

THE CULTURAL CONTENT OF A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

by

Beatrice Jones

Colonial and post-colonial systems of education in Africa have often been criticized for creating a sense of inferiority concerning both their language and their culture in the minds of young Africans who undergo formal schooling (1). Although programs of education have substantially changed in many African countries that have become independent, one factor has remained constant throughout colonial and post-colonial days - the use of a non-African language as the medium of instruction in, at least, the secondary stage of schooling. This factor implies another - the introduction of the language of instruction as a school subject at an early stage and the continued teaching of it to a high level of proficiency. It is therefore useful to consider the role that a second language can play in the cultural development of independent African nations. The topic is too vast to be handled either comprehensively or in great detail in a paper of this length. I cannot hope to do more than suggest certain points that should be taken into consideration when making a decision concerning the amount and kind of cultural content that should enter into a second language program (2). I propose to begin by briefly examining the nature of the link between language and culture and then to consider the connection between the cultural content and the aims of a second language program. I shall conclude by pointing out one of the psychological aspects of a bi-lingual and bi-cultural educational program.

Language and Culture

For the purposes of this paper the term second language will refer to a language that has been developed in a cultural background considerably different from that of the student's first language or mother tongue. The question immediately arises as to whether a choice of cultural content is possible when teaching such a language. Is not the link between language and culture so close that the very fact of teaching a language implies teaching some elements of the culture of the native speakers of that language? If so, what are those elements? Are they such as to alter the personality of the pupil in certain ways? For instance, does the teaching of French or English to an African student

tend to make him think or act like a Frenchman or an Englishman or, if this has occurred in the past, was it due to unnecessary cultural adjuncts that were, consciously or unconsciously, attached to the language programs? This is a question of great moment when English and French are being looked upon more and more as languages of international communication between Africans who, nonetheless, are more anxious than ever to retain and develop their own culture.

In his article on "Linguistic and Cultural Change," Harry Hoijer quotes Edward Tylor's well-known definition of culture as "that *complex whole* which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, moral, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." One may ask what this leaves out. It is not surprising that Hoijer adds, "It is clear that language is a part of culture: it is one of the many 'capabilities acquired by man as a member of society.'" (3) It may be worth pointing out, however, that the 'complex whole' is not a Platonic ideal but a useful *abstraction* which not so much 'includes' as 'reflects' the sum total of knowledge, beliefs, etc. of a society. Whereas the word 'culture' neatly summarizes the different attainments of society, the use of that word must not be allowed by a mental trick to forge links that are not inherently there between those separate attainments. For instance, the link between a people's art and legal system may lie so remotely in the past as to be no longer operative or even discernible (4). The teaching of the present-day legal system to another society would not, therefore facilitate an understanding of the art attached to that culture nor would the teaching of the philosophy in which both systems originated be guaranteed to give rise to similar legal and art systems in the new society. The synchronic link between the various aspects of a highly complex culture are often tenuous. Language, however, is not merely an aspect or a part of a culture. It is the medium through which the knowledge, beliefs and emotions of society are expressed. Language must therefore be a fairly adequate tool to express every aspect of culture. Moreover, a particular language must adequately express the particular culture of a given society. If not, the society would either reject or change the language. It would sharpen its tool.

Given this link between a language and a culture, must we go further and claim that a language can only express the culture of its native speakers and that it cannot adequately express the culture of another society? On the one hand we can point to the fact that language is never static,

that it continually changes to adapt itself to the cultural change of the society. If it can do this historically within society can it not do so across societies and cultures? On the other hand, this same phenomenon of linguistic change can be viewed as a constant, gradual tool-refining process that makes a language even more uniquely the possession of its native speakers. Which is the correct interpretation?

