

SPEECH AND REALITY

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy



INTRODUCTION BY
CLINTON C. GARDNER



ARGO BOOKS, INC.
NORWICH, VERMONT

CHAPTER 5

HOW LANGUAGE ESTABLISHES RELATIONS



IN DEALING WITH LANGUAGE, investigators have tread several ways. And since we propose an avenue hitherto untried, we shall warn the reader against mistaking our approach for one of those with which he is familiar. Which are the usual gateways?

The one aspect is through phonetics; the physiological fact of our moving the organs of our body when speaking, is analyzed. Breathing, the membranes of the throat, lips, gums, and teeth are used to explain the various sounds, gutturals, dentals, explosives, etc.

The other aspect is through meaning. The signs are compared to the purpose pursued in pointing to things and acts and qualities. The semantics are systematized.

A third way is historical. The invention of writing, of literature, and the origin of language itself is described.

Our approach differs from all three without denying their great value. We may make our point clear perhaps by using a comparison first. The processes of heredity and decadence, today, are widely discussed in medicine and eugenics. However, decadence is a mental and a psychological phenomenon as well. Healthy children of healthy parents may suffer from the impotence of their parents to convey their own convictions to their children. Whole generations may prove decadent because they behave as though posterity did not depend on their intellectual severity with their progeny. This is decadence, social decadence.

But without particular qualification, we moderns restrict decadence nearly always to the curse of inheriting diseases or disabilities. And we narrow arbitrarily the system within which decadence may take place, just as we do when we tackle language by physiology.

In language, we have a physical medium of social intercourse to establish relations. When I shake hands with a person, this obviously is a physical action. Yet, I do not ask the physiologists to have them explain the act of shaking hands, although the action of the body is absolutely important. And I propose, in a similar way, that we shall treat language as a way of shaking hands, of establishing relations. When we do so, we have a physical process, in space and time, shaking the air, instead of the hand, yet having a social significance.

The relations between people are established by physical and physiological processes. Although more remote from the physical organization of the partner, than sexual intercourse or shaking hands, the physical organization of people is involved and serves the establishment of relations. Instead of serving the process of generation or digestion, our bodies serve here for the establishment of social relations. The functioning of the larynx, the mouth, the ear, in functioning to this purpose, cannot be isolated from the social system into which it fits. Without a system of respiration, the function of our lungs cannot be interpreted. Without a system of social relations, our phonetics and our linguistic technique remains meaningless. The respiratory system, the organs of eating and the ear and eye collaborate in two or more people to span a bridge of which the interlocutors are the bridge heads. Upon them, something is laid, between them a process goes on to which they are subjected. In shaking hands, everybody realizes that an intimate connection is established. The Greeks called the act "being planted into each other's hands," thereby stressing the biological character of the union. They try to be rooted in each other like one tree. And so, in the shaking-hand process, all corporate acts of unities united in root and branches are pre-signified.

Is it possible to trace similar solutions of social grouping in speech? When people ask, they also listen to each other. But the

ways in which they are arranged in speaking and listening differ widely. During the time that one person speaks, another or several others will listen. Otherwise, he would not speak. However, this very general division in speaking and listening, in every particular case is tinged by a different social relation. And it is at this point, of the specific relation established between speaker and listener, that we shall try to organize the different acts of language, systematically. This system, later, will be derived from other angles, independently. But it will lead to the same classification. And in it we try to explain speech as a function of the various elementary social relations, just as breathing is a function of respiration.

Man is incalculable; man is free. Yet his incalculability is set to work on a limited number of physical and social possibilities.

The fundamental classifications of grammar and the fundamental classifications of social relations coincide. Discovering the one we discover the other. Grammatical classifications in themselves would remain arbitrary without such empirical backing by social reality.

When two or more people are together, their relations are not of an infinite variety. They may be combinations or pure forms of the following types:

1. The speaker and the listeners are unanimous, of one spirit. They agree.
2. The speaker and the listener are "dubious," split, and of two spirits. They are strangers.
3. The speaker depends on the listener, whom the speaker expects to act on what he has to say.
4. The listener depends on the speaker because the speaker has acted already.

