elimination of languages, and thereby devaluing the education received.

The second cause is the perpetuation of rigid disciplinary boundaries, and even, in some of the newer universities, the erecting of new ones where none existed before. The dissatisfaction of students with this kind of arrangement is reflected in the boom in adult education language enrolments in centres throughout the country.

Freedoms once given cannot easily be taken back, and so the members of foreign language departments must accept, though most probably do not, that the day of serious language preparation in secondary school is over for ever, except for the minority of children who are already bilingual and who are fortunate enough to attend a bilingual school, or whose parents are rich enough to be able to send them to a school where languages continue to be taught.

At the university level, language centres and beginners' courses within existing departments, and the freeing of the acquisition of a language skill from its traditional role, that of literary and aesthetic analysis, for use in other roles as well will all help. One important form of organisation of academic work widely employed in other countries is the "context" or "area study", as described by Associate Professor M. Clyne,[22] where scholars from a number of different disciplines can work on a common area of study in which a language is the unifying element. This would be at its most effective at graduate school level where a basic level of language and other disciplinary competence may be presupposed. It is vitally necessary that the isolation of foreign language learning in Australian universities be broken in as many ways as possible so that at least those students who want to understand what is going on in foreign countries and who are at present discouraged from doing so, may be given the opportunity to do so.[23]

In the wider context of the whole of Australian society, it can only be presented clearly to all the members of the society that when they decide that foreign languages are not relevant, they are deciding that foreign countries are not relevant either. Professor Sussex has written that:

> It is idle in these circumstances to pretend that Australia can "go it alone" in splendid monolingualism.[24]

No society can both isolate itself linguistically and still play a positive role in the scientific and intellectual world. The boundaries surrounding the study of languages in Australia have thus come to form an unnecessary restriction on the number of areas open to enquiry while serving no useful purpose.

NOTES

[1] Olive Wykes, "Survey of Foreign Language Teaching in the Australian Universities. A report prepared by Dr. Olive Wykes with Recommendations by the Sub-Committee on Foreign Languages", submitted to the Australian Humanities Research Council, November, 1966.

[2] E. C. Forsyth, *The Relevance of Rabelais, Some Thoughts on the Place of French Studies in an Australian University*, La Trobe University Inaugural Lecture (Bundoora: 1970), p. 12.

[3] *The Australian*, May 8, 1973. (Emphasis mine.)

[4] Commonwealth of Australia, *Fifth Report of the Australian Universities Commission*, Canberra, May 1972, p. 96.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

[6] *Report by the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on the Teaching of Asian Languages and Cultures in Australia*, Canberra, August 1970.

[7] A full study of the whole of Australia is now in progress by the Australian Academy of the Humanities through its Sub-Committee on Foreign Languages under the chairmanship of Emeritus Professor R. Samuel.

[8] University of Tasmania, *Submission to the Australian Universities Commission*, September 1959, April 1962, December 1970.

[9] It is too soon for the C.A.E.'s to make a significant impact here. Some current foreign language enrolment figures are: R.M.I.T., 12; W.A.I.T., 49; T.C.A.E., 25; C.C.A.E., 208.

[10] Personal correspondence, quoted with consent.

[11] *The Australian*, September 10, 1973.

[12] Personal correspondence, quoted with consent.

[13] 1973 edition, p. 49.

[14] *The Australian*, 27th October, 1973.

[15] See J. A. Fishman (ed.), *Language Loyalty in the United States* (The Hague, Mouton, 1966).

[16] André Martinet, *A Functional View of Language* (Oxford: O.U.P., 1961), p. 107.

[17] Pier Paolo Giglioli, "Introduction", in Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.), *Language and Social Context* (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 11.

[18] J. McManners and Crawford, R. M., *The Future of the Humanities in the Australian Universities* (Melbourne: M.U.P., 1965, p. 9, quoted by Wykes, *op. cit.*, p. 2).

[19] Forsyth, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-10.

[21] *The Australian*, 2nd October, 1973.

[22] Michael Clyne, "Some Thoughts on Departmental Structure", *Vestes Symposium: Boundaries Between Disciplines*, September 1974 (forthcoming).

