicography at MLA

“Back from the Future: Dictionaries in the Aftermath of Technology” is the focus of the Lexicography Discussion Group at the MLA convention, Washington, D.C., Dec. 27–30.

How have new opportunities and demands of technology affected the core values of lexicography or the quality of new versions of dictionaries? A panel of lexicographers will offer their viewpoints and then discuss them.

*Chair: William A. Kretzschmar, Jr., Univ. of Georgia. Panel:*

*Patrick Hanks, Current English Dictionaries, Oxford University Press.*

*Victoria Neufeldt, Merriam-Webster.*

*Michael Agnes, Webster’s New World.*

*David Barnhart, Lexik House.*

ADS Inaugurates Nebraska

By Catherine Rudin, Wayne State Coll.

(Professor Rudin, a Life Member of ADS, represented the Society at the investiture of the new chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. This is her report.)

April 26 was a lovely day. Lincoln is just enough south that redbud and crabapple-y things were in bloom (unlike in Wayne), the sun was warm, and even the wind wasn’t bad by Nebraska standards. We assembled in a gym some blocks away and paraded across campus in caps and gowns, led by a local jazz band.

ADS was first in the alphabetical delegate lineup; I got to march with a nice young man from the American Historical Society.

Unfortunately the ceremony itself was indoors, but it too was full of pomp and music. Not to mention musical metaphors. Chancellor Moeser is an organist, and one speaker after another welcomed the new “conductor” to “our orchestra” with quips about harmony. One even suggested the University would be better off if music were to replace speech, but judging by the number of words spoken at this event, it won’t happen soon.

It was rather fun; glad I went.
Methods IX at Wales, July 28–Aug. 2; Abstracts on Web

The Ninth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, at the University of Wales in Bangor, begins with registration Sunday evening, July 28 and ends after lunch Friday, August 2. The program includes fifty 30-minute papers and two featured speakers. Coffee will be provided in the mornings and tea in the afternoons. Wednesday afternoon will be set aside for an excursion to Bodnant Gardens in the Conwy Valley (£8); Thursday evening will be the conference dinner.

“Three people have shown interest in offering software demonstrations,” says coordinator Alan Thomas. “Further offers will be welcomed—as soon as possible, so that I can try and put a coherent session together. At the moment, the program is full, and any demonstrations would run concurrently with papers.”

The conference fee is £100 (students £50), including a copy of the conference proceedings. Room and board are extra. For information write Thomas at School of English and Linguistics, University of Wales Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG, Wales, U.K.; phone 01248-382-271; fax 01248-382-928; e-mail els030@bangor.ac.uk.

Full abstracts of the 50 papers are available from the ADS web pages. Go to http://www.msstate.edu/Archives/ADS/meetings.html and click on “Abstracts.” To get them via anonymous ftp, go to ftp.msstate.edu and look in pub/archives/ADS/Files for a file named methods.txt.

Program Highlights


9 Language or dialect? The current status of Galician. Brian F. Head, Universidade do Minho.


16 From Wenker’s sentences to computer techniques: 120 years of recording language variation. Barbara M. Ferré, U. of Georgia, Athens.

18. Corpus linguistics and opportunistic data collection. John Staczek, Georgetown U.


24 The perception of “Standard” as the speech variety of a specific region: computer-produced composite maps of perceptual dialect regions. Daniel Long, Osaka Shoin Women’s College.


28 Accommodation, ethnicity, and regional norms.

Dennis R. Preston, Michigan State.

31 Ethnolinguistic differences in Northern Ireland. John M. Kirk, Queen’s U., Belfast.

32 What can new-world Englishes tell us about old-world varieties? The case of verbal aspect. Sandra Clarke, Memorial U. of Newfoundland.

33 Ozark folk speech: a reassessment of traditional assumptions. Bethany Dumas, UT Knoxville.

34 Water-based isoglosses in Louisianian Acadian French. Catherine Bodin, Frederick Community College.


39 A technique for studying variation in speech rhythm. Wladyslaw Cichocki, U. of New Brunswick & Karin Flikeid, St Mary’s U., Nova Scotia.

40 The question of dialect boundaries: the SED and the American atlases. Lawrence M. Davis, Wichita State U.; Charles L. Houck, Ball State U.; Clive Upton, U. of Sheffield.

