

# **Sign Language Structure: An Outline of the Visual Communication Systems of the American Deaf**

**William C. Stokoe, Jr.**  
Gallaudet University

It is approaching a half century since Bill Stokoe published his revolutionary monograph, *Sign Language Structure: An Outline of the Visual Communication Systems of the American Deaf*. It is rare for a work of innovative scholarship to spark a social as well as an intellectual revolution, but that is just what Stokoe's 1960 paper did. And it is indicative both of Stokoe's genius and of his commitment that he did not simply publish his groundbreaking work and then sit back to watch the revolutions unfold. He actively promoted important changes in at least three areas of social and intellectual life. First, and perhaps most important, his work, that was ultimately generally accepted as showing the signing of deaf people to be linguistic, supported significant changes in the way deaf children are educated around the globe. Second, his work led to a general rethinking of what is fundamental about human language; and, third, it helped to reenergize the moribund field of language origin studies. This truly revolutionary paper has been reprinted at least twice, in revised and original versions, since its initial release in 1960, and now, five years after Bill's death, it is good to see it once again brought before the general public. – *David F. Armstrong, Gallaudet University*

## **Introduction**

0. The primary purpose of this paper is to bring within the purview of linguistics a virtually unknown language, the sign language of the American deaf. Rigorous linguistic methodology applied to this language system of visual symbols has led to conclusions about its structure, which add to the sum

Correspondence to: Marc Marschark, Department of Research, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, 96 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, NY 14623 E-mail: Marc.Marschark@RIT.EDU

of linguistic knowledge. Moreover, the analysis of the isolates of this language has led the writer to devise a method of transcription that will expedite the study of any gestural communication system with the depth and complexity characteristic of language.

Second, the system of transcription presented here as a tool for analysis may recommend itself to the deaf or hearing user of the language as a way of recording for various purposes this hitherto unwritten language. Those whose work in education or other social service brings them into contact with deaf children or adults may find both the conclusions and the system of writing the language helpful and suggestive.

0.11. Communication by a system of gestures is not an exclusively human activity, so that in a broad sense of the term, sign language is as old as the race itself, and its earliest history is equally obscure. However, we can be reasonably certain that, even in prehistoric times, whenever a human culture had the material resources, the familial patterns, and the attitudes toward life and 'the normal' which allowed the child born deaf to survive, there would grow up between the child and those around it a communicative system derived in part from the visible parts of the paralinguistic, but much more from the kinesic, communicative behavior of the culture (Trager, 'Paralanguage', *SIL* 13.1–12, 1958). Based on the patterns of interactive behavior peculiar to that culture, the communication of the deaf-mute and his hearing companions would develop in different ways from the normal communication of the culture. To take a hypothetical example, a shoulder shrug,

which for most speakers accompanied a certain vocal utterance, might be a movement so slight as to be outside the awareness of most speakers; but to the deaf person, the shrug is unaccompanied by anything perceptible except a predictable set of circumstances and responses; in short, it has a definite 'meaning'. That shrug would certainly become more pronounced, even exaggerated, in the behavior of the deaf-mute and perhaps also in that of his hearing partners in communication.

This hypothetical discussion of the origin and development of the gesture language of the congenitally deaf individual in any society is not to be taken as a prejudgment of the vexed question of language genesis. Surely total response of the organism precedes the selection of vocal or manual or facial signaling systems, but special signaling systems of the deaf, though a reversion in a way to the antelinguistic patterns of the race, can only develop in a culture, built, operated, and held together by a language, a system of arbitrary vocal symbols. The kinesic, or more broadly, the metalinguistic communicative phenomena out of which the primary communicative patterns of the deaf are built may once have been the prime phenomena, with vocal sounds a very minor part of the complex; but it cannot have been until long after the development of human speech as we know it that human culture had advanced to a point where individuals deprived of the normal channels of communication could be given a chance to develop substitutes.

Whenever such a chance of surviving and experimenting was afforded, the supposition is strong that individuals without hearing tended to group themselves, and hence to develop their visual communication systems in ways still more divergent from the communicative norm than would be the case if the deaf individual remained alone among hearing siblings, parents, or friends. To support the supposition there is both biological and linguistic reasoning. Many of the diseases which in modern times cause deafness in the infant before he has acquired speech would have been immediately or soon fatal in earlier times; but some ex-natu deafness is genetic, not only occurring in all periods of history but tending to give the deaf child one or several siblings as well as parents or more distant relatives similarly affected. The linguistic argument is

simple but telling: the effect on social grouping of having or lacking a common language is obvious and intense enough ordinarily; but when the difference is not between dialects or languages but between having or lacking language, the effect is enormously intensified.

There are records of successful attempts to teach persons deaf from birth to communicate in more socially acceptable ways, namely, by reading and writing, by manually spelling out language, and by lipreading and artificially acquired speech. But in the long stretch of time from antiquity to the middle of the eighteenth century these amount to the merest scattering of instances.

0.12. The real history of the sign language examined in this study begins in France in 1750. In that year the Abbé de l'Épée undertook the teaching of two deaf-mute sisters. What distinguished him from other brilliant practitioners in the art of teaching language to the congenitally deaf was an open mind and boundless charity. While others had instructed one or at most a handful of pupils, and seeking reputation and emolument, had paraded their successes while making a mystery of their methods, l'Épée gave his life, his considerable private fortune, and his genius to a school which in theory at least was open to every child born deaf in France, or in all of Europe. For nearly three decades he taught in and directed the school, making known its results only through monthly demonstrations open to the public until 1776, when he felt it necessary to answer criticism of his methods by rivals in a full exposition of his theory and practice.

This work, L'institution des sourds et muets, par la voie des signes méthodiques (Paris, 1776), shows clearly that the basis of his success is an amazingly astute grasp of linguistic facts. A few years before l'Épée began his career Jacob Rodrigues Pereira had come from Portugal to France and begun teaching deaf-mutes. His method was to begin with practice in articulation and much later to teach writing and reading with the aid of a one-hand manual alphabet. Although one of his pupils, Saboureaux, was a striking example of his success, composing works on the education of the deaf, and attacking l'Épée in print, there is no doubt that demonstration of it could be misleading. As l'Épée says, a pupil taught to recognize the manual alphabet and form letters with a pen could

demonstrate great decoding and encoding ability without really understanding anything of what he wrote; or a pupil could pronounce fairly intelligibly every French syllable without comprehending anything. In short, the language of the Pereira method was French, taught through articulatory exercises, ordinary writing, and a set of manual symbols corresponding to the letters of the alphabet.

L'Épée also taught speech but relegated it to a minor part of the educational program. His pupils too demonstrated their ability to write correct and elegant French. But they could also reason and answer questions calling for opinions supported by an education in depth. What is more his dictations were given, not in a one-for-one symbolization of French orthography, but in one or the other or both of two very interesting sign languages.

The difference between L'Épée and all his predecessors as well as many who followed him is his open-minded recognition of the structure of the problem. He could see his own language objectively and analyze its grammar in a way which made possible its transmission to and synthesis in the mind of a bright teen-age, congenitally deaf pupil in two years. He could also see the mind of a pupil as a human mechanism functioning by means of a language, without being alarmed at the fact that until the education was complete that language was not French. His detractors seem to have treated pupils as automata into which the French language – that is its pronunciation and orthography – could be built with the aid of suitable coding devices.

Though not the first to recognize the existence of a sign language among deaf-mutes – Montaigne two centuries earlier had been struck by its precision and rapidity (Essays, 2:29) – L'Épée was the first to attempt to learn it, use it, and make it the medium of instruction for teaching French language and culture to the deaf-mutes of his country. This language of the deaf, he, like writers for the next two centuries, called 'the natural language of signs', or le langage des signes naturelles. But for teaching the intricacies of French grammar and through it the art of abstract thought, he devised what now would be called a meta-language. This was his system of signes méthodiques.

'The natural language of signs' is a term with a long history; from 1776 to the early years of this century its

denotation has varied with the metaphysical and linguistic theory of the writer who used it. Particularly interesting is the almost magical effect of the adjective natural. Some of those who use it are confident that throughout time and terrestrial space there is a necessary and unbreakable connection between a sign and its meaning. Here, for example, is Valade, who wrote some penetrating studies of the sign language (1854): 'Les signes sont naturels quand ils ont, avec l'objet de la pensée, un rapport de nature tel qu'il est impossible de se méprendre sur leur signification. Ils ont une valeur qui leur est propre et qu'aucune convention ne peut changer.' L'Épée in his use of the term is less the metaphysician and more the linguist, but even he concludes his conspectus of 1776 with a 'Projet d'une langue universelle par l'entremise des signes naturelles assujétis à un methode.'

Actually 'the natural language of signs' is a false entity. A 'natural' sign language must be very much what is described in the first paragraph of this section. Any extremely close, non-arbitrary, relation of sign to referent will be in those few areas of activity where pantomime and denoted action are nearly identical, for instance, eating. Or it will be in the cases where pointing is as clear as language: you, me, up, down; etc. But most of the signs taken as natural, necessary, and unmistakable in the past are, of course, those parts of the total communicative activity of a culture which relate to a specific set of circumstances in that culture. This list of Arrowsmith's, in The art of instructing the deaf and dumb (London, 1819), contains some of all three kinds: 'yes, no, good, bad, rich, poor, go, come, right, wrong, up, down, white, black, walk, ride . . .' but whether a nod or some other sign was the 'natural' sign for yes in Arrowsmith's England, that sign is just as arbitrary, just as much culturally determined, as any syllable in a vocal system.

L'Épée realized that this natural language, indispensable as it was in the day to day existence of uninstructed deaf-mutes, was insufficient as a medium for teaching them French language and culture. When the language had a sign which could be used for a certain concept of French grammar he adapted it. He found that the pupils he encountered signified that an action or event was past by throwing the hand back beside the shoulder once or repeatedly. In his carefully worked out

set of lessons he shows how he teaches the past tenses of French verbs in connection with the days of the week and institutes at the same time some of his signes méthodiques. He uses one backward motion of the hand, over the shoulder, for the simple past, two coups de la main for the perfect and three for the pluperfect tense. When the language of 'natural' signs lacked a sign, as it did for the articles, he invented one out of hand. The definite article le was signed by a crooked index finger at the brow, la at the cheek. For some of these signes méthodiques of l'Épée and his successors the etymologies can be accepted as with any explicit coinages. The crooking of the index finger, he says, was a reminder to the pupil that the definite article chose one of many possible instances of the noun; the brow was to recall the male custom of tipping or touching the hat brim; the cheek is the feminine sign because the coiffure of ladies of the period often terminated (showily) there.

Another of l'Épée's signes méthodiques shows how he fashioned a bridge between natural signing and French. He found it necessary to invent several signs for the prepositions (as for other 'function words'), not that the natural sign language could not express relationships, but because the exact word demanded by the idiomatic French had no single sign equivalent. One such coinage was his sign for the preposition pour. He says it begins with the index finger pressed against the forehead, the seat of the reason or intention, and terminates with the finger pointing toward the object. The sign 'for' in American Sign Language is still made identically.