Adaptability of Language

To answer that question it is necessary to consider which aspects of language change through time. It is evident that the lexicon is most affected. Words are added as need arises both by creation and by borrowing. The former process is an easily observable occurrence as new commercial products are put on the market with coined names, *e.g.*, Fab, Ajax, etc. These new creations always obey the phonological and morphological rules of the language for which they have been created and borrowings are typically transformed to fit the pattern of the language into which they are borrowed. This occurs to such an extent that the source of borrowing is no longer recognized (5). The meanings of words also change. An Englishman's reference to carriages would not nowadays conjure up a picture of horse-drawn vehicles unless it were made in an historical context. It would probably be taken to denote railway carriages. Likewise, the common form of farewell used in England today would no longer be looked upon as a blessing. 'Goodbye' is not even recognized as a lexified form of 'God be with ye.' The import of the words is lost as is that of the American greeting 'Hi' derived from 'How are you?' Only the situational context remains. There is, of course, no reason why changes of this kind cannot occur synchronically within a language used across cultures. In such cases borrowings would come into this cross-cultural language from the first languages of the other cultures. This has already occurred to a certain extent through English communities living abroad. The Indian word 'pakka' and the Swahili word 'safari' are already universally accepted as part of standard English to express concepts which could not adequately be expressed by the English words 'correct' and 'journey.' Other words are more localized (for example, *mabati*, *matoki*), as are coined expressions such as 'up-country' (away from the city) and 'hit the tar' (arrive at that part where the dirt road becomes paved).

Change and extension of meaning can also apply geographically to incorporate new situations. An example of this is

the use of the word 'tour' by colonial officers who referred to a two-year working period between home leaves as a 'tour.' It is clear from these examples that the same mechanisms that have been applied historically within a society can apply synchronically to counteract the very strong link that lies between the vocabulary of a language and the culture of its native speakers when this language is used to express another culture. The difference lies in the fact that the diachronic (historical) process is gradual whereas the synchronic must be fast and needs to be, in most instances, artificially imposed. This entails a large amount of borrowing and coining of words and a considerable amount of extension of meaning to such an extent that a language that is adapted to another culture will quickly develop into a new dialect. Such new dialects have arisen in Australia, the United States, India and many other parts of the world.

The Impact of Culture on Language

So far, I have examined only the vocabulary. Yet the vocabulary has in recent years been looked upon by language teachers as the most superficial aspect of language while emphasis has been placed on the sentence patterns of syntax. This view goes back to linguists as early as Sapir who wrote, "The linguistic student should never make the mistake of identifying the language with its dictionary." (6) However, there does not seem to be a clear division between syntax and lexicon. Nominalizations and compound words and adjectives are the result of grammatical processes, the last two arising from relative clauses and the first from whole sentences. Certain linguists also believe that 'simple' names of objects represent semantic structures that are as complex as compound sentences. Whether this is correct or not, there is no doubt that complementation, relativization, nominalization, compounding, adjective and adverb formation together with lexification are so many forms of shorthand. All languages share these grammatical and lexical processes and it is the selective use of these processes in any given language that is connected with the culture of its speakers. For example, English has compounds such as bookcase, suitcase, blackboard, and cupboard that would need paraphrasing in languages attached to cultures in which these articles are not readily available. On the other hand, the numerous words for bananas in Bantu languages need to be expressed in English by such paraphrases as 'the finger-sized yellow banana eaten raw; the large red banana eaten raw; the large green banana cooked whole; the large green banana cooked for mashing, used for drawing beer' etc. By analogy with the terms 'eating apple' or 'cooking apple'

one could reduce the relative clauses to compounds and abbreviate the unwieldy phrases, *e.g.*, 'large green mashing bananas,' 'beer bananas,' etc. Nonetheless, with size and color mentioned for differentiation, the English paraphrase would amount to four words. The alternative would be either to create new terms or to borrow one set of local names. A similar problem occurs with kinship terms. In Bantu culture it seems necessary to distinguish between uncles and aunts on the mother's side and those on the father's. The English phrases 'my paternal uncle' and 'my maternal uncle' are unwieldy for frequent use. Is one to coin the words 'muncle' and 'funcler'; 'maunt' and 'faunt'? The possibilities are there. They have simply not been exploited because British culture is peculiarly uninterested in such details of kinship.

On the other hand, in some Bantu languages, the same term is used for one's sister as for one's father's daughters by other wives. Is the English word 'sister' to be used in this wider sense in cultures where differentiation between 'sister' and 'half-sister' would seem unnatural and unkind? In some of these languages the same term is also used to include one's female cousins, at least on the father's side and all women whose kinship entails strict prohibition of marriage and a strong claim to protection. This sense of kinship is, in English, best expressed by the term 'sister.' It is not surprising that the term is currently used in East Africa in this wider sense (7).