41 S-shaped curves of language standardization on the basis of repeated sociolinguistic surveys. Fumio Inoue, U. of Tokyo.

42 Variation in the results of various multivariate analyses. Michael D. Linn, U. of Duluth.

43 The notion “dialect area”: an alternative approach. Veronika Horvath, Ball State U.


48 The learning curve for lexical data entry personnel. Anne Marie Hamilton, U. of Georgia, Athens.

50 Types of “Indian” placenames in the United States. Grant Smith, Eastern Washington U.

51 The GNIS and dialect research. Edward Callary, Northern Illinois U.
If you have recently published a book, send pertinent information to Executive Secretary Allan Metcalf (address on cover), and we’ll mention it here.

Jeutonne P. Brewer. The Federal Writers’ Project: A Bibliography. Scarecrow Press (PO Box 4167, Metuchen NJ 08840), December 1994. 177 pages. $25. The Federal Writers’ Project of the Works Progress Administration was a brief productive union of the bureaucrat and the creative spirit during the Great Depression. The project supported and encouraged many writers, including Nelson Algren, Vardis Fisher, Lyle Saxon, Saul Bellow, John Cheever, Conrad Aiken, Margaret Walker, and May Swenson. Benjamin Botkin described the folklore work of the Federal Writers’ Project as the greatest educational and social experiment of our time. Linguists have studied language use and dialects. This bibliography includes sections on works about the Federal Writers’ Project, publications produced by the project, a chronology of the WPA with a list of its projects, and a list of writers who worked with the project. The annotations and the extensive index of names and titles will help the reader find references to particular writers, immigrant groups, and special projects. ISBN 0-8108-2924-X.


Verbatim Award, ADS Members

The first Verbatim-Dictionary Society of North America Awards were made in January to two members of ADS. One was Joan Hall of *DARE* (see Page 8). The other was Michael P. Adams of Albright College. He received $500 for travel to the University of Chicago for a book on the *Middle English Dictionary*. A chapter will compare the *MED* with the *Dictionary of American English*, which was edited and published at Chicago.

The *Verbatim*-DSNA Awards are funded by *Verbatim* magazine, edited by Laurence Urdang. This year’s awards committee consisted of ADS members Sidney Landau, Virginia McDavis and Herbert Morton.
REGIONAL MEETINGS, FALL 1996

Rocky Mountain Region
In association with RMMLA, Oct. 24–26; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Sheraton Old Town.
3:15 p.m. Friday, Oct. 25, Turquoise Room.
3. “It Is a Bird to Some Degree: Hedges in Male and Female’s Judgment on Birdness.” Yili Shi, Ball State Univ.
4. “Preliminary Results of a Dialect Survey of Utah.” Diane Lillie, Brigham Young Univ.
Chair: Xiaozhao Huang, Dept. of English, Univ. of North Dakota.
ADS Regional Secretary 1995–96: Grant W. Smith, English Dept., Eastern Washington Univ., Cheney WA 99004; e-mail gsmith@ewu.edu.

South Central Region
In association with SCMLA, Oct. 31–Nov. 2; San Antonio, St. Anthony’s Hotel.
5:45–7:15 p.m. Thursday, Oct. 31.
1. “Mais, I doan write dat anglish too good no’: Cajun Vernacular English and the Effects of Vernacular on Standard Writing.” Deary Cheramie, Nicholls State Univ.
2. “Audience and Dialect in the Writings of Somerville and Ross.” Nicole P. Greene, Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana.
Chair: Elsa P. Rogers, Modern Languages, Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana.
ADS Regional Secretary 1996–97: Charles B. Martin, Dept. of English, Univ. of North Texas, P.O. Box 13827, Denton TX 76203-3827; phone (817) 565-2149.
For SCMLA information write Katherine E. Kelly, Executive Director, Dept. of English, Texas A&M Univ., College Station TX 77843-4227; phone (409) 845-7041; e-mail scmla@acs.tamu.edu.