L'Épée's work shows an acute awareness of the several levels on which he was working. Gaining the confidence of his pupils by his ability to converse with them in their own 'natural' language, he could introduce them to the quite foreign French language in all its formal elegance through the meta-language of his signes méthodiques. His pupils still in school could demonstrate letter-perfect transcriptions when dictated to in these methodical signs; but his finished students, who from the first became the primary teachers in the school, had thoroughly learned French and could translate from natural sign language into literary French with a considerable saving in time; or they could just as easily transmit the import of written French to their pupils by using natural sign language.

0.13. It is greatly to be regretted that from l'Épée's day to the present his grasp of the structure of the situation of the congenitally deaf confronted with a language of hearing persons has escaped so many working in the same field. However, to continue the history, l'Épée died in 1789 and was succeeded by the Abbé Sicard who had studied under him a few years before and been put in charge of the new school for the deaf founded at Bordeaux.

Sicard is credited by some with even greater success than his master in bringing the most gifted of the deaf pupils to the highest levels of intellectual attainment. Certainly two of his protégés, Massieu and Clerc, wrote and reasoned with a skill outstanding among their hearing contemporaries. Clerc's articles in the first volumes of The American annals of the deaf (1847ff) are remarkable for their lucidity, good sense, and complete lack of mannerism of style which date the writing surrounding them in that journal. Moreover Sicard is the direct link between the French development of the sign language and the American Sign Language, which is the subject of the present study.

0.14. In 1815 Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet was sent to Europe by a group of public spirited citizens of Hartford, Connecticut, to study the methods of teaching the deaf. Visiting England first, he found little encouragement in the Watson's London Asylum (Hodgson, The deaf and their problems, London, 1953); but Sicard welcomed him, indoctrinated him in the method of the Paris school, and sent back with him Laurent Clerc who became the first deaf teacher of the deaf in America. The American School for the Deaf was established with Gallaudet as head at Hartford in 1817, and the New York School soon after. At both of these and at many which followed all over the country, the natural sign language as well as the methodical sign system originated by l'Épée was firmly established as the medium of instruction.

0.15. Actually these two sign languages must have tended to become one from the first. The advantages of having, instead of 'home made' gestures of the uninstructed deaf-mute, a sign language similarly executed but expressly designed to translate the French language and the culture to which that was the key must have impressed every signer who knew of it even in the eighteenth century. One may guess that some

notion of the French system had preceded Gallaudet's formal introduction of it to the United States. How else to explain the rapid flourishing of the language and the schools using this method to the point where a national college for the deaf was deemed necessary and established by Act of Congress in 1864 for the higher education of the graduates of these schools?

At any rate the present language of signs in general use among the American deaf stems from both the natural and methodical sign languages of l'Épée, but even the 'natural' elements have become fixed by convention so that they are now as arbitrary as any, and users of the language today are disdainful of 'home signs' as they call those signs that arise from precisely the same conditions that generate the 'natural' signs but that have local and not national currency.

Much condensed, this brief history has not always distinguished between signs themselves, which are analogous to words, and a sign language which is a system with levels corresponding to phonological, morphological, and semological organization. Actually one might distinguish not two but three kinds of signs: 'natural' signs whether 'home' signs or the accepted signs of a sign language in use; 'conventional' signs which are coinages with or without direct borrowing from another language; and 'methodical' signs, which in origin at least were sign-like labels for grammatical features of another language and were used only in teaching that language. Toward the latter two the language of signs seems to have behaved as have other languages toward borrowings. When the social and educational revolution in the life of the deaf initiated by l'Épée flooded the visual language with new vocabulary, the language adopted many of these conventional signs. But the meta-language of methodical signs was a different system, just as the symbolic code language of electronic computers is different from English; and its contributions could be only individual signs (such as 'for'), which came into the language with the same status as the conventional signs. That the French language, and later the English language, through the medium of the methodical sign language, or through persons bilingual in French and the sign language, affected the syntax of the sign language actually in use by the deaf may be suspected; but the writer's projected rigorous demonstration of such influence

will have to wait until the analysis of the present sign language is complete enough to allow such historical investigation. (See [section 0.3])

0.16. Studies of the sign language of the deaf uncomplicated by prescriptions for its use in teaching, by controversy about the advisability of using it at all, or by special pleading for its use as a universal language are not to be found. The work of l'Épée already referred to, despite its emphasis on the teaching of French grammar and syntax, is valuable both for its scattered descriptions of the 'natural' signs of the uninstructed deaf-mutes and for its attitude: none before him and all too few after him to the present day have been willing to face the fact that a symbol system by means of which persons carry on all the activities of their ordinary lives is, and ought to be treated as, a language.

Various bibliographers have credited l'Épée with beginning a dictionary of signs which was completed and issued by Sicard. Actually this work (Théorie des signes, Paris, 1808) is a two volume list of French words, arranged by subject matter, with their translation into methodical signs. Most of the words require at least three signs for their rendering: a base sign for the lexical meaning; a sign showing whether verb, substantive, adjective, or other; and further signs for determining case, gender, number, etc. This systematically logical way of rendering French vocabulary and semantics in gesture and pantomime is in many ways similar to the New Sign Language invented by Sir Richard Paget except that a word translated by his method begins with determinants, such as a sign for 'concrete' or 'abstract', and a subject-category sign, and progresses to the particular or base sign. (The new sign language: notes for teachers. London, Phonetics Dept., University College, n.d.) Both the eighteenth century and the modern systems are really methods of teaching, not languages capable of colloquial use.

Sicard also published a brief study of the method he followed in the Théorie volumes (Signes des mots, considérés sous le rapport de la syntaxe à l'usage des sourds-muets; Paris, 1808); but this too concerns the use of 'methodical' signs for teaching French vocabulary.

A different approach is apparent in the work of Bébien. His Mimographie, ou essai d'écriture mimique propre à régulariser le langage des sourds-muets (1825)

is a most ingenious attempt to devise a system of writing for the natural sign language. He was a teacher at the Paris school. His method of writing the signs is analytical, but his avowed purpose is to compose a vocabulary or dictionary of signs to serve as a regulator of the language much as the Academy and Dictionary performed that function for French. Considering the stage that linguistic analysis had reached in his time, his work is excellent in conception and execution. His symbols for rendering the hands and other parts of the body involved in the sign are representational enough to be easily remembered and read, and at the same time sufficiently conventionalized to be rapid and economical. He also used a few 'diacritical' marks to denote facial expressions: 'questioning', 'surprise', 'reverence', and so on. Movement seems the least well-handled part of his system; but there is a possibility that his writing system, as judged by one familiar with present sign language, falls short of succinct and accurate description of the language because the natural sign language itself in his time lacked uniformity in some ways. For example, the present American signs for 'chair' and 'name' are regular in every way. Both use the index and second fingers of both hands and both cross these fingers of one hand over the same fingers of the other hand at or near the second joint. The sole distinction is the orientation: edgewise (index finger uppermost) for 'name'; flat (palmar surface down) for chair. But in Bébien's time, though 'name' was signed just as now, the sign for 'chaise' was pantomimic, the signer making a more or less abbreviated attempt to sit in an imaginary chair. (The authority for 'chaise' is the picture-dictionary of Pelissier discussed below.)

In *Études sur la lexicologie et la grammaire du langage naturel des signes* (Paris, 1854), Y-L. Remi Valade rejects Bébien's system as too cumbersome and its symbols as too numerous. He retains, however, the purpose: a dictionary to regularize signs, to make for more uniformity, both in the language and in the education of the deaf. He understands very well why a dictionary of signs cannot be expected to resemble, or fulfill the same function as, a standardized French dictionary. What he projects in short is a French-Sign Language dictionary. Following each entry of a French word with etymological and grammatical notation

would be a description of the natural sign, which that word most nearly translates. Henceforth, he says, the French word would stand for the sign and could be used for it in writing sign language.

These considerations of the nature and function of the lexicological task, and the rejection of symbols in favor skillfully worded descriptions are echoed in two recent discussions of the sign language of the American Indian. C. F. Boegelin (1958) and A. L. Kroeber (1958) disagree about the importance at priority of lexicology in analysis and description of this language, which is in some ways intricately related to the sign language of the American deaf.

The Indian sign language, also, has been most often written about as a universal language, an instrument of international peace and understanding. To that and its advocates, aware of the deficiency of its vocabulary for this laudable purpose, have enriched it by borrowings, unacknowledged in detail, from the sign language of the deaf. There is also the vexed question of its origin, whether indigenous or directly caused by the sudden impact of a totally foreign culture. Its relation to other elements of some culture or sub-culture needs to be ascertained. Was it over a language in a strict sense or was it from the beginning a trade and treaty code? These and other questions need to be explored, and it is the conviction of the writer that the proper approach is not through Tomkins' (1926) or Mallery's (1880, 1881) description of individual signs. Even working with an informant, as Lamont West is reported to be doing (Kroeber, Voegelin, 1958), may not produce the kind of results intended. Kroeber's article suggests that it survives mainly as a performance for, and is even modified to meet the demands of, an audience of tourists. The surer way is through a rigorous analysis of the structure of the sign language of the deaf, which has in almost every respect the role of a language in a (minority) culture (0.2 below). Knowledge gained about the structure of the various levels of this language, the categories discovered, the nomenclature and symbology developed in the linguistic analysis of a living visual language will surely expedite the investigation of other gesture languages including the 'sign-talk' of the American frontier.

Valade's studies began with lexicography, but he also makes some interesting observations on the syntax

of the natural language of signs. Like all the l'Épée school of grammarians, he is able to get sufficiently outside his own language to compare sign language with French, Latin, and English grammar objectively. For example, he states that the syntax of sign language has no need for the copula in such statements as 'the corn is green' or 'the girl is beautiful' because the visual juxtaposition of the signs for substantive and adjective serves the same purpose. Such analysis is far superior to the conclusions sometimes encountered that the language of signs has no grammar or syntax, or that the absence of systems of verb inflection argues a defect in the language or an abnormal psychology of the user traceable to his aural deficiency. On the other hand Valade's conviction, shared by later French and American writers, that the order of signs in an utterance is closer than that of French or English to the 'natural' order of occurrence or importance will not bear scrutiny.

A different treatment of signs is given in the final portion of Pelissier's L'enseignement primaire des sourds-muets mis à la portée de tout le monde avec une iconographie des signes (Paris, 1856). Here he gives some four hundred drawings with dotted lines and arrows to show movement, each captioned with the French word it renders. These are now being transcribed in the system of notation introduced in the present study by the writer's associates (0.3 below); and studies of their structural and semantic relation to present signs are contemplated.

All the French writers on sign language so far reviewed are primarily educators of the deaf; l'Épée, Sicard, Bébien, and Valade are grammarians as well. Pelissier, however, writes less for the theoreticians of grammar than for a new group that must be reckoned with. In a century a linguistic community had developed, and a committee composed of deaf adults instructed in the Parisian and similar French schools, and of interested hearing persons, were making their views felt in the linguistically complicated educational controversies. Their interest was in the use, the extension, and the public acceptance of their language, which from Pelissier's iconography appears to be the 'natural' sign language with a difference. In 1856 this language retained some of the signs which were doubtless encountered by l'Épée when he met his first

uninstructed deaf-mutes; but its 'vocabulary' also included many coinages, conventional signs, and signs derived from the 'methodical' signs of the schools.