To summarize, the mechanisms for abbreviating speech exist in all languages, but they are differentially applied according to the needs of the culture that the language has been developed to express. The structure of a language is not, as such, intrinsically connected with any given culture, but the application of language mechanisms that lexicalize morpheme sequences and that categorize lexical items is not only language specific but also culture specific. In other words, the fact that a language uses word order and prepositions instead of case inflections to express subject and object, dative and benefactive, etc., as in English and Latin, does not seem to be connected with the culture attached to the language. Neither does the fact that one language uses verbal affixes to express a causative and another does not (8). But the lexicalization of the phrase 'cause to become not alive' (that is, to kill), together with the absence of a single lexical item for the phrase 'cause to become not obnoxious' is no doubt of cultural significance. Perhaps this lexicalization is due to the fact that more specific means have been found of causing others to be 'not alive' than

of causing them to be 'not obnoxious.' Bantu has a noun class prefix system which, by now, is of small cultural significance, but which earlier was highly significant when the system clearly categorized nouns into classes of humans, animals, plants, fruits, inanimates, masses, liquids, small objects, elongated objects, etc. An interesting view into cultural development is given by the fact that the class for humans evolved as linguistically distinct from the class for animals at a comparatively late stage of Proto-Bantu. This may have reflected an emergent homo-centric outlook on the part of the speakers of proto-Bantu. However, one must beware of making facile cultural deductions from semantic data. For instance, it would be fallacious to conclude that Bantu cultures take little account of the distinction between men and women simply because gender distinctions do not occur in either the pronominal or verbal systems of Bantu languages. In fact, no culture could make clearer distinctions concerning work, position and the sphere of action allotted to men and women. It cannot be claimed, therefore, that, even in the realm of semantics, there is a direct relationship between a language and the culture of its native speakers.

One reason is that language is used to express various modes of truth - the scientific, the observational, the poetic. Another is that linguistic change lags behind cultural change. Yet again, re-semanticization makes a change in verbal expression unnecessary. For instance, English speakers still say "the sun rises in the East." There is no doubt that long ago this utterance was considered to be scientifically accurate. Now it is well known that this is observationally accurate, but scientifically inaccurate since the sun's appearing to rise is the result of the earth's rotation. It would be naive for a man from Mars to deduce that the present day speaker was no further advanced than his predecessors in his 'beliefs' concerning the planets. Similarly the use of the phrase 'he learned it by heart' should not mislead an observer to assume that Englishmen believe that man's learning processes lie in the heart. Linguists say that the English language has no future tense since the future can only be referred to by use of an auxiliary which, on its own, has a separate meaning. However, an observer hearing the phrase 'the bucket will fall' must not deduce that English speakers are animists who adduce voluntary acts to inanimate objects. Nor should he think that they have no sense of future time since the language has no future tense. It is evident that the word 'will', used as an auxiliary, has been resemanticized to include the feature (+ Future) and exclude the feature (- voluntary). In this context it no longer means to 'want'. Numerous instances of this type give rise to serious misgivings concerning the Sapir-

Whorf hypothesis so neatly summarized in the much-quoted words, "Human beings...are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society....We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation" (8).

It may be that the reverse is true. Culture has a way of imposing interpretation on language. This is apparent when we see the use of the same language in different sub-cultures. The word 'square' has quite a different meaning on the lips of a teen-ager at the drug store than on those of his teacher in geometry. Similarly, the tourist who has 'had a bad trip' does not refer to the same thing as the drug addict who uses that phrase. The same can be said of such over-worked terms as democracy, freedom, love, etc. The only way of discovering the meaning of such terms is to discover something about the speaker. 'Democracy' in a socialist state does not mean the same as 'democracy' in a capitalist state, etc. The words take on a different content according to the cultural context and the content can be changed at will to such an extent that only an insignificant or peripheral aspect of the original remains. For example, any English speaker could make a fair guess at the meaning of 'main line' in most contexts, but who, innocent of the dope world, would guess that a 'mainliner' is a drug addict who injects heroin directly into the bloodstream? Who but a Cockney would understand the phrase 'apples and pears' to refer to stairs, and 'trouble and strife' to a wife, and how many Americans would interpret a 'waltzing Matilda' to be, not a 'dancing doll' but a blanket roll to an Australian of the outback? If the same words and phrases can have such different interpretations in different sub-cultures, there should be no fear that their use will impose a particular cultural pattern on learners of the language. Rather should it be feared that the cultural pattern of the learner will impose its interpretation on the new language. That is, in fact, a most persuasive and subtle source of interference that has rarely been discussed in literature dealing with contrastive analysis and which would be impossible to handle systematically at this stage given the little that is known concerning the semantic component of any language.