Midwest Region
In association with MMLA, Nov. 7–9; Minneapolis Marriott City Center.
3. “Continuing Change in Dialect Vocabulary.” Alvin L. Gregg, English, Wichita State Univ.
Discussant for session: Anna Fellegy, English, Univ. of Minnesota.
Chair and ADS Regional Secretary 1995–96: Beth Lee Simon, CM 109, Dept. of English and Linguistics, IPFW, Fort Wayne, IN 46805; phone (219) 424-8834; e-mail simon@cvax.ipfw.indiana.edu.
For MMLA information write MMLA, 302 English/Philosophy Bldg., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City IA 52242-1408; phone (319) 335-0331.
Future meetings: 1997 Nov. 6–8 Chicago, Ramada Congress Hotel; 1998 Nov. 5–7 St. Louis, Regal Riverfront Hotel; 1999 Nov. 4–6 Minneapolis, Marriott City Center.
(For SAMLA please turn to Page 8)
I-O U: Your Chance to DARE in Advance

High hopes continue that November 1996 will bring into publication the third volume (I-O) of our great Dictionary of American Regional English.

The next newsletter will tell exactly how you can get your copy of Volume III—and your copy of the previous volumes, if you missed them.

Meanwhile, to whet your appetite, the editors offer the following 26 tidbits from Volume III. Match them with the definitions and send a copy by **August 31** to **Joan H. Hall**, associate editor, DARE, 6125 Helen White Hall, 600 North Park St., Madison WI 53706. If you’re the first with the correct answers, you’ll win a copy of Volume III!

And if you don’t know them all, try anyway. “Last time no one who entered came even close to getting them all right,” says Hall. “So the person who gets the most right is the winner.”

The winner’s name, and the answers, will be in our September issue.

_DARE_ itself was a winner recently. For support of a Project Assistant to verify quotations this summer, Hall on behalf of _DARE_ received a 1996 _Verbatim_-Dictionary Society of North America award of $2000 in January.

### Regional Meeting: South Atlantic

*(See Page 7 for other regional meetings)*

In association with SAMLA, Nov. 8–10; Savannah, Georgia, Marriott Riverfront Hotel.


**Chair: Peter L. Patrick**, Linguistics Dept., Georgetown University, Washington DC 20057.

ADS Regional Secretary 1995–96: **Natalie Maynor**, English Dept., Mississippi State Univ., Drawer E, Mississippi State MS 39762; e-mail maynor@ra.msstate.edu.

_Preregistration_ is $30, students $20. Membership in SAMLA is $15 for individuals, $8 for students. Write SAMLA, Georgia State Univ., University Plaza, Atlanta GA 30303-3083; phone (404) 651-2693.

This first issue of the newsletter is intended to begin a dialogue among members of ADS and of the linguistic and pedagogic community on issues and points of usage. To this end, the comments of Richard Redfern concerning divided usage and the need to maintain a balanced perspective concerning usage and language change are particularly apt.

To Begin: The Question of Divided Usage
Richard K. Redfern

Many English teachers in middle school, high school, and college have heard little (perhaps nothing) about divided usage, and they are apt to reject the idea that both of two widely used locutions (as well as pronunciations and spellings) are good English. Unless things have changed greatly in the past ten or fifteen years, a rigid right-or-wrong attitude still dominates the thinking of most English teachers and, hence, of almost everyone who passes through our schools, public or private. Teachers are apt to label as an error in grammar a choice which is both grammatical and in wide use by people of all social classes.

Here are some examples of divided usage:

1. None of them are/is here yet.
2. Who/Whom do you mean?
3. That's him/he at the door.

Perhaps many teachers would consider the second choice in each sentence better English than the first, but I would maintain the opposite. Each first sentence is not only grammatical, but also idiomatic. The old feeling that none must be followed by a singular verb is pretty well disregarded by good writers; whom introduces a formality that is seldom appropriate in conversation; using a subjective case pronoun after a form of the verb to be also introduces a formal or stilted tone that would be out of place in informal speech or writing.