In all four cases, we need not analyze any social relations between the people involved, outside their momentary effort of speaking to each other. These speaking processes themselves and the various social relations are established. However, in the four cases, this has to be done in four absolutely heterogeneous manners.

We are accustomed to the interplay of two interlocutors, one asking, the other answering the question. Others may sing together a song, a chorale, a dirge; or we have the recitation of

an old text at a ritual, a *Te Deum* at mass, a legal ceremony in court where an old formula is recited that has been reiterated through the centuries. Finally, we see two men exchange words, one using command or order and the other acclaiming or consenting.

Let us analyze the four situations.

However, before going into them, we may well be curious about the phase preceding the utterances of the interlocutors. This situation consists of silence. And silence, too, is an actual social situation. I may be silent because I am alone, because the other man has not turned up. I may be silent because nothing new has flashed my mind that I must tell him. Silence may mean that although more than one person is present, they are in perfect agreement and have no issue to raise. And, silence may prevail because a number of people don't find a way of speaking together, from shyness, embarrassment, misgivings, hostility. In one and the same situation, silence may result from the lack of something:

1. Lack of a person to talk to; lack of an audience.
2. Lack of a person to listen to: lack of authority, of content, of something extraordinary to be said.
3. Lack of relations between two people. They may be strangers, different.
4. Lack of distance, too close relations between people, so that they think they need not say anything.

In 1 and 2, the moment has not come yet. The partner or a new subject matter is lacking. In 3 and 4, the scene is not set. In 3, the strangers move in peculiar and separate rooms; in 4, the unity and intensity is too great to allow for the distance in which alone language can fly back and forth. The time element is prohibitive in 1 and 2, the space element is prohibitive in 3 and 4.

Social relations need a medium distance in space and time. Too great distances and too small distances, both, are obstructive. But all these relations correspond to the great situations of decadence, war, chaos, revolution.

Language is a system of social relations. And grammar we shall call the scientific process by which we become conscious

of this system of social relations. The term grammar, ever since antiquity, has been limited to signify classroom considerations about the use of forms in speech. However, there is no reason why grammar should not be lifted to the level of a social science, of *the* social science, perhaps.

Great difficulties block the road of grammar, however. The terms used in grammar books are, in part, accidental, luggage from Greek and Roman misunderstandings of old standing, like the term "Copula" for the word "is," which is one of the most inveterate signs of the fact that grammar has not been treated as a science of society.¹

We shall have to be very cautious in building up a terminology which is free of a scholastic dogmatism. We must try to reduce the processes of speech to a system of social relations. Not all relations are based on speech. But all lasting relations are and have to be. That our organs of sex lead to social relations is an accepted fact. However, they only lead to marriage when speech intervenes. That our hands can organize the surrounding objects by craft and by work is admitted. Now the hands as well as the lungs, the throat and the mouth, our shoulders (in shrugging them), our head (in shaking it), the whole body, in fact, can be used, and is used for the purpose of establishing relations with other human beings.

This effort, however, becomes language properly speaking, when the relations are mutual and reciprocal. When I speak and you listen, when I formulate and you repeat, when I object and you explain, when I sing, and you fall in, we have human language.

Human language is not complete without the democracy of universal participation by which an undying speech, through the ages, is ascertained. We all speak and listen, formulate and repeat, object and explain, start and fall in. And all the objections, explanations, songs, formulas, etc., are restated and remodeled incessantly. Language survives any individual speaker.

¹ Few errors have been this persistent. This one has been fortified by metaphysical ideas which were attached to it. The philosophers, misled by the name "*verbum substantivum*," have opposed the substance with the accessories. A whole system of logic has been based on the primary existence of the verb 'copula.'

—J. Vendryes, *Le Langage*, 1921, p. 146.

Thus, language is obviously not restricted to building up temporal and passing relations. It tries to build up recurrent and remembered relations. In speaking, the acts of mortal men are lifted up to the level on which they become unforgettable because they are communicated. In speech, the processes of the universe are recorded and mentioned forever. Every sentence that we form today contains actual records of the acts to which our sentence as it is spoken now compares the act described in our sentence. And these former acts are contained in the words, the morphemes (word forms), the phrases that we are using, and we bring to life again these processes and facts of the past simply by speaking today. One cannot speak of the French or of America or of polo without recording, through these words, all the processes that led to the existence of France and the Americans and of the game of polo.