Interference of this kind is most easily, if also most trivially, illustrated with reference to concrete objects. An African learning such English nouns as 'house' or 'well' or 'garden' will base his concepts on the houses, wells and gardens that he has seen which may bear no resemblance to those referred to by the Englishman using these words. Professor

Martinet once said that, despite his efforts he could not bring himself to call an American town hall a 'mairie' even if he were speaking French when referring to it. The two were different entities even though they served a somewhat similar function in the two societies (9). This reticence is understandable on the part of a speaker who is conversant with both cultures. If, however, French were but one of fifty different languages in France, and French schoolboys had to learn English to communicate inter-regionally, they would use the word 'town hall' to refer to their 'mairie' and would probably be blissfully unaware of the fact that an American town hall was quite a different thing, performing a partially different set of social functions and bearing a different social atmosphere. At a greater level of abstraction the term 'democratic' can be used by many African children to describe adequately a system of rule based on the meeting of village elders long before the children have looked into the complexities and intricacies of a modern democratic state, and without in any way imposing a British as opposed to an American or Russian view of democracy. If such views are imposed that are not inherent in the culture of the learner, they will not be so much imposed by the new language as by the text-book author or the teacher of this language who may, himself, either belong to another culture or be strongly influenced by that other culture. In other words, it is quite possible for an Indian culture or a Chinese culture to be taught to Africans through the medium of English. This is not to deny, of course, that the best medium for the learning of Chinese culture would be Chinese, just as the best medium for learning an African culture would be the African language used by the speakers of that culture.

Deictics of Language

One element of language that must be considered in this discussion is the deictic categories. These are much more intricately bound up with syntax than most other areas of semantics. Fillmore writes:

Deixis is the name given to those aspects of language whose interpretation is relative to the occasion of utterance, the time of utterance, and to times before and after the time of utterance; to the location of the speaker at the time of utterance; and to the identity of the speaker and the intended audience. An extended theory of deixis would take in several other aspects of the speaker's spatial, temporal social orientation. (10)

This aspect of language figured greatly in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of the 'world view' of the speaker of a particular language. There is no doubt that deictic categories differ from language to language, yet it is difficult to see exactly where such categories tie in with culture, except for some rather superficial reflections of social attitudes as is shown, for instance, in the use of special terms of respect for particular persons. I use the term superficial with reference to these, not because the respect thereby expressed is a superficial aspect of culture, but because its particular mode of expression through a grammatical category is quite arbitrary. For example, the Spanish child can express respect for an elder by the use of the second person plural; a Ugandan child may do so by kneeling in the presence of the elder; and an American child by addressing him as 'sir'. Differences in spatio-temporal categories cannot be annulled so easily. A language with two categories of place deixis (*i.e.*, near speaker - away from speaker) would have to reorganize its spatial outlook to express a third medial category as do Spanish and Japanese, or as did Middle English with its term 'yonder'. It is not clear whether these categories affect or reflect the 'world view' of the speaker, nor to what extent they and the 'world view' interact. Nor is it clear what part this spatio-temporal 'world view' plays in the non-linguistic aspects of the speaker's culture. Opinions have been expressed that claim such a 'world view' to have repercussions in every sphere of culture, but no more is actually known than is expressed in the moderate statement of Whorf:

Whether such a civilization as ours (western and technical) would be possible with a widely different linguistic handling of time is a large question - in our civilization, our linguistic patterns and the fitting of our behavior to the temporal order are what they are, and they are in accord.

An interesting additional note to the above quote tones down the extreme claim seen in the first quote from Sapir, *i.e.*, that man's thinking is *limited* by his language, for Whorf goes on to say,

*Science is beginning to find that there is something in the cosmos that is not in accord with the concepts (of time) we have formed....It is trying to frame a New Language by which to adjust itself to a wider universe (*i.e.*, the universe of relativity)." (11)*

This 'new language' is therefore the expression of new concepts formed in opposition to "the language habits of our community."

It would seem that the mind of man transcends the limitations of his language.