It seems to me that the MLA and ADS have only occasionally stressed the educational implications of articles about language. In November 1983, when John Algeo sent out a questionnaire on the needed research in usage, one of the "needs in the study of usage" was "bringing the best of scholarly knowledge to bear on public discussions of usage and on pedagogical applications." I don't remember how many votes that need got. I think that experts—with some exceptions such as Robert C. Pooley in The Teaching of English Usage (1974)—have not done a good job of communicating ideas which should be well known to those who teach English in fourth or fifth grade through college.
Of course some books do say something about divided usage. Most, however, give it only a brief mention. C. C. Fries's *The Teaching of the English Language* (1927) mentions divided usage. Porter Perrin’s *Writer’s Guide and Index to English*, which had a lot of use in the 1940s and 1950s, had an entry on divided usage. *In Current American Usage* (1962) Margaret Bryant refers to it several times, as, for example, when she notes that “Usage is divided between toward and towards with either form acceptable” (220). I have a high opinion of J. J. Lambert’s *A Short Introduction to English Usage* (1972), but I was disappointed because he paid so little attention to divided usage. On the other hand, Ed Finegan refers to it in several places in his *Attitudes Toward Usage* (1980). All of us probably know many other books and articles that deal with divided usage.

The earliest reference to divided usage that I know of is in George Campbell’s *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776): “Usage is the sole mistress of language; grammar and criticism, her ministers... Where usage is pretty evenly divided between two different but resembling modes of expression, either is proper. If the authorities preponderate on one side, it is in vain to oppose the prevailing usage” (as quoted in J. Leslie Hall’s *English Usage* (1917).

As an example of what not to do, I cite a passage in *The Standard of Usage in English* (1908) by Thomas R. Lounsbury. For ten pages he discusses whether “the two first cantos” and “the three first men” and the like are preferable to “the first two cantos” and “the first three men.” Then he fizzes out by saying: “Not until a complete examination shall have been made of the works of the greatest authors of the past century and of the comparative frequency of their employment of both modes of expression, will any one be in a position to decide whether the best usage resorts to each of the two indifferently, or tends to adopt one to the exclusion of the other” (134). If, as I suspect, Lounsbury had found many instances of both expressions, he should have said that either is acceptable English.

As Redfern admirably demonstrates, the question of divided usage is indeed an important one now just as it has been in the past. Recently, a retiring colleague presented me with his much used and highly annotated copy of Albert H. Marckwardt and Fred Walcott’s *Facts About Current English Usage* (English Monograph No. 7. National Council of Teachers of English. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938). Their work is based on Sterling Leonard’s posthumously published *Current English Usage* (1933), ranked 230 items as being “established,” “disputable,” or “illiterate” using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage Level</th>
<th>Percentage Approving</th>
<th>Percentage Disapproving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputable</td>
<td>25-75%</td>
<td>25-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>75-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These rankings are based on the opinions of a panel of 229 judges (30 linguists; 30 editors; 22 authors; 19 businessmen; and 130 English teachers).

Even a cursory viewing of Leonard's data raises some interesting points about changes in English usage in the past 60 years. For example, concerning the number of nouns, Leonard notes (1) that 'There is a large works near the bridge' is clearly "established" usage, although "English teachers ranked the usage much lower than did linguists," (2) that 'There is a big woods behind the house' is "disputable," although in "informal speech, this is probably acceptable in the United States," and (3) that 'The data is often inaccurate' is "illiterate." Although Leonard mentions the high degree of disagreement among his respondents (linguists approving the usage; teachers, businessmen, and authors disapproving) might well move this usage into the "disputable" range, he ultimately says "there is no dictionary justification for the singular use of this plural form, and that such use, from the point of view of cultivated usage, is still dubious to say the least" (70).

All but a few die-hard purists and prescriptivists today would recognize all three of the above usages as "established." Similarly, Leonard's listing of 'Aren't ("nt or rnt) I right' as disputable would strike all modern users of American English as peculiar in the light of its nearly universal acceptance among educated speakers, forgetting that, as Leonard quotes an American linguist who participated in the survey, "The English seem to have succeeded in putting over Aren't I. I still do not care for it" (90). Care for it or not, this once British colloquialism has become the established usage today.

Clearly, then, divided usage is often a sign of language in the process of change and one that members of the Committee on Usage and of the American Dialect Society as a whole ought to be investigating. Perhaps it is time consider repeating a Marckwardt and Walcott-style study of usage, especially in the light of the revised Oxford English Dictionary and of such non-prescriptivist tools as Randolph Quirk, et al.'s A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (New York: Longman, 1985) to determine how accurately handbooks and grammars reflect the actualities of language use.