Pelissier's work, as the title indicates, attempts to use the language as a means of dispelling the mystery which had surrounded the teaching of the deaf since the middle ages. Does one wish to teach French to a deaf-mute? Let him learn the latter's language and proceed from there. This rationale as well as the language was imported to America, as this resolution of the World Congress of the Deaf held in St. Louis, in 1904, proclaims:

'The educated deaf have a right to be heard in these matters and they shall be heard.

'Resolved, that the oral method, which withholds from the congenitally and quasi-congenitally deaf the use of the language of signs outside the schoolroom, robs the children of their birthright; that those champions of the oral method, who have been carrying on a warfare, both overt and covert, against the use of the language of signs by the adult, are not friends of the deaf; and that in our opinion, it is the duty of every teacher of the deaf, no matter what method he or she uses, to have a working command of the sign language' (Annals, 1904).

American writing on the language itself may be represented by three manuals:

Joseph Schuyler Long, The sign language: a manual of signs, being a descriptive vocabulary of signs used by the deaf of the United States and Canada, Omaha, 1952; 1st, ed., Des Moines, 1918.

J.W. Michaels, A handbook of the sign language of the deaf, Atlanta, Ga., 1923.

Father Daniel D. Higgins, How to talk to the deaf, St. Louis, 1923.

These all describe the method of making the signs and to some extent of phrasing utterances in the language. The greatest space in each is devoted to an English-Sign vocabulary using illustrations and verbal descriptions of the sign that translates the English word. Grammatical descriptions and prescriptions are implied in the linking of each sign to an English word with its inevitable relegation to a certain part of speech.

There is a similar kind of manual of the Australian sign language: How to converse with the deaf in sign

language as used in the Australian Catholic schools of the deaf, by teachers of the schools at Waratah and Castle Hill, N.S.W. (1942). This sign language brought to Australia from the Dominican School in Cabra, Ireland, has some signs identical with present American signs, others which seem related, but a great many signs using, as do present American 'wine' and eighteenth century French 'vin', a 'letter' of the one-hand manual alphabet as an element of the sign.

Of these four handbooks, the Australian and Michaels' seem to show a greater adherence to the methodical sign system; the latter giving signs for 'verb', 'substantive', etc., in the Sicard manner; the former rendering such words as 'the', 'he', 'is' by specific signs in a manner foreign to the 'natural' sign language and having signs likewise for prefixes and suffixes of English words.

The one full length modern study of the visual communication of the deaf is Father Bernard Theodoor Marie Tervoort's dissertation Structurelle analyse van visuell taalgebruik binnen een groep dove kinderen (Amsterdam, 1953). This work, though an interesting exploration of such questions as spontaneous language origin and development and the psychological-linguistic implications of visual instead of visual-acoustic orientation and of esoteric and exoteric languages and their grammatical-logical categories, has actually slight bearing on the present study for several reasons: In Holland where his observations were made, signing alone, or with simultaneous spoken accompaniment as practiced in many American schools, is not used as a medium of instruction. Officially prohibited, it occurs as an 'after hours' activity among the school children he studied, most of them unacquainted with any sign language outside their own group. His conclusions show that the signs they used were developed in the school group itself and tended to vanish when the group dispersed. The signs he observed were always accomplishments of speech or silent speech-like movements and could thus be in no way substitutes for speech. He therefore analyzed stretches of this combined visual-oral language by using the categories of traditional Dutch grammar. The present study is of a sign language which has a wide geographical currency as well as a recorded persistence through more than a century, which is accepted as an educational medium, and which will in

this and projected studies be shown to have a syntactical, morphemic, and sub-morphemic structure different from that of English. Moreover, for several reasons, the observations in Tervoort's study were limited to children under the ages of puberty, while the practice in the present study is to follow the principle of choosing informants from among the intelligent adult members of the language community.

The writer is well acquainted with Father Tervoort who is making Gallaudet College his headquarters while engaged in a study of the language and psychological development of students of two American schools for the deaf over a six-year period. His working hypothesis is an extension of his original thesis that the deaf child has 'two languages, an esoteric and an exoteric one; one for mutual intercourse, the other for talk with outsiders' (English summary, 1.293) and he has stated that in the first two months of the experiment there are already indications that the esoteric elements tend to disappear as the child matures in the direction of a more or less standard English. With the caveat that the writer and Fr. Tervoort disagree amicably on terminology, the writer in this context would characterize the other's work as more in the nature of a controlled experiment in the fields of psychology and educational method than strictly in the field of linguistics (Trager, 1949). The writer also believes that in the experience of the American deaf person there are two languages, not esoteric and exoteric and therefore only psychologically distinct, but linguistically different: these two are American English, known to the deaf through various substitutes for hearing, and the American sign language, the subject of this microlinguistic study.

Exploration of the possibilities of sign language for international use continues also. The World Federation of the Deaf issued at Rome in 1959 a booklet of 339 photographs (for 322 signs) captioned by numbers only, followed by alphabetical indices of English and French words keyed to the numbered pictures (Prèmiere contribution pour le dictionnaire international du langage des signes, terminologie de conférence). Some of the English-word sign-picture correspondences seem to be identical with the word-sign equivalence generally accepted by users of the American sign language; other words are connected with quite unfamiliar signs. There

is a third category of correspondences—the word translated by a sign which in American sign language usually renders a word more or less distantly related semantically to the WFD entry. This flexibility of sign-concept relation many account for the phenomena observed by the writers (Dr. Cesare Magarotto and Mr. Dragoljub Vukotic): ‘During the numerous meetings and international congresses held these last ten years, the deaf-mutes of different countries and continents have been able to hold conversations on different topics with the sign language, understanding each other without the least help of an interpreter’ (p. vii).

0.2. The application of the techniques of the sociologist and cultural anthropologist to the linguistic community formed by the deaf is as new as structural analysis of their language. Much of the information about the group which is desirable as a background for strictly linguistic analysis is lacking, but the writer is most fortunate to have been associated in the first years of the new Gallaudet College research program with Dr. Andres S. Lunde whose paper ‘The sociology of the deaf’ is the pioneer work in the field.

Dr. Lunde has graciously permitted the quotation of substantially all of this paper, first presented at the 1956 meeting of the American Sociological Society in Detroit. Its information is most pertinent here and its delineation of areas where research is needed may lead to further collaboration of sociologist and linguist. He writes:


‘The deaf as a group fall into a completely unique category in society because of their unusual relation to the communication process and their subsequent adjustment to a social world in which most interpersonal communication is conducted through spoken language. No other group with a major physical handicap is so severely restricted in social intercourse. Other handicapped persons, even those with impaired vision, may normally learn to communicate through speech and engage in normal social relations. Congenitally deaf persons and those who have never learned speech through hearing (together representing the majority of the deaf population) never perceive or imitate sounds. Speech must be laboriously acquitted and speechreading, insofar as individual skill permits, must be substituted for hearing if socially approved intercommunication is to take place. The rare mastery

of these techniques never fully substitutes for language acquisition through hearing.

‘With his acoustical impairment as a background, the deaf person undergoes certain conditioning social experiences which separate him from the hearing and tend to make him a member of a distinct sub-cultural or minority group . . . . The sociology of the physically handicapped is a neglected field; a few texts barely touch upon this subject and then, in the case of the deaf, often inaccurately. Only a handful of articles pertaining to the role of the physically handicapped in society has appeared in sociological journals . . . are to be distinguished from those who are “hard of hearing”, or those of partial hearing who can hear with the use of mechanical or electronic hearing aids, and those who become deaf late in life after having acquired speech through hearing and associated, in normal communication, with hearing persons. By and large, the deaf group as a whole never used hearing for speech. The available evidence, which is incomplete, seems to indicate that approximately 39 per cent of the total deaf population was born deaf, that another 19 per cent became deaf by the end of two years of life and that an additional 28 per cent became deaf between the ages of three and five (Best, 1943). This means that approximately 58 per cent of the deaf never used hearing for speech and that 86 per cent of the total deaf population was deaf by age five. The social implications of this fact are extensive; the deaf as a group have never undergone the normal experiences of socialization during the formative years.

‘The deaf may be defined therefore as a group composed of those persons who cannot hear human speech under any circumstances and consequently must find substitutes (in speechreading, language of signs, etc.) for normal interpersonal communication. The definition as applied to the group discussed in this paper is to be understood to include only those persons who become deaf at a relatively early age in life (or are born deaf) and who, for the most part, undergo the special institutional experiences analyzed below. As far as can be determined from available data, this group numbers around 100,000 persons, although some estimates of a more loosely defined deaf population go as high as 180,000 persons. Censuses of the deaf were taken from 1830 to 1930 and were discontinued for reasons of inconsistency and under-enumeration. In 1930, 57,085 persons who had

Table 1 Factors in the isolation of deaf persons and the establishment of a social group of the deaf (A.S. Lunde). Read from the bottom up this chart shows the lines of social divergence from birth through adulthood



become deaf before eight years of age were enumerated (15<sup>th</sup> Census of the U.S. 1930, "The Blind and Deaf-Mutes of the United States 1930", Washington, D.C., Bureau of the Census, 1931). Estimates based on the U.S. Public Health Survey of 1935-36 indicated a total deaf population of 170,000 in 1950. Of these it is estimated that approximately 100,000 could be classed as not having used hearing for speech (Bachman, 1952).

"The deaf person is often taken as an individual adrift in a hearing society; while this may occasionally

be the case, for the most part the deaf person is a member of a well-integrated group, especially in urban areas. How he becomes cast as a member of such a group may be investigated by means of a hypothetical life-cycle, as illustrated [in Table 1].

'It may first be noted that sociological research could throw considerable light upon the etiology of deafness. There appears to be a prevalence of deafness among lower income families, reflective of inadequate medical care and services in infancy and childhood.

Beasley (1940) observed a direct relationship between family income and incidence of impaired hearing in the Public Health Survey of 1935–36.

‘The deaf child begins his life separated from the normal associations with the hearing world to a degree not yet investigated. According to various observers, sound and hearing are extremely important for orientation from the first moment of life. The hearing child spends considerable time during the first four weeks of life “responding” to sound; at the end of 16 weeks the child seems to identify sounds (Gesell and Ilg, 1953). By 28 weeks he is at Esper’s stage of sound imitation, vocalizing vowels and consonants, which will soon take on the status of words (Esper, 1935; Klineberg, 1940).

‘Toward the end of the first year the stage of verbal understanding begins; by 2-1/2 years the use of spoken language is understood. By 3 years the hearing child begins the development of logical expression in words and sentence structuring, and through the expression of ideas, becomes aware of “self”. At 4 years he asks “Why” questions, is become oriented and plays conversationally with his group. At 5 years the hearing child begins to discuss more remote and difficult problems such as war and crime in common with friends, and attacks the problems of sex, time, space, death and God (Gesell and Ilg, 1947). By the time he enters school the hearing child is equipped not only with a background of information but with the ability to express himself in language.

‘The deaf child is cut off from these experiences; he lacks the orientation provided by the hearing association with his family and playgroups. As most studies of personality have been made of the deaf child in the school situation that is after the age of five or six there exists no available information on the first years of deafness. We do not know exactly how the deaf child learns, orients himself, becomes aware of himself or of his position in the group. Further research into the operation of socialization and personality formation of the deaf is urgently required.