By speech, we convey acts to people who are unaware, ignorant, remote from the acts in question. Or we raise objections to the conveyance of such acts through us as a medium. Whatever we do, communicating, transmitting, obstructing the communication, we render a service to the acts that go on in the universe by making them accessible to those who have neither seen nor heard what we have seen and heard. We duplicate and triplicate the intensity of life on earth by bringing all separate processes, dispersed through centuries and over thousands of miles, into one stream of continuous conversation and recording.

To speak, as we usually say, "about" the world is a misleading diagnosis. When we speak about something, we do less than we are expected to do. When we chat about God and the world, our mind is on a vacation. And this chatter, gossip, talk, is the shell or the chaff of the real and full power of speech when things speak through us. It is a gross misunderstanding to judge speech by its play-variety, small talk. That is mere reflection on real speech. Through us, the world quite literally comes to know itself. We should not use the sloppy expression of talking about the universe. By taking cognizance of the universe and carrying it with ourselves to others, the universe is speaking to man everywhere and forever. The ubiquitous and

omnipresent character of life on earth depends on man, since through his traditions, his story-telling, his observations, the passing events in the remotest corner of the globe are kept as an eternal present before all the generations and nations of the earth.

This is man's contribution to the universe by which the whole life in the universe is changed. The universe is reflected in man, it is communicated by man to all other men scattered over the round of the planet. The cosmic acts, by our participation, gather considerable momentum. The earthquake of Lisbon in 1755, instead of killing some thousand people there, influenced all Europe, shook humanity to its depth, and was present to the minds of all humanitarians, directly or indirectly, for the next one hundred and fifty years.

Man offers his respiratory system, his ears, his gestures, and his body as a whole for the purpose of functioning in this cosmic mail service. Nothing remains undiscussed that man does experience. A never-ending stream of communication connects the first man to all of us as is shown by the fact that we speak the same language after six thousand years. And this cosmic service is to overcome the limitations in time and space of any cosmic event. We, all the time, spread the good and the bad news. And to spread news is the function of *homo sapiens*. In this way, he establishes a permanent system of coordinates in time and space. In this new time-space system, far remote events and far distant things draw together closely, by passing through the human mind till they are brought together practically, too.

When man began to speak, the existing universe began to be reflected a thousand times in the prism of human language. Before, the sun had risen. But now, men told each other: the sun has risen. And He rises in the minds of millions who don't see him rise, from their apartment windows. To speak means to spread or to communicate or to forward acts. In this sense, all speech is propaganda. For, as the waves carry to the universe the emanations of a source of light or energy, in no other way is the true word the expression, the forwarding energy of a real movement in the center, the center being either the universe or we ourselves as parts of it.

Malinowski made the discovery among the primitives that the language they speak is denotation of actions. This is significant. Although the word denotation is not fit for what he himself describes. The primitive, also, "communicates" where we "denote." To us, abstract and introvert moderns, language signifies the denotation of concepts or ideas. To the real speaker, it always will mean to transfer acts to other people:

Transfer it because I have experienced it: tale, story.

Transfer it so that it may reinforce my action: song, "let us go."

Transfer it so that it may eliminate resisting action about objections: "he actually is going."

Transfer it so that I need not act myself: command: "go!"

All speech is transfer of actions to other human beings, and thought is a subcase of such transfer. Thought is transfer of actions to the speaker himself, usually by overcoming his own resistance. When we begin to doubt, when we reach the age of discretion, when we analyze, we imply that the phase has passed in which we could be taken in by the irresistible force of other people's speech. We now need to go by second thought. However, that thought is the overcoming of a barrier within ourselves, is expressed by all words that express the process. *Dubitare, zweifeln*, make distinctions, discriminate, are all securing the introduction of a dualism within the person. An individual becomes a person by being able to represent speaker and listener both within one person. Logic is the faculty of restoring the unhindered flow of the words after breaking down the resistance by objections. And, as the word objections shows, objections are the inward-projection of outside objects and of the actions of these objects that at first sight stop the transfer of the actions of the universe to me in the form in which they first reach me.