From the point of view of language teaching, there is no doubt that the spatio-temporal categories of a language cannot be excluded from the program in the way that irrelevant "meanings" of lexical items can be, and insofar as these introduce a new 'world view' to the learner, the learner is perforce being introduced to the 'culture' of the second language (as much as this spatio-temporal 'world view' and the 'culture' are inter-related). In theory, this is unavoidable. In practice, however, it would be interesting to discover how far and in what ways English spatio-temporal categories prevent a Bantu culture, for instance, from being expressed. In any case, such categories do not, *ipso facto*, impose political, social, economic and aesthetic cultural concepts of the English-speaking world, though they might predispose the learner to a better grasp of these if and when presented to him at a later stage.

The Second Language Program

If the broader cultural concepts do not form an intrinsic and inseparable part of language, what then should be the cultural content of a second language program? This, of course, depends on the reasons for which the language is taught. The term 'second' language is generally used to denote a language which learners will sooner or later need to use as a tool in their everyday life. This term is used in opposition to 'foreign' language, which is usually acquired as a cultural asset. Obviously the program of a 'foreign' language will be heavily weighted with the culture of the native speakers of the language. Such a language is learned with a view to reading its literature or, in the case of 'exotic' languages, to entering into contact with a culture that is totally different from one's own. A *second* language, however, is one that will be needed as a medium of communication and possibly instruction in one's native land. The amount of 'foreign' culture and of 'local' culture that should enter into the teaching program of a second language must therefore be carefully considered according to the aims of each section of the program.

For instance, primary school children in Uganda learn English in order

- a) To receive instruction in English in the higher classes of the school;
- b) To enable them to communicate with members of other tribes who speak different languages;

c) To play their part in the civic affairs of their country where administrative business is conducted in English. For none of these functions will the pupils of primary schools need to learn about British or American culture, but they will need to be able to converse in English about both inter-tribal and national affairs. The primary school English program should, consequently, concern itself entirely with 'local' culture, the meaning of which term I will unravel later. At the other end of the scale, a student of literature at the university level cannot 'get by' on modern African literature in English. He will perforce study the great classics, but his teacher must bear in mind the fact that the student will need to have the background to this literature filled in, in terms of cultural content, in the same way in which a British student needs to be given background to American literature before he can grasp its significance.

What about the secondary school student who stands between these two extremes? Is it necessary for him to study something of British culture? If not, can such study be avoided? The answer to the first question once again depends on the aim of the language program which, in turn, depends on both government policy and the economic level of the country. Will the product of the secondary school normally be placed in an influential position in which he will be expected to have personal contact with the outside world? Is the policy of the country such that it has much greater contact with English-speaking countries than with others? If so, the secondary school student may well be introduced to the cultures of these countries. If, however, there are now sufficient university graduates to fill such influential posts, there is no need for the secondary school programs to be particularly biased toward British culture just because the medium of instruction in the school is English.

Nonetheless, another factor enters here which may render necessary a large amount of incidental study of British culture. This factor lies not in the language but in the textbooks used as a medium of instruction. Texts written for a certain reader take for granted a body of experience that is common to both author and reader. Text and reference books written for British readers take many aspects of British culture for granted. This is more readily apparent in literary works, but is nonetheless evident in all but the most scientific prose. Metaphor is one way, analogy another, and mere absence of detail a third way in which a writer will rely upon a common cultural background. The comparison of an historical event to a more recent event known only to British readers; an example of a geographical

physical feature drawn from the geography of England rather than that of Africa; assumptions made concerning the behavioral reactions and customs of the British - all these cultural implications that fill the texts and reference books in African secondary schools wither leave the student in a perpetually uncomprehending state or force him to absorb large doses of British culture. Texts and reference books in all school subjects could theoretically be written that teach the same content, but without reference to British culture. But, although this is feasible for the primary school at the present stage when primary school libraries contain only a small number of books, the task for the secondary school would be wholly impracticable. It seems, therefore, that the secondary school student will, incidentally, have to learn much about British culture.

Should the English language teaching program attempt to help the student to read his subject texts by giving systematic information about British culture or should it, on the contrary, balance the incidental acquisition of British culture by placing greater emphasis on national and local culture? It would seem that texts for the English program are always the first to be written specifically for local consumption. It would, therefore, be possible for these to reflect local culture - even in the secondary school. I will not attempt to answer the question beyond pointing out that much research is needed to discover how students could be helped to better understand the culturally weighted reference and library books that they need to read in such large quantities.