‘The relation of the deaf child to his family has not been entirely investigated. It is generally understood that many parents do not learn of their child’s deafness until the child is two or three years of age. Patterns of reaction ranging from rejection to over solicitous behavior have been observed. The role of the parent in the life of the

deaf child, the effect of parental rejection or overprotection, the relation of the deaf child to the other members of the family (i.e. sibling relationship). . . indeed the total family environment of the child during the first six years of life have not been adequately investigated.

‘The social isolation of the deaf child may be interested in the play group experience. While few studies are available in this area it is obvious that lack of verbal communication must be a retarding factor operating to limit interpersonal experience in peer-group relationships. Brunschwig (1936) found, for example, that deaf children had a smaller number of playmates at any one time than hearing children and they engaged more frequently in solitary activities.

‘The typical deaf child next enters the school for the deaf. In 1955 there were 23,033 children being taught in educational institutions for the deaf in the United States (*Annals*, January 1956). Of these, 66.3 per cent were full-time residential children and 33.7 per cent were day-school or day-class children. With respect to social isolation some preliminary studies have indicated that the institutional experience may further remove the child from contact with the hearing world as compared to the day school, from which the child returns daily to the normal environment of home and community associations. Some data tend to support the hypothesis that the residential school experience retards social development (Streng and Kirk, 1938; Burchard and Myklebust, 1942; Avery, 1948). Burchard and Myklebust found that the longer the period of residence in a residential school the lower the social maturity quotients on standard tests (p. 241–50). There is not sufficient evidence to warrant any conclusions concerning the effect of attending a school for the deaf; if there are negative aspects, there are also positive aspects, which should also be investigated.

‘The curricular programs in schools for the deaf vary and progress for each student is individualized to a considerable extent. The burden of teaching basic communication, speechreading, reading and writing, takes precedence over course work as such. The omission of sign language is significant. (Neither Dr. Lunde nor the writer knows of any school where instruction in sign language itself is part of language itself is part of the curriculum.) The deaf child, already retarded in communication ability, now is further

limited in academic development. Thus the system of education as well as the institutionalization itself plays a role in comparative retardation, the deaf child being trained academically at a pace much slower than the hearing child. This further widens the gap between the hearing and the deaf, taken as groups.

'The education of the deaf is further restricted by the fact that there are only twelve accredited high schools for the deaf in the United States (*Annals*, January 1956). The majority of the deaf do not obtain a high-school education or its equivalent. This places them as a group on the lower levels of educational achievement, another factor in group segregation and which affects their chances for higher education and better employment opportunities.

'It is at the school for the deaf that most deaf children meet other children like themselves for the first time and enter into peer-group associations without the restrictions the special handicap imposed in their relation with hearing groups. They begin to develop feelings of identity with the deaf group and to acquire the group attitudes which tend to set them apart. Preliminary studies at Gallaudet College reveal that the deaf institutional adults recalls his first days at the school for the deaf in three categories: –first, his misery at begin taken away from home and family, second, his fear of the institution itself (his perception of it as a "hospital" or "nut-house"), and third, his amazement and pleasure at finding other deaf girls and boys like himself. Homesickness and fear disappear as he becomes a member of the newly-discovered in-group.

'It is also here that many acquire for the first time a new means of visual communication, the language of signs, which becomes not only a special language of a sub-cultural group but serves as a means of identifying the deaf from the hearing. Although oral schools emphasize speechreading and speech, the plain fact is that the deaf as a group use the sign language among themselves. According to Best, 78.2 per cent of the deaf used sign language and only 1.0 per cent used speech alone (Best, 1943, p. 203).

'In 1955, 78.6 per cent of the schools for the deaf taught by means of the oral method, only 5.1 per cent taught by the non-oral method and 14.3 percent by the combined method. However, only 19 per cent of the public schools and 24 per cent of the private schools

reported restrictions upon the use of communication methods outside of the classroom which can only mean that the sign language was permitted in most of the schools using oral teaching methods (*Annals*, January 1956). A study of the sign language, how it is acquired and transmitted, the significance of its content, and so on, would throw considerable light upon the entire process of communication as well as indicate the thought-process of the deaf.

'Most deaf persons leave school at the end of the grammar school period, but an almost equal number leave before they have completed the work. In today's competitive market this means that they bear an additional handicap besides deafness itself; lack of schooling is one reason why the deaf are largely found in the lower-paid occupations. The deaf may therefore most frequently be found in the lower socio-economic classes, considering the prevalence of deafness among children of the lower classes and the occupational categories they largely fill in adulthood (U.S. Office of Education, 1936).

'After the school years the deaf person tends to continue his group association with other deaf persons throughout life, through alumni associations, state societies of the deaf, religious and welfare organizations, churches for the deaf and various fraternal orders. The deaf have organized their own newspaper and magazines, and they have established their own homes for the aged deaf. The extent of membership in formal organizations is not known, but it is known that the deaf will go to considerable extremes to seek each other out, that they prefer the company of the deaf to that of the hearing and feel more at ease with other deaf persons (Pinter, Fushfeld and Brunschwig, 1937). Among the adult deaf, in-group feelings are strong and group loyalty is intense. The extent to which group solidarity might be expressed was indicated in the movement in the nineteenth century to establish a deaf-mute Utopia in the West; Congress was petitioned to set aside a state or territory for deaf-mutes only (*Annals*, 1858).

'Marriage patterns also indicate the tendency for the deaf to associate with each other. In the only extensive study of the marriage of the deaf, published in 1898, Fay found that 85.6 per cent of the married deaf had married other deaf persons. One preliminary study of attitudes of deaf college students shows that only 5 per cent would

prefer to date a hearing person rather than a deaf person, and about the same proportion would prefer to marry a hearing person. About 65 per cent have already made up their minds to marry a deaf person.

'Among the other factors enforcing the social isolation of the deaf from the hearing world is public opinion, as expressed in the attitudes of the hearing majority. These appear to be similar to the fear and hostility patterns which appear in other dominant-minority relations; there is the assumption of the inferiority of the deaf and the stereotype of the deaf as "dumb". There seems to be less public sympathy for the deaf apparently because of the ignorance of the gravity of the handicap and because of its invisibility. The Social Science Research Council reported that the deaf were held more in contempt than the blind, the crippled, and the aged (Baker, et al, 1953). The public is simply not aware that deafness may be the most severe, socially, of all handicaps.

'Thus the deaf, first isolated from normal social relations by the fact of physical handicap become segregated as a group through the operation of institutional patterns in the general culture. Admittedly little is known concerning the social condition of the deaf; few sociologists have been interested in the problems presented. The majority of research studies on the deaf have been made by psychologists who have often reported contradictory findings with respect to the intelligence and achievements of the deaf (Meyerson, 1955). Much of the confusion in these and other areas seems to result from a lack of attention to the social factors or variables involved in personality development and to a lack of recognition of the formation of a deaf sub-cultural group.

'The most recent experimental studies seem to indicate that the average deaf person is of normal intelligence (Hiskey, 1956). The so-called differences between the deaf and the hearing are largely the result of differential social experience (Getz, 1953).

'There is much to be explored in this entire area. Sociological research in this undeveloped field can contribute much to the understanding both of the individual problems of the deaf and of the social problems associated with acoustical impairment.'

0.21. The simplest representation of possible communication behavior of American deaf persons would be a line with these extremes: at one end of

completely normal American English exchange, the 'listener' with perfect lipreading ability receiving all that the speaker with perfect articulation is saying. At the opposite end would be a completely visual exchange, the 'speaker' and the 'bearer' using only a system of gestures, facial expressions, and manual configurations as symbols. Of course, neither end is reached in actuality. Although a very few individuals can attain high proficiency at lipreading, or speech-reading, under perfect conditions, and many develop excellent speech, most deaf persons reserve this mode for contact with hearing persons. The purely visual communication with no admixture of English is rare, though it may be that the less formal education he has the nearer the individual's communication would approach the purely visual.

But here the linear representation breaks down. Besides these first two modes of communication, digital symbolization of the orthography of English is also available to the deaf. Therefore the non-oral communication of the typical American deaf person may be anything from 'pure' English printed on the air, so to speak, to sign language with or without an admixture of English words or word-derived symbols. But again, the actually observed communication is a combination in all degrees of these two with or without vocal, whispered, or silent articulation as supplement or accompaniment.

In other parts of the English-speaking world there are other ways that the manual alphabets and the signs are combined. In American sign language, as aforesaid, English words manually spelled are often treated just as if they were signs in a stretch of utterance, and some signs (fewer than one would expect) are made by a hand configuration which recalls the initial of an English word that is a translation of the sign. But here too there is regional and individual difference: the magazine of the National Association of the Deaf in a series of illustrated short articles has been advocating a greater use of the initial-sign correspondences (The silent worker). In England a quite different manual alphabet is in use; one which requires both hands to form the letters, and thus one not so easily combined with signs.

However, the American sign language, ultimately deriving from the French, has been extended to a larger population more widely dispersed. It therefore has had a quite different development, not the least important

factor of which is its relationship to 'complete' manual spelling, speech, and lipreading.

Total communication behavior is what we would seek to know, but analysis and synthesis are necessary and the present study is directed toward discovering the structure not of the whole communicative complex but of the sign language. The sign language, as the term is understood in this study, requires only a small, though radical, change in the definition of language given by Trager in his 'Paralanguage' (SIL, 1958): 'it is the cultural system which employs certain of (the visible actions of the face and hands,) combines them into recurrent sequences, and arranges these sequences into systematic distribution in relation to each other and in reference to other cultural systems' (p. 3).

The body of the paper will deal first with observed behavior corresponding with phonetic behavior in spoken languages. Then will follow the analysis of this behavior, and the analysis of the structure corresponding with the phonemic level. Next the morpheme list will be considered, then morphemic structure, and an account of the procedures now in use and contemplated for the analysis of the morphology and syntax.

Chereme, i. e. /kériym/, and allocher are proposed as names for the concepts corresponding with phoneme and allophone (The combining form, cher-, 'handy', as old as Homeric Greek has been preferred to the learned chir- or cheir-). Other terms useful or necessary to avoid confusion or false analogy will be introduced at appropriate parts of the discussion. It seems well to take sign as equivalent to word when the frame of reference is the sign language, or signs. The precise relation of sign to morpheme will be considered in the appropriate section below.

As the invention of a symbol system for the transcription of the sign language has had to go hand with the analysis of its structure, the symbology as well as nomenclature will be presented gradatim with the analysis. For convenient reference a summary of the symbols appears in an appendix.

0.3. The writer, after much consideration of the matter, has chosen to present this study over his name alone; but much of the work at all stages since the beginning has been done by two research assistants who might as easily be named co-authors. Carl Gustaf Croneberg and Dorothy Chiyoko Sueoka have ana-

lyzed and transcribed data, discussed the determination of the cheremes, and contributed ideas as well as time to the study to the point where it is difficult to determine authorship. In the detailed discussion of the data, however, the sign or notation when necessary will be identified by initials (CGC, DCS, WS).