[23] See D. E. Ingram, "Towards a More Articulate Australia, The Case for Applied Linguistics and Language Centres", *Australian Journal of Education*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (March 1973).

[24] R. T. Sussex, *Language and Languages in Australia*, Inaugural Lecture, James Cook University of North Queensland, March 1973.

GUERRILLA LINGUISTICS

RAY CATTELL*

SOME subjects are born interdisciplinary.† If lines of research in several traditional fields converge, the researchers involved

*Sub-Department of Linguistics, University of Newcastle.

†It will be obvious to the reader that the term "discipline" is used fairly loosely as this article, to mean "field of study". I am aware of different and more tightly constrained definitions, but find this one more relevant to what I want to say. If anyone feels strongly that I am misusing the word "discipline", I will be happy if he will mentally substitute whatever term he prefers.

can come to feel that their interests are more strongly related to parts of neighbouring fields than to the rest of their "own". Traditional demarcations then serve only to irritate, and it is likely that attempts will be made to redraw the lines. If they are successful, a new, "interdisciplinary" subject is born.

That is not the way in which the label "interdisciplinary" has come to be applied to Linguistics, which is a very old discipline in its own right. In the latter part of the fourth century B.C., Panini wrote an Indian grammar that still draws almost universal admiration (perhaps not entirely because most linguists are unable to read it in the original). About the same time, the Greeks also interested themselves in linguistic questions. There have been lines of development from those days to the present.

Linguistics is one of the subjects that *achieve* "interdisciplinariness". (I am not sure whether there are any that have it thrust upon them, so this series is now terminated.) In recent years, lines of research have led out from Linguistics to other disciplines. In the process, various "interdisciplinary" satellites like mathematical linguistics, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics have been born, but the cross-disciplinary interests have not been isolated by these developments, and continue to be part of Linguistics proper.

At the beginning of each year, the Linguistics Section of the Quarterly Progress Report of the Research Laboratory of Electronics at M.I.T. always carries the same statement of research objectives, which begins:

> The ultimate objective of our research is to gain a better understanding of man's mental capacities by studying the ways in which these capacities manifest themselves in language. Language is a particularly promising avenue because, on the one hand, it is an intellectual achievement that is accessible to all normal humans, and, on the other hand, we have more detailed knowledge about language than about any other human activity involving man's mental capacities.

I think it is fair to say that the majority of linguists would probably agree with this statement, though there would be sharp differences of opinion as to how the objectives were to be fulfilled. And, given this statement, it is not surprising that Linguistics has common ground with Psychology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Sociology, Education and most other cognitive studies. Nor is it surprising, given that its data is language, that it should draw from and contribute to the study of particular languages such as Italian, Japanese and Malagasi.

It is symptomatic of these relationships that papers on Linguistics

have appeared in the past decade or so in volumes with titles like *Readings in Mathematical Psychology, The Twelfth Symposium in Applied Mathematics, I.R.E. Transactions on Information Theory, Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Biological Foundations of Language, Language and Philosophy,* and numerous others of similar kinds.

The cross-fertilisation of academic interests goes far towards explaining the fact that in America scholars calling themselves linguists are employed in numerous departments with different titles. A recent number of the *Bulletin* of the Linguistic Society of America[1] includes a report on employment in the field of linguistics. It gives a breakdown of the departments in which linguists work in the United States.

> Linguists hold appointments principally in departments of:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Linguistics | 26.9% |
> | English | 21.7% |
> | Commonly taught foreign languages (French, German, Romance, Slavic, etc.) | 19.2% |
> | Anthropology | 8.4% |
>
> Another 8.4% hold joint appointments, most between linguistics and foreign language or English departments.
> Departments which employ the remaining 15.4% include uncommonly taught foreign languages (e.g., Far Eastern African), E.S.O.L., psychology, speech, area and ethnic studies, communications, education, computer science, and various special institutes, projects and programmes.

I have no figures for Australia, but have had close contact with Australian linguistic organisations in recent years, and have the strong impression that the diversity of employment is at least as great here as in America. Before the last election of office-bearers in the Linguistic Society of Australia, the six members of the executive were drawn from departments of English, French, Japanese and Linguistics. The members of the present executive are from departments of Anthropology, Education, English and Linguistics, and from the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Various other fields are represented amongst the general membership.