English Medium Primary School

To return to the primary school, I would like to consider a plea that has recently been made for English medium instruction from the start in Uganda (12). This already exists in many schools in Kenya. From the point of view of culture, two questions must be asked. Do we wish to exclude the 'home' culture from the school? If not, is English adequate as a 'sole' medium of the home culture? I suggest that unless we wish to see the rapid disintegration of African cultures within a few generations it would be unwise to exclude the 'home' culture from the school. Schooling is the only means to the 'modern' more comfortable way of life that appeals to everyone. The school therefore stands in high repute. If the home culture is excluded from the school it will be relegated to an inferior status in the minds of the pupils avid for all the convenience and wealth enjoyed by the 'educated'. The only way to show that the home culture is honored is to give it a respectable standing in school.

Can this be done in English? At this stage I must define my terms. I have referred to national culture and to home culture. This dual appellation is intended to reflect the fact that there is no such thing as a single Ugandan culture or a single Kenyan culture. What, in fact, exists are on the one hand, a variety of well established 'tribal' cultures that have already been profoundly affected by the impact of Christianity and Islam, and are being affected ever more rapidly by that of material progress and, to a smaller extent, by formal schooling. These are the cultures that I refer to as the 'home' culture of the pupil. On the other hand, there is an urban way of life that has developed from the impact of different tribal cultures upon one another when mixed in the towns, and from their adaptation to modern technology in an urban environment. This adaptation includes a certain amount of 'borrowing' from what could be termed the 'universal urban culture' that spreads its fads and fashions throughout the cities of the world. The national culture is, in fact, a culture of the future - a culture that will arise from all the elements mentioned above - a culture that is now in the process of formation and that can be, to a certain extent, guided by government policy and instruction in the schools. I have also used the term 'local' culture when referring to both the home and the national cultures in contrast to the foreign culture of the second language. I shall now use another term - 'rural' culture - to refer to that which the 'home' cultures share in common.

Now we may return to the question stated earlier. Can the home cultures of African children be adequately taught in English? The answer is no. Each home culture has its own foods, its own dances, its own customs and ceremonies. To transliterate or create English words for all of these would be quite a task. However, it could be done, or alternately, the original names could be retained in the same way in which the Mexican food names taco, tortilla, etc. have been absorbed into North American English. What could not be translated are the numerous idioms, proverbs and wise sayings that depend upon a play on words. The same is true of heroic poems or even prose stories that depend greatly upon alliteration, reduplication and the use of ideophones for effect. The totally untranslatable aspect of the culture, however, would be the deictic categories that were mentioned earlier. These categories are shared by languages of the same group but, in a country like Uganda, where languages of different groups are spoken, the aspects of home cultures that are shared by all cannot include those categories. English may be able to express the rural culture in which the dances, foods, etc. of individual groups can be referred to in general terms, but specific training in any of the tribal cul-

tures can only adequately be done by the language of the tribe itself or at most of a tribe whose language is closely related and whose culture is not greatly at variance. The home language should not, ideally, be excluded from the school.

Bilingual Education

Given bilingual education in primary schools, a question arises concerning which aspects of the national culture should be included in the English program and which in the vernacular. Should English only deal with the urban culture, for which it is best suited by reason of its technological terminology, leaving the home language to express both the home and the more general rural cultures? If this solution causes the least linguistic effort on the part of language program compilers it is, at the same time, fraught with danger - the danger being similar to that inherent in total neglect of the home culture. If home and rural cultures are associated only with the home language while the inviting, new urban life is associated only with English, both home and rural cultures and language will be relegated to an inferior status connected with early childhood. This is all the more striking in a system where English takes over completely at a fairly early stage of the child's education. It is less evident in a system where the rural culture could continue to be presented right through secondary school in an African language not too far removed from the home language, as is the case with Swahili in Tanzania. In the former case, therefore, English should be used to express the rural culture as well as the urban, while the vernacular would rise in stature if it were used to express aspects of urban as well as of rural life. This shows the need for compilers of both language programs to work together in order to produce a combined course in which the two programs complement without duplicating one another.

Conclusion

I have attempted to show that language and culture are inherently connected only in that area which reflects spatio-temporal and perhaps causal relationships; that a language can therefore be adapted to express another culture and that it need not impose upon the learner the wider cultural aspects of its native speakers; that a language, however, is best suited to express such a culture in that its metaphors, idioms, proverbs, and other literary devices specifically refer to the native culture, but that nonetheless the greater part of culture that is incidentally taught with a language is due more to the link between the teacher (or textbook writer) and his culture than to the link between the language and its culture.