The analysis and conclusions here presented are based on two kinds of observation of signs, extensive: for us all, contact with students, faculty, and visitors of Gallaudet College from every state, Canada, and eight or ten other nations; for CGC several years in a school for the deaf in Sweden and travel in Europe and nine years at Gallaudet as student and teacher; for DCS school for the deaf and several years work with deaf associates in Hawaii as well as four years of graduate and undergraduate work at Gallaudet; for WCS brief formal instruction followed by four years of teaching and research at Gallaudet College;—and intensive: for all of us repeated study of some five thousand feet at normal and reduced speed of motion pictures of the signing of fourteen deaf and two hearing informants.

While no systematic attempt has been made so far to identify and classify dialects and idiolects of sign language there is clear indication that such divisions are real. We believe that the analysis to be presented is valid so far as it goes for all the sign language idiolects we have observed, but more, that it and the notational system developed with it can be used to describe gestural languages other than the sign language of the American deaf. The present study is offered as a fairly complete statement of the first level of structure of the language.

The morphology and semology, especially the syntax, of this sign language and its dialect structure are presently (February 1960) being studied by the writer and his associates under a two-year grant from the National Science Foundation. Future plans include historical studies and comparisons with sign languages of other cultures.


## 1. Cherology

1.0. Sign language utterances contain both signs and finger-spelled English words in varying proportions, but structural differences make it possible to separate the two. And for the purposes of cherology (the sign language analogue of phonology) the two must be kept

separate. The units of the syntactical system are morphemes, but morphemes of two completely different systems of structure. The finger-spelled English word is a series of digital symbols which stand in a one to one relationship with the letters of the English alphabet, but the word itself is a morpheme or combination of morphemes constructed from English language sounds on principles systematically described by the phonemics and morphophonemics of English. Though the deaf person may never have heard a sound, such is the power of symbolics and the adaptability of the human mind, he may still have acquired the ability to use the written or fingerspelled word with as much symbolic force as any speaker of English can achieve. The sign, on the contrary, is a unit of the sign language, constructed, as are all morphemes from the isolates of its own language system by principles that it will be the purpose of this part of the paper to explain.

To the signer these two kinds of morphemes may, out of awareness, be treated as equivalent because they are freely interchangeable in his utterance; but as soon as their structure is examined, the visually presented English word and the sign are discovered to differ radically. The statement, 'Yes; I know him' remains the same whether each of the four words in it is signed or fingerspelled. Thus without any change in the word order there are sixteen different ways of signing it. 'Know', for instance, is spelled by making with the fingers of the hand, successively, the configurations for k, n, o, and w; but 'know' is signed by touching the tips of the fingers of the slightly bent hand to the forehead. It is signed thus in isolation, that is, much as know is said /<sup>3</sup>nów<sup>1</sup>#/ in isolation; but in sign language utterance 'know' may get only a slight movement upward of the bent hand.

The greatest communicative difference between these two structurally different kinds of morphemes available to the user of the sign language is seen in this possibility of variation within a pattern. Finger-spelling is telegraphic in several senses of the word, but the signed 'know' may have modifications which can vary the meaning of the sentence from 'Yes, I am acquainted with him'; to 'Oh, sure; it's only what I expected of him'; to give but two possibilities. The completely finger-spelled sentence has only the signer's facial expression to differentiate it from the same



thing written on paper; it is at one more remove from language itself than writing and thus is a territory symbol system, not itself a sign language. There are no clear indications that the sign language of the American Indian transcends this kind of relationship. But the structure of the sign, in the sign language of the deaf, permits considerable linguistic latitude, because the sign itself is not an isolate but a structure of elements which themselves admit of linguistic variation.

1.1. The twenty-six letters of the English alphabet are represented in finger-spelling by nineteen distinct configurations. Different attitudes of three of these configurations add five more letter symbols; and motion of two of the configurations give the last two. Thus there are three modes of symbolizing within the American manual alphabet. The letters a, b, c, e, f, i, l, m, o, r, s, t, v, w, x, and y are represented by unique configurations of the hand. The letters d, g, and q share one configuration variously oriented; as do another triplet, h, u, and n; and a pair, k and p. Two letters are symbolized by configuration plus motion. The i-hand draws a j in the air so symbolize j; and the index finger (d and g) draws the z. Fig. 1 shows these symbols and configurations.

Except for *j* and *z* the symbolization of letters is by static show of configuration. Motion is non-significant and is limited to that needed to change attitude and configuration. But this is true only for the alphabet considered as a set of symbols mutually contrasting. In use for spelling, one hand symbol may need to contrast with itself, as is the case when a doubled letter occurs. There are three ways of signaling this occurrence, their choice structurally determined. With *j* and *z* doubling is simply a matter of making the necessary movement twice. Configurations which require an opposition of thumb and fingers, or a grip, are doubled by opening or relaxing the fingers and repeating the configuration. Other configurations are moved to the side with a slight shake to show double occurrence.

Word endings are marked by holding the terminal letter an almost imperceptibly longer time than the others. Word beginnings may be marked by a displacement of the hand from a previous position. These observations, however, approach the region of individual preference and style and should be so considered.

Here is a tabular summary of the contrastive system of the American manual alphabet:

Contrast by configuration,			
Normal attitude:	a b c d e f i k l m o r s t u v w x y		
And inverted attitude:	q	p	n
And horizontal attitude:	g		h
And motion:	z	j	

A great deal of the contrastive load is put on the differences of configuration so that the other two resources of the system, attitude and motion, are very slightly used. So slight are some of the differentiating features that the system is less effective for communication over distance, to large groups of viewers, and in poor light than for *tête-à-tête* use. Nevertheless it is workable, useful, almost indispensable, and in heavy use by the deaf; and what is more it is an excellent means of communicating with the deaf-blind. The writer, introduced to a deaf-blind man after two or three years experience with using the manual alphabet with deaf persons found that a conversation was not only possible but also amazingly rapid and easy. The deaf-blind person reads the alphabet by holding his hand lightly against the front or back of the speller's hand. The relatively small use of motion and attitude change is an advantage under these conditions by reception.

The nature of finger-spelling, evanescent though the symbols are, is that of a graphemic system. And as any grapheme may have allographic forms, so the configurations of the manual alphabet actually observed in use show variations. For example, the pictured *g* of the manual alphabet has all four fingernails touching the edge of the thumb, but frequently seen is an allograph in which only the first two fingers meet the thumb, the others being tightly folded into the palm. Other allographic differences are the result not only of individuals' preference but also of the conformation, flexibility, and muscle tones of the signer's fingers. A difference between the appearance of men's and women's formation and articulation of the 'letters' is noticed even by observers who are not familiar with the system, and this difference, it may be noted, runs through all sign language activity. Subjectively at least, it is a difference as great as that of timbre and pitch of men's and women's voices.

1.11. Closely related to the manual alphabet is the system of digital numeration used by the deaf. There is less uniformity in finger numbering than in finger-spelling; but a similar combination of configuration, attitude and motion is characteristic of both. The first five cardinal numerals are often but not invariably made with the palm of the hand toward the signer, while the six through nine configurations are often done with the back of the hand toward the signer. Ten is made by slightly shaking or jerking the flat with thumb uppermost. The system is strictly decimal, the tens symbol being repeated, in full form or vestigially, through the second decade. Eleven through fifteen and sixteen through nineteen may show the same reversal of attitude as the first and second group of digits. Multiple digit numbers are signed by shaking the hand slightly forward at successive points on a line from left to right in front of the signer.

[Table 2], prepared by CGC and DCS shows many of the features of the numeral system.

The statement of the formation of the ordinals is not exhaustive. The following table of equivalents of the English ordinal and adjective second will show something of the possibilities:

Washington was <u>second</u> in the league.	Fingers 1, 2 in a horizontal 'V' are drawn from left to right a short distance.
---	---

**Table 2** Table of Numeration

Number	Configuration (Fingers: tb, 1, 2, 3, 4)	Attitude	Motion
0	<u>o</u> of manual alphabet	Edge of palm toward viewer	none
1	1 upraised	Palm usually toward signer; this is the	''
2	1, 2 upraised	case with 1–19, except that, for emphasis	
3	tb, 1, 2 upraised	or visibility, 6–9 and 16–19 may be	
4	1, 2, 3, 4 upraised	signed with palm toward viewer	
5	tb, 1, 2, 3, 4 upraised		
6	tb, 4 tip contact; 3, 2, 1 upraised, slightly relaxed	''	''
7	tb, 3 tip contact; 4, 2, 1 upraised	''	''
8	tb, 2 tip contact; 4, 3, 1 upraised	''	''
9	tb, 1 tip contact; 4, 3, 2 upraised	''	''
10	tb upraised from fist <u>a</u> *	back of thumb to signer	Shake or twist to right
11	fist <u>a</u> , (1)** [see Motion]	palm usually toward signer	(1) snaps up from under thumb
12	fist <u>a</u> , (2)** [see Motion]	''	(2) snaps up from under thumb
13	fist <u>a</u> , (3)** [see Motion]	''	(3) snaps or opens from fist nod 1, 2 together]
14	[DCS: (3) upraised fist <u>a</u> or <u>a</u> , (4)	''	(4) snaps or opens from fist nod (4), tb in palm]
15	[DCS: (3) upraised fist <u>a</u> or <u>a</u> , (5)	''	(5) snaps or opens from fist nod (4), tb upraised]
16–19	<u>a</u> , appropriate unit digit	''	<u>a</u> changes rapidly into appropriate unit digit
20	relaxed <u>L</u> , closed <u>L</u>	palm toward viewer; this is usually the case from 20–99	<u>L</u> closes to pinch; may move slightly to right
21 23–29	<u>L</u> and unit digit	''	<u>L</u> into unit digit; may move slightly to right
30	(3), closed (3)	''	(3) closes; may move slightly to right
22, 31–99	(first digit), (second digit)	''	(first digit) into (second digit); may move slightly to right
100	(1), <u>c</u>	Edge of palm toward viewer	(1) into <u>c</u>
1000	palm of left hand; (1), <u>m</u> on right hand	Left palm held out; palm of right hand toward signer	(1); then <u>m</u> tips touch palm of left hand
1,000,000	as above	as above	As above, then repeat <u>m</u> touch farther from wrist

\*Fist a' and 'fist a' refer to configurations of the manual alphabet; see Fig. 1.

\*\*Figures in parentheses refer to configurations already described above.

Approximations by decades: The equivalents of the English 'forties', in his 'thirties', 'doing seventy', are signed by shaking the configuration for the decade (30 through 90) in small arcs from the wrist. A facial expression accompanying such signs also helps to indicate that the number is approximate.

For numbers over one hundred, use digits and signs in the order corresponding to the number. Example: 257,100 is signed: (2) (hundred) (57) (thousand) (1) (hundred). There is no standard rule for signing long numbers; the requirements for clarity will dictate the practice. Where long numbers are not separated into groups, the common practice would be to 'read' off the number, moving hand from left to right. Short numbers, such as telephone numbers, registration numbers, etc., may be read off as above, or may be separated into groups by the signer, without signs for hundred, thousand, etc., as is the usual case with years: 1959 is signed (19) (59).

#### ORDINALS:

The sign language employs as visible ordinal system only a limited group of numbers (1–9 or 10): The fingers in configuration desired, tips toward viewer, make slight, repeated twisting motions. There is also a second system, used to indicate position on a chart or list, such as a chart of baseball league standings: with fingers in configuration, palm toward signer, finger tips pointing left, the hand moves to the right.