A.S.

Changing Usage: To Beg the Question

E. W. Gilman,
with citations supplied by
Tom Creswell, Rudy Troike,
Ron Butters, and Jesse Sherdlowers

In the Chicago Tribune of 3 January 1996, Bruce Fuller, a by-liner, wrote:

But the short-run theatrics around the EITC begs a long-term question: What measurable effects do these expensive tax credit and voucher programs exert...

Here we have the new interpretation of the
old phrase *beg the question* that created a considerable number of comments on the ADS discussion list beginning in mid-December 1995. Instead of meaning ‘to assume the truth of the very point raised in a question’, this new, usage plays on the semantic overlap of *to beg* and *to ask*. That discussion subsequently revealed several other examples of the changing usage of this stock phrase:

Clinton’s foreign success begs the question: What next?
   —*Insight on the News*, 13 Feb. 1995

With such enthusiasm for the program, it almost begs the question: What if it doesn’t work?
   —*Reason*, March 1995

It begs the question: Why are we all so fearful?
   —*Des Moines Register*, 15 Feb. 1996

As this usage was new to me, I went to see what our citation files had to offer. The first was a note from one of our younger editors at Merriam-Webster who had heard it in 1992 and suggested we keep an eye out for it. Apparently somebody had:

The title “Now You Know” would seem to beg the question “Who wants to?”

The verb can even occur intransitively:

...but one question continues to beg: Is there a market ...
   —*Shape*, December 1991

This new use is easy to identify when the question is expressed directly, as it is in the foregoing examples; but the question can also be expressed indirectly:

...his scandalized expression-making throughout the first three acts inevitably begs the question why he didn’t speak up earlier.
   —*Times Literary Supplement*, 24-30 Aug. 1990

We have reached the age when brute force can outperform creativity. This statement, of course, begs the question of what creativity is.
   —*New York Times*, 18 Feb. 1996

The indirect version raises the problem of ambiguity—it is not always clear whether *beg is intended to mean ‘raise’ or ‘avoid’ from the bit of context accompanying a typical dictionary citation. This will be a problem for dictionary editors, but so far we don’t know if it is a problem for readers. It will bear watching.
Call for Submissions
The ADS Teaching Newsletter invites you, your colleagues, and your students to submit book reviews, short articles on pedagogy, notes on teaching ideas, and related materials. If you or a colleague has (or might be persuaded to compose) an item for the newsletter, please contact Alan D. Manning, Dept. of Linguistics, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. E-mail: alan_manning@byu.edu

Book Reviews


Writing for Academic Publication is a portable paperback mentor for graduate students and assistant professors wishing to publish in order to progress in their careers. Frank Parker and Kathryn Riley provide sound advice in the spirit of their own admonition that "the essence of academic writing is didactic." The book includes meaty how-to chapters on book reviews, time management, abstracts, conference presentations, response articles, research articles, introductions, examples, quotations, figures, metalanguage, conclusions, and submitting manuscripts for publication.

The introductory chapter points out that graduate programs often fail to give adequate training in the realities of producing, presenting, and publishing academic texts. Parker and Riley present their book as a solution to the problem, using materials from a college-level course that trains graduate students to participate actively in scholarly writing. As such, Writing for Academic Publication is an ideal textbook for graduate seminars that emphasize professional preparation. The thoughtful tone of the book is reminiscent of composition professor Duane Roen, who defogs the publishing mystique by treating graduate students as "fellow word-crafters" who can and should publish early.

The strengths of the textbook include clear prose, logical organization, and useful examples. The diction and structure of the language throughout the book is as clear as crystal. With the
exception of the time management chapter, which separates the book review from other genres, the organization of the book is coherent and practical. Each point of each chapter is illustrated with suggestions, quotations, or sample texts. The book practices what it preaches about summarizing each key point, illustrating it, and then interpreting it.

The authors provide a strong rationale for the methods they recommend. For example, they argue convincingly that index cards are essential for organizing and accessing research notes when reading scholarly materials.