No language is communication with others only, it is communication with the universe. We try by speaking to communicate our experience of the universe to our fellow men; by listening, reading, learning, we try to get hold of their experiences of the universe. To speak means to re-enact cosmic processes so that these processes may reach others. In every sentence, man acts within the cosmos, and establishes a social rela-

tion for the sake of saving the cosmos from wasting acts in vain. Man economizes the cosmic processes by making them available to all other men. Man, by speech, establishes the solidarity of all men for the acceptance of our universe.

Now, we are able to return to the question: how does language deal with the position of the second person, the listener, when this second person shall really be made a participant of the communication? If the transfer of the act shall be perfect, mere listening offers little guarantee.

I do not remember any analysis of the fact that the doer of the spoken word, not the mere listener, must be investigated when we wish to encompass what is done by speech. The social relation is not established when the man to whom I speak has gotten the acoustic impression on his membrane. The reaction to my saying may take a lifetime and more. But I must take the whole reaction into consideration in my analysis of the meaning of language. In certain cases, the reaction may be immediate and, perhaps, must be quick; in others, it is slow. But the time element, in both cases, is essential for explaining what I am doing by speaking at all.

We see that short-lived and long-lived relations are aimed at, by speech. And that, for that reason, language branches out in very different forms of grammar, of style, of expression. When I break into song, my mood is accepted by the fellow who goes along with me, singing, too, as well as he can. When a man has founded and started something, he longs for disciples who will repeat the good news in his absence and even long after his death. When somebody orders something to be done because he can or will not do it himself, the man who receives the order must relate it as given to him, he must respond, and make himself responsible for the execution of the order. When a soldier today acknowledges an order, he does it in a sentence. However, the simple Latin *venio* (I come) is not far away from being a whole sentence by repeating the command and acknowledging it by the affirmation "*jo, oh*" as the best answer, meaning: "Come? Sure!" The command itself reads "*veni,*" the additional "o" is the receipt. *Egō* the I, in Latin contains the same element, of course, of exclamation or acclamation.

When an object is announced by one speaker, the other may

understand or misunderstand it. The play of question and answer, for the indicative is the dialectical display of the mental equality between two men faced by a different part of reality, and attempting to compare notes and objections on objects in the surroundings. And, thus, we have four social relations established by the four different modes or moods of speech.

Old and young: people in succession, sacramental words and their reiteration.

Friends: people in agreement: soloist and chorus.

Strangers: people in disagreement: question and answer.

Leader and led: command and response.

When we analyze this further, we see that two forms are enacted by people because of their peculiar time relation; the two others on account of their peculiar space relation.

The repetition is needed where the two men are separated by age, one being older than the other so that the disciple must reiterate the word.

The command and response are needed where the older cannot go himself but must send somebody else to act or to make the experience although he may have gone through it before himself. Any imperative orders the other fellow to move; the commander is waiting for the other to act. He wants to transfer an act to his listener so that the act may take place, because it is the act just missing in the perfect time-space pattern that the speaker has in mind. Any imperative tries to convince the respondent of the next step that has to be taken to restore the universe of time and space, to its proper shape. This is the "growing" or "happening" or the "being in process" which is signified by the genuine imperative. Future is not at all what will happen sometime later. It is, at its root, the one act that is missing and that, by the word, is transferred to the listener so that he may act. Future is the "*unum necessarium*," the one thing needed of the New Testament, where the original function of the imperative is restored by Jesus.

The future depends on the fact of there being imperatives. Future is concrete. Imperatives are not placed *in* the future. But the future is what needs action. This impending and im-

perative character of the time concept "future" is overlooked in modern discussions.

When we sing together, we live together in an inner space. Our minds form one mind. We are animated by one spirit; we are unanimous and this unity signifies that we move in an inside, an inner space, compared with the rest of the world. The "inner" space is reflected by the fact of chorus singing. In it man's mind is not "his" mind, in isolation. Whenever he makes up his mind, he communicates. However, in singing, we are less remote from other minds than in other forms of communication. Here, the whole notion of different minds is subdued in favor of stressing the unanimity. The "inner" life of man is not a privilege of private individuals. Any group in the world has this inner sanctuary. Even big nations have their privacy where they sing, and their public discussions where they object and reverse the process of unity by meeting in the world outside which, always, consists of separate bodies, separate minds, distinct and antithetic objects.