For higher ordinals, these two systems are not used, probably because the movements in these systems, if added to the movements that are elements of all numerals containing more than one digit, would produce awkward combinations. Instead, the ordinal is understood by context or indicated by the addition of a finger-spelled 'th'; spelling for the three lowest ordinals, 'st', 'nd', and 'rd', however, are rarely seen.

#### FRACTIONS:

Simply sign the numerator as shown in the table of numerals, then sign the denominator below the place where the numerator was signed. For decimal fractions, first indicate decimal point by pecking forward with a closed x hand, then sign the numerals sequentially to the right.

#### MONEY:

While there is a sign for 'dollar' in the language, it is often omitted, one to nine dollars being signed by the configuration for the number desired moving quickly from prone to the supine position. 'Cents' is spelled manually, with a few exceptions. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (10) and (25) cents (and the synonyms for the latter three values: nickel, dime, and quarter) are signed by first touching the right part of the forehead with g, palm toward the signer, and then signing the numeral in front of the forehead while the hand maintains the same attitude. One to five cents can also be signed with the fingers already forming the configuration when the thumb tip of manual g touches the forehead.

What's my grade on the second test.

First the bell rang; second the door opened; and then the lights were out.

Fingers 1, 2 in a vertical 'V', the hand makes a quick twist or flick in supination.

Thumb, finger 1 upraised from fist, thumb vertical, the index of other hand touches Finger 1.

The English verb second in a parliamentary context is signed by moving forward the upright forearm, thumb and first finger upraised from the fist. This sign has an interesting antonym: the same configuration swung back (even until the thumb touches the signer's chest or shoulder in some instances) signifies 'I'm next'; or 'I want to follow you'.

Manual spelling and numeration as shown operate in part by static presentation of visibly different configurations, in part by motion. In general the static mode of manual symbolizing seems to be used with symbols themselves fairly well fixed, as letters and numerals are; while the symbolization of relationships, such as the ideas expressed by second, tends to find expression in motion.

1.2. In sign language proper the signs always have a component of motion. In fact the structure of signs is identical with that of the two exceptional letters of the manual alphabet j and z. The nature of the symbolizations, however, is radically different. The essential features of z are that the hand having a certain configuration, in a certain place, makes a certain motion. In the context of other alphabetical symbols this action will symbolize simply the letter 'z'. But when the same configuration, in the same position, is moved in a very slightly different way, the context being signs, the action symbolizes not a letter but the idea expressed in English by the word where.

The sign clearly is, as the morpheme, the smallest unit of the language to which meaning attaches. That is, as the foregoing example shows, the significance resides, not in the configuration, the position, or the movement but in the unique combination of all three. The sign-morpheme, however, unlike the word, is seen to be not sequentially but simultaneously produced. Analysis of the sign cannot be segmented in time order but must be aspectual. The aspects of the sign which appear to have the same order of priority and importance as the segmental phonemes of speech are the aspects of configuration, position or location, and motion.

Other features of sign language appear to operate with these basic aspects in some such way as do pitch, stress, and juncture with the segmental phonemes. One such feature is facial expression already noted above. It seems likely that behavior of the kind classified as kinesic when it accompanies speech (Trager, 1958), may have a more central function in a visual language. That is, the same activity which is kinesic with respect to American English may actually be suprasedgmental, or metaspectral, in sign language. But analysis of these features presents many difficulties, and if the assumption of the writer and his research associates is correct, this analysis will be much more feasible after the analysis of the basic aspects.

Like consonant and vowel, the aspects position, configuration, and motion may only be described in terms of contrast with each other. Position may be signaled by proximity of the moving configuration to a part of the signer's body: a fist moved at the chin, the forehead, and the chest, makes not one, but three distinct signs—'ice cream'; 'Sweden'; 'sorry'. But when the marker is the non-moving hand, position is signaled by configuration of that hand: for example, let the configuration of the moving hand be the index extended, the motion be brushing down or out across the tips of the fingers of the non-moving hand; if the non-moving, position-marking hand has all fingers outstretched one sign is made, 'what'; but if only the little finger is held out, a quite different sign is made, 'last' (for some signers). Configuration is here a feature of both the moving and the marking hand, but it is serving configurationally for the one and positionally for the other.

Similarly the aspect of motion may be observed to be sometimes a change in configuration without movement in space. But a change in configuration will still be motion as determined by the language, because it has the same function structurally as movement through space.

1.21. The aspects of the structure of the sign need more convenient terms than position, configuration, and motion; and it will be as well to avoid the suggestion of mutual exclusiveness these words have in their ordinary uses. Tabula, designator, and signation may be easily shortened to tab, dez, and sig, and we may define them thus:

A tab is that aspect of the unanalyzed visual complex called the sign which by proximity to a part of

the signer's body, by position in space, or by configuration of the non-moving hand signals position as contrasted with dez and sig.

A dez is the configuration of the hand or hands which make a sig in a tab.

A sig is the movement or change in configuration of the dez in an otherwise signaled tab.

1.22. This order: tab, dez, sig, is used throughout this paper. Although it corresponds to no certain time sequence in the occurrence of sign language phenomena, the order adopted permits some nice economics of notation. Like the hundreds, tens, units of decimal numeration, the tab, dez, and sign places permit the same symbol to have more than one denotation. Many of the configurations of the tab hand are identical with those of the dez hand. A three place notation permits the same symbol to be used to stand for either aspect with immediate distinctness. Sig symbols likewise have a different value in tab or dez place. One sign, for example, is the motion of turning the dez in pronation. If a tab or dez differs from another only by the attitude of the hand, a subscript (in this case the symbol for pronation) to the tab or dez symbol will indicate that the configuration is thus presented.

1.3. A number of signs are marked positionally by contact with or proximity to a precise point on the signer's body. Forehead, temple, cheek, ear, eyebrow, eyes, nose, lips, teeth, chin, and neck may be touched, pinched, brushed, struck, or approached by the dez in the making of signs. However, examination of many pairs of signs for minimal contrast indicates that some of these markers are but allochers in complimentary distribution. For example, the forefinger of the dez hand can easily brush the tip of the nose in passing across the front of the face, but when the sig is motion outward from the same region, particularly when the dez is such that the sign is interpreted as 'see', the signer and viewer tend to think of the marker as the eyes. Since no significance attaches to a contrast solely between nose and eyes as tab, these are analyzed as allochers of the tab mid-face. Their selection is determined by dez and sig.

Similar consideration of all the signs observed leads to the isolation of six tabs above the shoulders. The six with the writer's symbols: the whole face or head **O**, the upper face or brow **∩**, mid-face **a**, lower face **∪**, cheek or side face **∫**, and neck **∩**.

The signer's trunk also figures as a tab, but large as this part of the body is relative to the face, it is not divided into smaller regions contrastively, that is chereimically. One or both hands as dez may touch the top of one shoulder with the fingertips (to make the sign 'responsible' or 'responsibilities'). Yet both hands may be placed on the hips (suggesting the kazatsky dancer's attitude and signifying 'Russia'). These two signs use the extreme upper and lower allocheric limits of the tab trunk, but the contrast is all in the dez and sig, and not even the whole distance separating the shoulders from the hips is significant. The trunk tab symbol is [ ].

The non-dez arm makes the tab for some signs. The upper arm is tab for 'hospital', 'Scotland', and the slang expression 'coke'. Its symbol is **∩**. The writer has observed signers occasionally making one or other of these signs as low as the muscle of the forearm, but always in casual, informal circumstances where a colloquial or relaxed manner of speech would be equally congruent.

The arm from the elbow outward is used in a different group of signs—that is, with dez or sign different from those of the signs made on the upper arm. And it is used in three contrasting ways, upraised, prone, or supine. The symbol for the upraised forearm, the elbow making an acute angle, is **✓**. The symbols for the last two of these tabs are the same as those used for the movement of dez in pronation, **∪**, or supination, **a**. Again the aspect is all important. As tab, the symbol **a** denotes the forearm presented supine; as sign the same symbol denotes that the dez is rotated in supination.

In all these arm tabs the hand is ignored by the language; it may be open or closed, tense or relaxed depending on the signer's habit of signing, his state of mind, or muscle tone. But there are other signs with tabs signaled by the hand opposite to the dez hand in which configuration is the only important consideration. As configurations, these tabs differ not at all from dez configurations. The different is in their use: when the hand having the configuration moves or changes, it is acting as dez; when it acts as point of origin or termination of motion or otherwise marks position, it is acting as tab. Any of the configurations used as a tab may also be used as a dez, but not all dez configurations are used as tabs.

1.40. When the visual aspect of 'position', that is the tab chereme, is marked neither by a precise anatomical point nor by difference in attitude, the sole determinant of position is the hand's configuration. As stated in 1.1 nineteen configurations are used to represent letters in the American manual alphabet. All of these and more might be used as structure points in sign language, but actually only sixteen configurations are used contrastively. However, the number of distinct configurations (allochers) which may be observed is limited only by the criteria of difference the observe wishes to adopt.

The differentiating kind of analysis, analogous to phonetics, has never been attempted for sign language. But it is quite obvious that the phenomena of the language could be thus treated were there any need for doing so. The visible phenomena of sign language need be no more limited in variety than the phonetic phenomena of speech. The findings of clinical psychology would seem to indicate that the sense of sight could discriminate more differences than the sense of hearing. But the activity is language, not vision, and that economy noted in all cultural activity operates here. Moreover, for the sign language, analysis is only beginning, while vast amounts of data have been collected and extremely fine techniques of discrimination have been employed in phonetic analysis.

At this time an extensive description of the configurational data is not needed, for the operating principles of phonemic systems are well established. It is not the absolute value, the precise curvature or direction of a finger that determines the structure point, but the fact that each structure point is one of a set of such points treated as different from the others in the set by all users of the language.

The configurational structure points of the American sign language are parts of a primary symbol system which has linguistic structure and so are not equivalent to the configurations of the manual alphabet, a secondary graphemic system. Although both are made visually perceptible by the hand, their relationship has some features of the relationship of the phonemes of one language to the graphemes of the writing system of another language. If this non-congruence of configuration cheremes and alphabetic configurations is kept in mind, we may for convenience still make use of letter symbols to represent the cheremes of the sign language.

1.401. In the American manual alphabet a, s, and t are all represented by a fist, the thumb respectively lying alongside the closed fingers, clasping them, or thrusting between the index and second finger. It is apparent that conditions of visibility must be good for these differences of configuration to be distinguished. The sign language, however, never makes a significant contrast solely on these differences. Instead the contrast is between any fist-like hand and all other (non-fist-like) configurations. Hands looking like a, s, and t will be observed to pattern, however, in allocheric ways. For example the tab and sig of 'sorry' select an a-hand as the usual dez allocher; but the tab and sign of 'other' select the a-allocher; and some signers may use t-allocher in 'try'. The one symbol 'A' would suffice for the first chereme, but convenience of transcribing and reading suggests a closer notation here as in some other cases to indicate allochers in complementary distribution; therefore we label this chereme: A/S, using the S when the allocher of the fist-like chereme is closer to the s-hand of the manual alphabet. The symbol A<sub>t</sub> may be used if it is desired to note the occurrence of the 't'-like allocher of the fist chereme.