They give original insights as well as time-tested techniques for achieving success in research. In chapter four, they identify and exemplify two types of conference abstracts, TOPIC abstracts and THESIS abstracts. They discuss reasons for choosing one type or the other to enhance chances of getting a paper accepted.

Even tenured, prolific professors can learn something from Parker and Riley's heuristics. In chapter five they enumerate three fundamental rules followed in superior conference presentations: 1) presenters speak freely with eye contact instead of reading a script, 2) they observe time limits, and 3) they use a visual aid. These suggestions were invaluable to me last August when I made two presentations at an international conference in Austria.

The weaknesses of the book are not serious. The introductory chapter is somewhat ambiguous about whether the book is intended for graduate students or assistant professors preparing for tenure. Since the book works well for both audiences the flaw is minor. The title of chapter eleven, entitled "Figures" misled me somewhat. I thought the authors might discuss rhetorical and stylistic figures, but they were referring only to tables, charts, and graphs (visual figures). Perhaps a subsequent edition of this book could change the title of that chapter to "visuals," and add another chapter discussing rhetorical figures which strengthen the power of scholarly rhetoric.

Some explanations in the book seem incomplete and thus slightly condescending. For example, in chapter five the authors state that conference presenters who read a paper instead of talking about the topic do so because they need "a security blanket." Although I agree that oral presentation is superior to
reading a paper, some of my most talented colleagues read their conference papers formally for legitimate reasons: 1) to observe time limits: ten double-spaced pages equals a twenty minute presentation; 2) to demonstrate a careful preparation rather than a casual approach to the professional demands of the conference; 3) to satisfy the formal conventions expected at some professional conferences; 4) some authors feel more elegant and deliberate in written discourse than in verbal explanations.

As a whole though, *Writing for Academic Publication* is a cogent handbook for people who are serious about communicating with their peers in the adventure of scholastic inquiry. Parker and Riley have provided long-needed guidelines for achieving success in the marketplace of ideas.

Cynthia L. Hallen  
Linguistics Department  
Brigham Young University

---


The 3rd edition of the *St. Martin's Handbook* is unique in that it is the first handbook to address language variety. For a genre that focuses on how to help students effectively communicate their ideas (and not just be aware of surface mechanics) such attention is long overdue and represents one of the bridges between linguistics and rhetoric and composition. Considering language variety in such a setting complements the handbook's other treatments of language which attempt to incorporate more than grammatical rules and how to's. Sandwiched between chapters dealing with "Enriching Vocabulary" and "Using Commas," Chapters 27, 28 and 29 treat Diction, Language Variety and the linguistic common ground among race and gender, respectively.

The authors suggest that the purpose of these chapters is to help students "shift language gears" as needed between community, workplace and school, and illustrate this using examples, exercises and guidelines. The examples
are easily accessible and connect to the handbook’s student audience, taken from menus, the language of sportscasters, fiction, and even street talk, as in the examples of signifying, one of several African American insult strategies. The authors also devote some attention to the uses of language variety for multilingual writers, an approach which corresponds to similar attention in each of the other chapters.

Lunsford and Connors center their discussion of both diction and language variety in terms of their appropriateness to various regions, occupations, social and ethnic groups and relate the choices students make in their writing to their topic, purpose, audience and differing rhetorical effects the writers may wish to create in the use of different diction choices and language varieties. They caution against the tendencies to discriminate against those who do not speak the “standard” English, those who reject people who sound affected, and those who insist that there is only one correct way to speak or write. The authors argue that the diversity of language varieties enriches written and spoken text. While they urge caution in a student’s use of a variety that may not be native to them, since it might alienate members of a particular community, they maintain that used appropriately, however, “ethnic varieties of English can build identification and understanding between writer and reader”.

The chapter also examines code-switching within a work, i.e. when to use phrases from other languages, and the need to recognize that each participant in a language community speaks and writes in a particular variety of a language. Although the work is primarily focused on writing, its examples and exercises link reading, writing and spoken language together.

The true strength of this chapter’s inclusion in the handbook is not that this information is new, but that it exists in a work which students use for their own writing. It helps make the points for teachers that attention to the various social and regional language varieties can enhance communication, adding another voice to those who would encourage students to look beyond prescriptive notions of correct grammar and language use.

Paul Baltes
English Department
Brigham Young University