Outside, everything is distant from any other object. External space has the one feature of separating all things. Our eyesight is given us to see the differences of things. The world, as seen through our eyes, is a very peculiar world of atoms, of distinct entities. Most people are ignorant of the fact that this world of our eyesight is just one world view among the others. They believe in the separatedness of things and minds, because we, indeed, have the freedom to bring everything under the scrutiny of our eyes as though it were not a part of us, but something independent and distinct. However, the minds that are objectionable to each other must remain on speaking terms if they are to live in peace together. In question and answer, two minds, otherwise not related, boil down their differences as two single minds.

The Platonic dialogue is based on this minimum of mutual understanding by which we, at least, may question each other. Unfortunately, this form of living together mentally has been treated through the ages, as "more natural" than discipleship, chorus singing and response to a command. It is not. The rational way of two minds meeting in the doubt of a question

is the best way for two strangers that meet each other on the market place. For traders, for the commercial world, this way seems to be the only way. But it is but one form of communicating among others.

Magister and disciple, singer and chorus, leader and respondent are of equal originality in their linguistic situation as the interlocutors of a discussion in the form of question and answer. By isolating the interrogatory mood, the origin of question and answer was inexplicable until today. As soon as we compare the prosaic process of question and answer to its parallels in historical tradition (formula and repetition), in musical unanimity (singer and chorus), in political challenge (imperative and response), question and answer are disclosed as one application of the general principle of social relations to be established through speech, the application to the meeting of two people from different spaces, and therefore of a different standard of objectivity.

When singers are absolutely sure of their unanimity, they may afford to sing in different voices, as a pleasure, playing with their inner integration to the brink. When question and answer pass between strangers, they may play with some inner agreement, just in their joy of successfully overcoming their difference of mind, as when Socrates does all the talking. And he only asks rhetorical questions. The rhetorical question: Don't you know? presupposes unanimity, in the form of a situation that presupposes the interlocutors being strangers. The rhetorical question oversteps the diffidence between strangers, by revealing their already being friends. This amiable form must not blind us against the original estrangement at the bottom of any logical discussion between two separate minds.

It is impossible, in the prose created for this cautious and rather external debate, to say: "He is a jolly good fellow." This sentence has to be sung, even in our days, because it stresses the inner solidarity with this fellow.

The clearest case of two strangers meeting is symbolized by our question: How do you do? The answer usually is suppressed; both interlocutors ask the same question. They establish relations, from the very foundation. The German salutations,

Grüss Gott, Auf Wiedersehen, boast of a unanimity between the two persons which allows them to unify their desires, their optatives. The Anglo-Saxon formula stresses the absolute right and insularity of the two gentlemen, both trying to let the other have all the possible independence of mind that goes with peace between them.

Now as to the means that serve the construction of these different worlds between people.

All language exploits large parts of our body, in making us serve as cosmic agents of news. In singing, however, more and deeper parts are set in motion than in parliamentary debate or scientific discussion. The reason probably is that in singing we are carefree, disarmed, and can let go. In rational discussion, we barely move our lips, and, with the rest of our body, we sit tight. In telling a story, the tale of things past, the epic rocking-chair tone is that of the man who has spent his real energy in the past of which he is going to tell the story right now. But the historian, the story-teller, distinctly uses a style and a voice that differs from rational argument.

All invitation to enter the future, to bring about the future, again uses a different intonation. Everybody knows that it takes years to acquire the voice of command that is without flaw and effort, neither shrieky nor embarrassed but irresistible. Some people think that it has to be learned in early youth, as much as singing, if it ever shall be first rate. The four types of intonation embroil the speaker and the listener into four different social situations. And upon these peculiar social situations the forms of grammar, the styles of books, and the eccentricities of whole national languages have been built.

In summing up, we may list our findings as follows: language establishes social relations between men as agents of cosmic communication. The actions going on in the whole universe, including our own lives, are re-enacted by the speaker so that they may reach the rest of mankind. Through speech, the life on earth reaches a new level of prismatic reflection on its own processes. On this level, any event, otherwise limited in time and space, may become noticeable all the time and everywhere.