But there is an additional reason why linguists in Australia find themselves working in departments with names other than linguistics: the fact that there are very few linguistics departments to work in. In 1972, there were 59 universities in the United States offering a Linguistics Ph.D.[2] In Australia, as far as I am aware,[3]

there were three. The American figures do not include departments offering a Ph.D. in subjects such as English or Anthropology with a concentration in linguistics. Nor, by definition, do they include institutions which offer linguistics only in lower degrees. In Australia, as far as I know, there are no additional institutions offering honours at the B.A. level in the subject Linguistics beyond the ones that offer Ph.D.'s. In America there are many, though I am not in possession of the exact figures.

It might be argued that the figure of 59 universities offering Ph.D.'s in Linguistics in the United States, where the population is over two hundred million, is not really much better, proportionally, than three in Australia, where the population is about thirteen million. While arithmetically correct, this argument would ignore the extra institutions in the United States offering Linguistics to honours level in lower degrees, and would also ignore the fact that a number as low as three or four universities is below the threshold of complexity needed for vigorous activity in a subject in any country, no matter what the population is.

At present, Australia has two universities with departments labelled simply "Linguistics" (A.N.U. and Monash), one "School of English and Linguistics" (Macquarie) and one "Sub-Department of Linguistics" (Newcastle). The latter is an autonomous unit, "sub" only in the sense that it is smaller than a full department and lacks a chair. Apart from A.N.U., which is blessed with two, the rest of Australia has just two and a half linguistics departments. Sydney is about to establish one, and there are various other rumours which I will not fan here.

Overseas, particularly in America, there has been a tremendous expansion in linguistics in the past decade, though it is true that it has slackened off with the recent cutbacks on spending. The growth seems to have been a direct result of the academic impact of the subject, and the realisation of its potential importance for cognitive studies. In Australia, no dramatic expansion has yet taken place, though there are subtle indications that it may be beginning. Bernard Shaw introduced a female character in one of his plays with the remark that she had never withered because she had never bloomed, and until recently it seemed fair to wonder whether this was to be the fate of linguistics in Australia.

The recent change of name from "School of English Studies" to "School of English and Linguistics" at Macquarie, the establishment of the sub-department at Newcastle at the end of 1972, and the imminent establishment of a department at Sydney are hopeful signs, and there are some indications of increasing government

interest in the field. The A.U.C. has set up a six-man committee to report on the whole range of language studies and linguistics in Australian universities. While linguistics is perhaps only a subsidiary part of the committee's terms of reference, it could emerge as a most important part of any integrated plan for language studies. It would seem strange to the point of eccentricity, in fact, if the subject that deals with the theory of language did not have an important place in any integrated plan for language studies at university level.

Meanwhile, the actual situation in the universities is not as bad as the mere counting of linguistics departments might suggest. Full courses in the subject are being offered at present in English departments at Queensland and New England, in The Language Centre at Melbourne, in the departments of Modern Languages, Philosophy and sociology at La Trobe, and in the School of Anthropology at Western Australia.[4] And these courses formally labelled Linguistics by no means exhaust what is being taught, since a good deal occurs at various universities in strands of courses with other names. At the University of Tasmania, for instance, there are linguistics strands in English courses, and at Monash some attention is given to linguistics not only in the Linguistics Department, but also in the Departments of French, German, Indonesian, Japanese, Russian and Spanish. I will not attempt to be exhaustive in such listings, since there are pockets of activity from coast to coast, often involving people who have to work in isolation from other linguists and battle against all sorts of local difficulties. I believe these "guerrilla" activities in linguistics are likely to be very important to the future of the subject in Australia.

Some subjects have an immediate popular appeal, so that someone only has to mention that the university should have a department in one of them and everyone seems to agree instantly; popular opinion is translated into an official request to the A.U.C., and hey presto! a department is established. That is not the status of linguistics in Australia at the moment. Many university administrations and/or the A.U.C. have sat fairly heavily on proposed developments in linguistics in recent triennia, perhaps more through indifference than outright hostility. The committee already referred to may possibly change this, but at present the situation is that anyone who hopes to establish a department of linguistics must first get the subject going as a flourishing concern, and then try to expand it and convince the planners that they should begin planning for something they didn't plan for.