1.402. The flat hand is the second chereme in our arbitrary ordering. It has allochers resembling the b-hand of the manual alphabet: the hand is a prolongation of the wrist or is slightly bent back to display the palm, the fingers together and parallel, and the thumb bent across the palm. The sign language hand may however appear more similar to the 4-hand of one system of manual numeration in conventional use: this is the same as b except that the four fingers are spread. It may be quite like the 5-hand, thumb and fingers spread tensely or loosely. And finally it may be combine b and 5 by keeping the fingers closed, but the thumb extended. This we label the B/5 chereme, using B for its close, and 5 for its spread forms; also B for dez when the sig requires palmar contact, 5 for dez when sign calls for thumb contact.

1.403. It will be disturbing at first for one familiar with the manual alphabet to see the c and o hands equated; but in signing, as distinguished from spelling, the recorded and observed data leaves no doubt that the sign language does not take the difference as cheremic. Both configurations make a curve, fingers joined and thumb opposed. Symbols: C, C<sub>#</sub> (#, 'close'; see 1.54).

The allocheric forms of this configuration chereme might be described as the shapes the hand would assume in grasping balls of different sizes. Picking up a grapefruit would require a 'c'-like configuration. A smaller diameter sphere would let thumb and fingers meet as in spelling o.

1.404. The E chereme is used in relatively few signs, and might perhaps be treated as a tense, retracted allocher 'C'. Its basic form is the right closing of the fingers and thumb against the palm; in one form the nails of the aligned fingers rest on the edge of the first joint of the thumb, in another a space separates thumb and fingers, in still another the first two fingers rest on the thumb and the other two fingers are curled into the palm. Its use in such frequently occurring signs on the Gallaudet campus as 'Europe', 'street-car', 'emperor' and the 'name-sign' for President Leonard M. Elstad give it the status of a chereme at least in the Gallaudet College dialect of the American sign language.

1.405. The chereme: 'F' is clear-cut and easy of isolation, not because it shows any lack of variant forms, but because none of those resemble allochers of other cheremes. 'F' is characterized by the joining of thumb and index finger at the tips or by crossing the thumb over the bent index, with the other three fingers extended.

1.406. The pointed index, as would be expected, is frequently used as tab and dez. The forms of this chereme may be close to the manual alphabet's g, index projecting from the fist; or to its d, index raised, second finger and thumb touching at tips; or to its l, thumb and index extended from the otherwise closed hand. The symbol adopted for this chereme is 'G', though occasionally in transcription 'D' may be used to show the allocher resembling the finger-spelled d.

1.407. The index and second fingers extended side by side and touching from the clasped hand also make a distinctive configuration which furnishes the manual alphabet three symbols u, n, and h; but here the difference in the two systems is immediately apparent. Various presented, pointed up, down, and to the side, the alphabetic configuration is read as three different letter symbols. But sign language uses motion as well as configuration significantly, so that once the hand is moved, this three-way distinction is lost; the three different symbols become one dez, which has meaning

only in association with a tab and sign used with it. The symbol 'H' is used for this chereme.

1.408. The little finger extended from the fist makes a configuration not easily mistaken for another, although when the thumb is lax or separated it may look like the manual alphabet y. This chereme, designated 'I', is used in many frequently occurring signs as dez and in a few as tab.

1.409. The configuration used for k in the manual alphabet actually resembles a Roman letter 'K' (when made on the left hand and viewed from the thumb side). The index finger forms the back, the second finger the upper limb and the thumb the lower. With the hand retracted in pronation the letter p is represented by the same configuration in finger-spelling. As with the 'H' described above, the cheremic ue of this configuration is quite unlike its alphabetic, and the symbol 'K' is used for its cheremic employment.

1.410. The 'L' chereme formed by making a right angle with thumb and index finger, the other fingers closed, may have forms appearing identical with some allochers of 'G'. However the dez and sign (when 'L' is tab) make clear the essential features of the 'L' are the angle between thumb and finger, or its digital duality, while the essence of 'G' is its pointing, or its singularity.

1.411. The bent hand chereme is essentially a dihedral angle at the knuckles. Made with three or four fingers, with thumb folded, across palm, along hand, or extended, this group of configurations clearly contrasts both with the flat hand, 'B', with the curved hand, 'C', and with the two joined fingers of 'H' in its bent allocher. The allochers of the bent hand are all more or less similar to the various individual forms of the manual alphabet m; hence the symbol, 'M'.

1.412. The crossing of the first two fingers is a distinction configuration permitting only the variations occasioned by the individual signer's bone and joint strictures. This is the r of the American manual alphabet (x in the Swedish system of finger-spelling, CGC) and since it serves as dez in only a few signs, and those obviously related to its alphabetic use (e.g. 'rule', 'reason', 'right', 'ready') it is likely to be a fairly recent addition to the dez list. The symbol for it is 'R'.

1.413. The v of the alphabet gives us the next configuration, which is the V-for-Victory made famous by Winston Churchill. But while the sign 'visit' is an

obvious alphabetic coinage, unlike the 'R', this configuration, 'V', figures in a great many signs with no alphabetic origins. It might be thought to represent the eyes or light rays as the dez in 'read' or 'see'; its use seems quite arbitrary in 'mean', 'purpose', and 'mis-understand'; the intersection of the fingers of this configuration is the point of origin when it is tab in 'begin'; but its obvious duality is apparent in the dez of 'double' or 'twice'.

1.415. The bent forefinger raised hookwise from the fist is one of the allochers of the 'X' chereme. Another, frequently seen, is formed by bringing the tips of the index finger and thumb together so that the loop thus formed projects from the fist. These two appear to be in free variation. There is another allocher in complementary distribution. When the sig calls for a flicked or snapped opening of this dez it is formed by momentarily trapping the thumb nail under the bent forefinger.

1.416. The last of the manual cheremes is 'Y', most commonly seen as thumb and little finger projected oppositely from the fist, but the three fingers between may also be loosely held or even barely bent. A very different looking allocher of 'Y' is formed when the spread hand has the middle finger bent in from the knuckle. See 'morphocheremic change' below.

Two other formations are observed to be used as allochers of 'Y'. The first described 'Y', with the index also extended, is seen along with statistically more normal 'Y' as dez of 'airplane' and 'fly in an airplane'. And a configuration not in the American manual alphabet, though it is the h in Australian finger-spelling, appears in some signs. This is formed by keeping the index and little fingers upright from the hand while the other fingers and thumb close.

1.42. One most important tab remains to be considered. When no overt signal of position is made, when the sig does not require the dez to move toward or away from any specific body part, when the dez is in a neutral position in front of the signer's body, when the position is a natural or comfortable one for holding and moving that dez, then the tab is 'neutral' or 'zero'. The symbol used is **0**; but when the whole sign is written it is equally clear and easier to show this tab of a great many very frequently used signs by leaving the tab column blank.

1.5. The motional aspect of the sign would present a bewildering maze of movement were it not possible to

apply to this visual system the clearly formulated methods of modern structural linguistics. Operating for each user of the language, in the midst of an almost infinite variety of movement, is the principle of significant contrast.

1.51. Circular motion, for example, may be large or small, may lie in any plane the signer's anatomical limitations permit, may be interrupted or complete; but none of these variations is called upon to carry the primary burden of significance. When a configuration of the non-dez had is tab, the dez circles it as center, the plane of that circle being vertical and perpendicular to the frontal plane of the signer's body. When the tab is zero or neutral, the circling movement is made in a plane convenient to the dez configuration. When the tab is some other part of the body, it serves as center for the circular sig. But these are aspects of a more or less simultaneous action, and it may be as illuminating to say that the center of the circle which the dez describes serves to locate the tab. The symbol for the circular movement sig is @.

1.52. Some of the other movements of sign language behavior can be reduced to motion essentially vertical, side to side, and to and from. The exactitude with which these approximate directions coincide with the coordinates of three dimensional space is immaterial. Polarity is important, and in some signs the opposite direction of sig motion is used to make a pair of antonyms: 'borrow' and 'lend' differ in sig only, the motion being respectively toward the signer and away. But both directions may combine in the sig of other signs, as in 'explain' where the dez moves to and fro.

Each of the three ways of using the sig requires a symbol:

"^" up	}
"v" down	} vertical sig
"~" up and down	}
">" right	}
"<" left	} lateral sig
"z" right and left	}
"T" toward	}
"I" away	} to and fro sig
"H" to and fro	}


1.53. A similar three-way use is characteristic of the rotation of the forearm. Supination is symbolized by **a**, pronation by **b**, and both, or 'twisting', by **o**.

These twelve symbols, or four kinds of contrastive motion, with the circle, constitute the grosser sig movements, those made with elbow or shoulder as fulcrum.

1.54. Two smaller movements using the wrist as fulcrum are the nod or carpal motion, symbolized **Ⓝ**, and the open-close, or foral motion, in which the hand spreads or contracts changing configuration. Symbols: #, close; **Ⓜ**, open.

A still smaller motion is digital, a wiggle of the fingers from the knuckles, which is symbolized **Ⓛ**.

1.55. The sigs so far described are all motions of the dez seen as moving freely, the nature of its movement determined by the muscles and joints involved. A second class of sigs is characterized by interaction between dez and tab. This includes approach, touching, crossing, entrance, joining, and grazing, as well as action in some ways opposite: separation and interchange. These are symbolized as follows:



## 2. Morphocheremics

2.0. If every sign of this sign language were simply composed of a tab, a dez, and a sig, the morpheme list of the language could be simply determined by the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{no. of tabs} \times \text{no. of dez} \times \text{no. of sigs} \\ &= \text{no. of morphemes.} \end{aligned}$$

But there are several different patterns of sign formation, not to mention compound signs and contractions; and the language in true linguistic fashion allows certain combinations of elements and not others. That is to say, the structure of morphemes in the system is not mathematical or mechanical but linguistic, and this level of organization truly constitutes the morphocheremics of the language.

2.1. When the tab is zero the dez is free to make any of the sigs except those of interaction with a tab. These signs cannot, however, be considered tab-less because

every sig is defined as motion of some dez somewhere; and also by definition the 'somewhat', however signaled, is the tab. The zero tab is less precisely located than the others but it is still a place, that space in front of the signer's body, where the hand can freely and comfortably move.

2.2. The tabs signaled by parts of the body are more or less precisely located depending on whether the sig calls for contact by the dez or only motion in their vicinity (Some older informants and a 1911 motion picture of a sign language rendering of Lincoln's 'Gettysburg Address' indicate that body tabs were never actually touched in formal signing. CGC). With body tabs any dez may be used and the following single sigs: circle, approach, touch, and graze. Sig clusters are also found: circle followed by touch; touch and motion up, down, or away; touch and wiggle; and touch and circle (rubbing). There are even some triple clusters: touch, right and wiggle as in 'dream'; and touch, close, and up, 'because'. One or two apparent quadruple sig clusters are perhaps better analyzed as compound signs.

2.21. Another most important morphocheremic feature of the language may be an example of shift. The practice of some signers, particularly those taken as paragons of usage by many, is to make the tab clearly visible in such a sign as 'see'. Both by approaching the mid-face (really eyes) closely, and by pausing perceptibly between this indication of the tab and the outward motion of the sig these signers achieve a 'classical', 'formal', or 'pure' style of signing much admired but not always followed by a younger generation of sign users. The informal or colloquial style of these latter signers, however, sometimes seems to indicate a structural more than a stylistic change.