The cosmic acts are either those that have happened before

or that are bound to happen (past or future). This is expressed by inculcating to posterity the reiteration, or by summoning listeners to obey the obvious imperative.

The cosmic acts either are familiar to all members of the conversation and only need re-enforcement through unanimous constation. All poetry and music appeals to human unanimity, as being inside one mind; or they are conflicting news because strangers meet, diffident of each other and each other's environmental data. All prose dialogue is based on the diffidence between question and answer, as though men were extraneous to each other.

The disciple, the chorus, the answer, the response, have to be taken into account to understand the system in which the speaker is serving as a function or cosmic agent. For his act is not completed before the reaction to his words ascertains his having spoken, in the true sense of the word, at all. The reaction proves that he has been able to do his duty as re-enacting the cosmic processes so that they may be endowed with the quality of being known, done, felt, and remembered. The past must be remembered by reiteration, the inner life must be felt, the outer circumstances and facts must be known, and the future must be done so that it may become a part of the unforgettable, knowable, experienced, and responded for time-space pattern called the universe. It is not so easy to accept the universe as Margaret Fuller thought.² It takes doing as well as remembering, feeling as well as knowing before the year of life is acceptable to men as its apostles.

The Classification of the Parts of Speech

Man has to convey to his fellow men the acts of the universe. These acts appear to him either in process of being achieved or as having been achieved. They appear to him as processes within one mind, or as objects that are exposed to various interpretations from different angles. We all need words that make clear with what aspect of the universe we wish to

² She said proudly: "I accept the universe!"

deal. The personal pronouns: We, you, it, they, I, mine, yours, only make sense when you are actually talking to people, within one circle of peaceful relations. All personal pronouns testify to the achievement of one spirit within many, in an inner circle.

Nouns are of the opposite nature. They classify the stone, the rain, the deer, the tree as beings outside, as objects of which we cannot be sure that they are brother sun and sister moon. However, we may deal with them differently, at different times. In poetry, sun and moon are real people; in science, they are not. It is perfectly reasonable that we should have two names for each thing, one from the inside, the other for its external objectivity. And we have, indeed. Since we all have two or three names. One is our name as a friend, inside one community; the other signifies our worldly existence, among a hostile world of demand and supply and the struggle for existence. By another name, or by the weight of the family name, we may trace our historical background, our past, or let it be traced by others. And that certain names given to us in the cradle, also contain a challenge to secure future action by the carrier of the name, is too well known. All ecclesiastical tradition believed in the vaccinating effect of name-giving.

Today, this aspect of names is in the decline because man has lost faith in the future. And immediately, we see him hide in his ancestors, his race, his country, or his class; and because he ceases to take his name as a challenge, he allows himself to be classified as determined by membership in a group, by exposure to environment, or by racial inheritance. The other perpetual temptation is to qualify the universe by its origins and causes. The first two words are "bad" and "good" when it comes to experience of history. Old ways are good ways, radical and revolutionary ways look bad since they are untried. Attributes usually are marks of recognition cast upon new events to compare them with events of the past. All legality and righteousness, for example, depend on precedent. Nothing is legal that has never happened before. Because liberties are given only for acts preconsidered, in general, at least.

It is futile to ask whether private property on the waves of

the ether is "right." These waves are known for so short a time that the old idea of private property cannot be applied to them without serious misunderstanding. These misunderstandings are committed daily. Whenever we qualify new events by right and wrong, good and evil, we try to convince ourselves and others that we know what they are. Adjectives are usually employed to describe new things by familiar names. The adjectival use of language, then, is tracing the unknown back to the known. When I say the table is round, red, heavy, I assume that the three adjectives are apt to be helpful in familiarizing us with the otherwise unknown table.

Verbs are used for the opposite purpose. They neither induce old or extraneous, or interior experience. The great sensation of verbs is that the universe is made over, in this moment, and is turning into something different. The imperatival usage in speech is, as mentioned before, quite obvious in the imperative that we address to somebody because we ourselves can't do what has to be done to make the world perfect. We shout at somebody else.

The languages, however, although they have given the imperative a prominent and creative role in the formation of the verb, also can express imperatival quality by more involved forms of the verb, or by using nouns as imperatives. "Light" may be used as an imperative to have the lights turned on.