There is often a special difficulty for anyone who would try to do this from within a language department. The history of growth

of languages in Australian universities has been such that the subject-names, "English", "French", "German", etc., normally mean "English Literature", "French Literature", "German Literature", etc. There is language study, in the sense that students are required to learn the language that they are going to speak and whose literature they are going to study, but the aims of the courses are not normally linguistic, and the courses are rarely the function of an underlying linguistic theory. It is not my present purpose to argue that this is wrong, but rather to draw attention to the apparent facts and to comment that the students understand what is meant by the subject-names, and expect things to be as they are. This orientation of the language subjects contains potential difficulties for the linguist. If he is serious about what he is doing, he will inevitably find himself wanting to introduce kinds of language study that are not traditional in language departments in Australia. To make matters worse, he is very frequently someone who did not start off as a linguist, and who is officially supposed to be something else. He is likely, therefore, to be doing something unaccustomed, not only as far as the department is concerned, but also as far as his own life and career are concerned. In the absence of any other linguists in the immediate vicinity, this can be a lonely experience.

If optional linguistics components of courses are introduced in such a department, the number of takers will initially be small. This can mean a lower work-load for the linguist than for his colleagues, in terms of marking, interviewing, etc. (though not usually in number of lecture-hours). They may (not unreasonably) feel some resentment about this, particularly if their own loads are heavy, and a demand may develop to make the linguistics strands compulsory, so as to distribute the load better. If the demand succeeds, further problems are immediately created, as students become the unwilling recipients of something they didn't join for.

Setting aside future acts of God, which might strike up departments fully-formed out of nowhere, it seems likely that many linguistics departments will struggle into the light because of what I have already called guerrilla activities. It is highly likely that departments that have this kind of birth will differ from each other according to their origins. In any subject-area, a certain diversity is normal: there will be some departments that are strongly oriented towards theory, and others that are more interested in applications; some that follow one school of thought, and some that follow others. But there is probably an extra dimension of diversity in linguistics because of its cross-disciplinary relationships, and particularly because of the different directions from which departments can come. And surely no one will regret that.

NOTES

[1] *L.S.A. Bulletin* (Linguistic Society of America), No. 58, October 1973, p. 14.

[2] *L.S.A. Bulletin*, No. 56, March 1973, p. 34.

[3] It is difficult to be certain of the facts because handbooks are not always explicit about arrangements for Ph.D.'s, and also because handbooks for a previous year are difficult to come across. Nevertheless, I believe the statement in the text is accurate.

[4] These details are taken from the handbooks and calendars of the relevant universities. At the time of writing, only those for 1973 were available to me, and it could be that there will be changes in 1974 of which I am unaware.

SOME THOUGHTS ON DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE

MICHAEL CLYNE*

MOST Australian universities possess—and perpetuate—a structure with watertight departments. While co-operation exists between departments and between individuals in departments, the organisational framework for staff appointments, courses, graduate supervision and research tends to presuppose insularised departments. The unit system at a number of universities (e.g., Macquarie, Monash) has made undergraduate courses more flexible, but units too are generally departmentally-based. The maintenance of the present departmental system has almost become an end in itself.

Traditionally there are some departments which teach a discipline—a set of principles or methods on a theoretical framework (and its application), e.g., Linguistics, Literature, Sociology; and others which are multidisciplinary, e.g., German, Asian Studies, Education, Medieval Studies, in which several disciplines (such as Linguistics, Literature, Sociology, Visual Arts, Philosophy, Politics, applied to a particular context (area, period or objective) are taught. It is usually assumed—in university regulations, for instance—that each department represents one "discipline". Course sequences are based on this assumption and any sequences that happen to be discipline-oriented and cut across departmental boundaries are treated as exceptions. One university recently found it necessary to pass a special regulation deeming History and Ancient History (taught in different departments) one discipline—but for the purpose of one paragraph only! There are some disciplines which are taught in as many as eight departments in one university, and some topics recur in the courses of several departments, but there is little recognition of this fact.

* Associate Professor of German, Monash University.