It is therefore theoretically possible to teach English without exposing the learners of the language to the culture of its native speakers and this possibility can be realized where few books and only local teachers are used for instruction. However, as soon as a more liberal education is granted to the pupils, with the use of a large library and of expatriate teachers or 'local' teachers who have had contacts with the other cultures, exclusion of the culture connected with the language of instruction becomes impracticable. This fact must be squarely faced when planning a second language teaching program in the secondary school. A decision must be taken as to whether this program should aim at facilitating an understanding of the 'second' culture or should, on the contrary, counterbalance the impact of this culture. It may be possible for it to do both. With reference to the literature course, P.J. Roe of Tanzania has written, "the student must also be trained to respond to what he reads and to consider the problems *in the light of his own environment and society.*" (13) This is true of everything the student reads - including those elements of 'human' culture that have universal application as well as those that are specific to the 'second' culture. A second language program is probably the best place in which this consideration of other cultures in the light of the learner's own culture can take place. For this to be possible, however, it is necessary that the student be helped to develop a more mature understanding of his own culture through courses of oral and written literature in some of the major local languages.

Footnotes

1. An eloquent reiteration of this accusation is to be found in Talmy Givon's article in *Ufahamu*, Vol. I, No. 3 (Winter, 1971).
2. This may be the place to point out that, as far as I know, no such overall decision has ever been made outside the Eastern bloc. Compilers of textbooks have made their own decision concerning the content, both cultural and linguistic, of their course and texts for use were, in the past, selected more for their linguistic content and methodological approach than for their cultural or ideological content.
3. Harry Hoijer, "Linguistic and Cultural Change," in Dell Hymes, ed., *Language and Culture*, (1964), p. 455.
4. In earlier societies the complex 'whole' forms a more

compact 'whole' in which the parts are more closely inter-related. In many societies, for instance, art and law are connected to one another via beliefs. As Sapir observes, "The sharp distinction between religious and other modes of conduct to which we are accustomed in modern life is by no means possible on more primitive levels. Religion is neither ethics nor science nor art, but it tends to be inextricably bound up with all three." (Sapir, *Culture, Language and Personality*, p. 136). An instance of this in more developed societies can be found in the creation of geometric designs in Hebrew and Moslem art as a result of the injunction against idols.

5. There are several 'levels' of borrowing reflecting different stages of assimilation. W.H. Whiteley, "Loanwords in Linguistic Description: A Case Study from Tanzania," in I. Rauch and C.T. Scotten, eds., *Approaches in Linguistic Methodology*, (1967), gives an excellent systematic presentation of these with reference to Swahili.
6. Edward Sapir, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, (1949), p. 219.
7. This is not altogether different from English. Goodenough writes, "In response to the question 'Is he your brother?' ego cannot say 'No, he is my half-brother' (i.e. not my *brother* but some other kind of relative) but can only say 'Yes' or 'Yes, he is my half-brother.' By way of contrast it is possible to answer the question 'Is he your brother?' by saying 'No, he is my stepbrother.'" (W.H. Goodenough, "Yankee kinship Terminology: A Problem in Componential Analysis," in *American Anthropologist*, Part 2, Vol. 67, No. 5 (October, 1965).
8. E. Sapir, *Culture, Language and Personality*, Daniel G. Mandelbaum, ed., (1961), p. 69.
9. In a lecture at UCLA.
10. Charles Fillmore, "Deictic Categories in the Semantics of 'Come,'" in *Foundations of Language*, 2(1966), pp. 219-227.
11. B.L. Whorf, *Language, Thought and Reality*, John B. Carroll, ed., (1956), p. 154.
12. Sam Mugalasi in "P Ladefoged, et. al., Language Teaching in Uganda: Its Implications for Language Teaching in Uganda," Unpubl. paper for English 270K, UCLA, Winter, 1971.
13. P.J. Roe, "The Teaching of Literature in Tanzanian Schools," in J.P. Gorman, ed. *Language in Education in East Africa*, (1970). Italics mine.

* * * * *

Beatrice Jones was born in France and educated in France and England. From 1955-1965, she worked under the Ministry of Education in Uganda, training teachers to teach English and compiling language programs. She received a B.A. from York University, and a M.A. and TESL certificate from UCLA. She is currently a doctoral candidate in Linguistics at UCLA.

* * * * *