From this last example, it becomes clear, that our grammatical classifications must remain aloof from any particular historical form of morphemes and endings. Yet, the nominal, verbal, pronominal and adjectival form of language is something eternal. No language can be without it. Wherever we are "within the group," we are moving "usward," as the old English phrase allowed to say. The whole world looks like a part of us, and "mine" and "thine" are separated from anything outside our unity. All language of a group, integrated and harmonious like a family or a club, is pronominal, and because it is, it is exclusive for non-members of this community.

The nominal usage, on the other hand, goes out to meet the stranger to discuss with him the facts that he and we can agree upon without being friends or brothers.

The adjectival language is connecting us with the past, with history, with the origins of our conscious life. And the chapter of Genesis that insists on dating our history back to the moment when people discerned wrong and right, is correct. From this moment on, all men have striven to speak one language or to restore the unity of language by building up again and again a consentaneous table of evaluations, of good and evil, valid for all.

The imperatival usage of language is creative. A new act asks for a new word. And the verbs seem to be that part of language containing the greatest originality and the most efficient fruits of creative gestures, new words. In every moment of linguistic life, there may be found two trends: one to derive verbs from nouns (as in the A conjugation in Latin or "book, to book," "table, to table.") And the other tendency of starting with a new verb, and then following it up with nouns derived from the verb (as in the Latin E conjugation, or in old English lose, looser; to pull, pull-over, etc.). But it seems to be plausible that more independence, more creativity is shown in the verb describing a new act, and then let the nouns spring from it as the verb leads to permanent agents and actual situations. The verb "to taxi," in flying, is perhaps an instance of a case where a noun was in back of the idea first, but ceased to be consciously envisualized, and the act became so intriguing that the verb became independent.

We now are equipped to connect the usual grammatical terminology of the schools with our social-relation terminology. All language may take four shapes, and so may all parts of speech: the experience asks to be called future, past, objective or subjective.

1. The *subjective* is called ours and mine by pronominal language.
2. The *objective*, as between strangers, is extrapolated as by nouns, nominal language.
3. The *old* is expressed as having certain qualities, adjectival usage.
4. The *new* is expressed as in process, as bound to come

off, imperative usage, because the success depends on the act voiced.

Or, we may table our findings as follows:

- a. The *inward* aspect stresses the unity of the interlocutors, who feel their unanimity: pronominal language. (Pronouns: we, I, ours, mine, you, thou, yours, thine, etc. Conjunctions: and, but, in spite of, etc. Optative, subjunctive. Poetry, Music.)
- b. The *outward* aspect stresses the freedom of each interlocutor who meets in an objective world: nominal language. (Nouns: stone, rain, fire, hail, tree, etc.; one, two, three, four, five, etc. Indicative speech. Arithmetics.)
- c. The *backward* aspect traces everything to its familiar qualities: adjectival language. (Adjectives: red, green, good, bad. Participles: loving, gone, been. Historical background, moral judgement.)
- d. The *forward* aspect accompanies the unfinished creation of the world of tomorrow: imperatival language. (Verbs, imperatives: Thy will be done, thy kingdom come.—or help! stop! listen! Political eloquence, prophesy.)

It always has aroused my attention that the preface of the Christian Mass, which is one of the most perfect documents of human speech, should begin with adjectives, and, what is more, with a considerable list of adjectives. It runs: *Vere, dignum et justum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte.*³ We have seen that all language is an attempt to enact the processes of the cosmos always and everywhere. This prayer judges the always and everywhere (*semper et ubique*) from the aspect known to man by his experience, as dignified, just, fair and wholesome. It is historical and adjectival language at its apex because it describes the meaning of the historical attempt of all of us when we speak, and in tackling the very heart of language, it does this in the perfect form of one special style. *And true perfection in speech is not achieved*

³ Truly worthy and just, right and wholesome it is that we always and everywhere give thanks to you, o sacred Lord.

by mixing the four styles but by being completely devoted to one of the four at a time. The most important fact about speech is that it must remain four-fold, and no one style can communicate the whole truth of the matter we are trying to convey. No one style can be reduced to another. Rational, scientific language is one of four different languages, and must remain so.