The writer would analyze the 'classical' sign for 'see' as mid-face tab, **v**-dez, and (particularly the platform articulation of the sign) approach sig, followed by outward movement sig: in symbols, **ⓧvⓧ**. The much more frequently occurring, informal, or perhaps more recent, sign is composed of zero tab, **v**-dez, and outward sig: **ⓧv+** or **v+**. Apparently signs in very frequent use, sufficiently distinct in dez dez and sig from other signs, tend to shift from a body tab to zero tab. 'Know', to take another example, is formally, or in older signers'

idiolects, upper face tab, flat hand dez, and touch sig:  $\sim B^*$ ; but a form often seen is flat hand dez, upward sign, in zero tab:  $B_a^\wedge$ .

2.3. With configuration of one hand as tab and the same or another configuration of the other hand as dez, the sigs are the interagent motions, or are clusters of sigs beginning with one of these, with separation, linear motion, or interchange as the terminal chereme.

2.4. At this point the aspects of the sign, tab, dez, and sig need to be more precisely defined. These aspects are but ways of looking at phenomena, which to its users is unitary. A sign is the basic unit of the language to the signers, just as the word is the basic unit to the naïve speaker. The original definitions of tab, dez, and sig permit such classifications of the structure of signs as the foregoing: but when two hands are in use, there may be difficulty in deciding whether one had is tab and the other dez or both hands are a double dez in zero tab. This area of doubt can be narrowed by a decision to call one hand the tab when its motion is negligible or minor compared to that of the other hand; and to call both a double dez when they move parallel, symmetrically, or oppositely. The tab-dez analysis seems more likely when the configurations of the hands differ. The double dez is indicated when both are the same; but as some signers make it, the sign 'show' is of the latter kind: the flat hand, B, and the index hand, G, meet directly in front of the breastbone and move forward together, the fingertip pressed into the other palm:  $BG^{* \updownarrow}$ . However, others hold up the B, palm outward, touch its palm with the other hand's G and press it forward. With respect to the touching sig the B is tab and G dez, but with respect to the outward sig the hands together become dez, pushing forward. This might be written cheremically:  $BG^{* \leftarrow \rightarrow}$ , with the parentheses to show that the hands in contact now act as dez performing the second sig.

The double dez, identically configured, in tab zero often requires another symbol, which though written in (second or third) sig place is a morphocheremc, not a cheremic symbol. This is the symbol,  $\sim$ , for alternating movement of the hands of the double dez.

The F-hands held about six inches apart and moved downward,  $FF^\vee$ , make the sign which renders English 'decide' or 'decision'. The same double dez moved alternately up and down,  $FF^{\sim}$ , makes the

sign for 'if' or 'judge'; and again moved alternately to and fro,  $FF^{\sim}$ , this double dez makes the sign translated 'explain'.

The double dez hands may operate first as if they were tab and dez with an interagent sig, then move. Such a sign is 'habit', the tab zero, dez (double) the fist, first sign cross, and second sig downward,  $AA^\dagger^\vee$ . Another example is 'slavery',  $AA^\dagger^z$ . A sign similar in structure shows the use of another morphocheremic symbol, the dot, to indicate repetition of a sig or sigs. With the same double dez the sign 'work' repeats its sig so that the wrists touch twice,  $AA^\dagger$ . Some signers are careful to touch the insides of the wrists together. This formation of the sign would be written:  $A_a A^\dagger$ . It is not necessary to show that the second A is prone, as knuckles-upward is the normal way of holding the cheremic fist.

2.51. The common structuring of physical behavior of many kinds by the left-right opposition is completely superseded by the tab-dez and other contrasts of the sign language. Generally the right-handed person will use his right hand for dez, left for tab, when a hand tab is required; but he may reverse this at will. Fatigue, visibility determined by relative positions of signer and viewer or by direction of light source, and as yet undiscovered favors may occasion the right-handed person's use of left hand as dez. Since, however, there is no morphophonemic significance attached to right-handedness, some signers utilize the right-left opposition for rhetorical purposes. The allocation of right and left hand to two characters in a signed anecdote, for instance, may be most effective, not only for the separation which English pronouns cannot easily accomplish but also more graphically. One may imagine the right hand dez as one person of the story and its sig as his action. If the sign is 'hit' the left hand tab may be imagined momentarily to symbolize the other person as object, suffering the action; the action of the right fist in striking the left palm thus gains graphic physical force and effect in addition to its arbitrary linguistic denotation.

In the writing system employed in this study the dez symbol will be read as right hand, and the tab, if it is a configuration of the hand, as left. In transcribing signs as they are observed, a reversal of hands that seems important will be indicated thus:  $\text{Я} \text{Q} \text{A}^a$ . This would be 'other' made with the left hand, the first

rotated in supination, but, because it is left-handed, the motion to the signer's left.

2.52. Just as body-tab signs in frequent use may become zero-tab signs, two handed or double dez signs in zero tab may become one-handed. Three such signs in very frequent use are examples of three different kinds: 'what?' is, made with a (left) hand tab; 'why?' with a body tab; and 'how?' in zero tab, with double dez. The formal or standard forms of these are written: **BG**, **Y**, and **MM**. But in colloquial use they may appear thus: 'what?' **G** (with the dot above the sig symbol to indicate a staccato movement); 'why?' **Y** (the 'wiggle' sig shows that the allocher of 'Y' is the one with which a wiggle is possible, the spread hand with one or more of the medial fingers bent inward); and 'how?' **M**.

The one-handed form of signs of which 'how' and 'what' are representative examples may be selected for other reasons than those, which determine whether a situation is formal or informal. One of the signer's hands may be occupied in a way that has nothing to do with the act of communication except that it will be apparent to both parties that two handed signing is impossible or inconvenient, and therefore allowance made. The signs used as examples above are questions, so that is may happen that the signer's other hand will be extended beyond the zero tab space even to the limits of interpersonal distance and there as an index be admonishing or fixing the person questioned, or by grasping a lapel, wrist, or arm be imploring or extorting; that is, one hand may be paralinguistically (to sign language) or kinetically used while the other makes the strictly linguistic symbol.

Again, the signer may have a rhetorical use for the non-signing hand. The left hand may hold a dez used in a sign for naming a person or object while the right hand alone 'says something' perhaps about what another person did to the first. Some of the signs in this recital will be one-handed anyway and some will have body tabs. In this context a sign or two which should have a hand tab or a double dez will be understood perfectly, though the left hand is still marking an element of previous discourse.

There is still another factor to be considered in the occurrence of one-handed signs which were formerly, or are formally, made with two hands. Economy of effort as

a principle of language change will always be checked by need for ready intelligibility. As was noted above in connection with shift from body tab to zero tab, the dez and sig may be sufficient to distinguish a sign from others; but is quite possible that signers without being aware of doing so tend to drop some of the distinguishing features of a sign when its contexts alone, or syntactic distribution, would suffice or almost suffice to determine it. This is not simply the counterpart of the '\*\*\* \*\*', said I' of *Tristram Shandy* although both are cases of visible symbols; but it has the features of the processes by which languages come to tolerate numbers of homonyms which formerly were distinct phonemically.

2.6. Although the typical signer, like a speaker of any language, may appear to be quite conservative about neologisms, there is evidence of rapid and widespread change in the two hundred years since the sign language was recognized, used in teaching, and partially recorded. The difference between the methodical signs in Sicard's *Theroie* (1808) and the signs now in use in the United States is large, but still apparently evolutionary. But even in the sign data observed in this study there is evidence of structural change. This is nowhere more apparent than in the language's treatment of signs which may be termed compounds and contractions.

The principle of the methodical or consciously invented sign, as noted in the Introduction is multiple signaling of structural and semantic information. A base sign for the lexical meaning would be followed by signals for designating the part of speech, number, gender, degree, etc. Detailed historical studies are so far only in the planning stage, but it seems reasonable to suppose that the methodical signs underwent considerable change as they moved from the text-book and the systematic course in French grammar into the colloquial language. There are many signs now in use which show this kind of origin and presumably many more not obviously so derived will be found to have some from the same source. A direct link between the French methodical signs and the signs used in the United States is the preservation in manuals by Long, Higgins, and others of traditional etymologies. In addition the American sign language has or had until recently a large toleration for compound or complex signs—which all the methodical signs had to be.

2.61. As described and illustrated in the manuals, 'brother' is signed 'man-same'; that is, the signer makes the sign for 'man' and immediately follows it with the sign for 'alike' or 'same':  $\sim M^{*} \uparrow / G_{2} G_{2}^{*}$ . 'Son' is signed, according to the same sources, as 'man-baby':  $\sim M^{*} \uparrow / a a^{*} z$  (the supine arms are laid together and the mimed baby is rocked). 'Father' is 'man-generation before':  $\sim M^{*} \uparrow / B B_{2} \wedge$ . 'Lady', according to the manuals, is 'woman-polite':  $\} A^{*} / [15]^{*}$ .

All these signs are true compounds in the terminology of this paper. Each one is not only treated syntactically as a single sign but is often accompanied in simultaneous utterance by speaking the single English word equivalent in meaning. Although each element of the compound is complete with tab, dez, and sig of its own, the elements form a syntactic and semantic unit. But these are 'classical' signs, their form defined, their etymology recorded, and their meaning translated in one or more manuals. They are also to be observed still in use by some signers, particularly in lectures, sermons and prayers, or from chair and floor in formal meetings. In colloquial use they have changed. The first, 'brother', is least changed; the tab of the second element may appear in readiness even as the first element is signed. The others show more clearly the process of contraction. 'Son' becomes  $\sim M^{*} \uparrow a$ ; that is the right hand dez closes thumb to fingers at the brow and turns in supination as it descends. All this is done by the hand in a continuous, smooth motion; the supination and descent component of the motion are all that remain of the sign 'baby'.

The sign for 'father' is still more changed in contraction. The tab is still upper face, but the dez may be the spread hand, '5', or a loosely held fist, 'A', which opens to the '5'. The sigs then are touch and wiggle or touch and open:  $\sim 5^{*} \uparrow$ ; or  $\sim A^{*} \square$  (the point of contact in both cases being the thumb). This and an analogous contraction, 'mother',  $\sim A^{*} \square$ , or  $\sim 5^{*} \uparrow$ , in turn give a new (colloquial) compound, 'parents':  $\sim A^{*} \square / \sim A^{*} \square$ .

Another contraction is the colloquial 'lady', which incidentally seems to have the same kind of distribution with 'woman' in class dialects, as do the two words in English. The sign for 'lady' as it is usually seen is written in our symbols:  $\} [15] \downarrow$ ; the thumb of the spread hand brushes the chin as it moves downward to

touch the breastbone or collarbone. Here we have a different kind of sign from the other contractions. In 'son', colloquial, the sigs of the contraction combine parts of the sigs of both elements, while tab and dez remain those of the first element. In 'father' and 'mother' the dez is either from the second element, the spread hand, or from the first element of 'mother', the thumb-up 'A'. The tab comes from the first, although the chin, not the cheek is actually grazed in 'mother', and the sig is a new motion which suggests or combines in a way both original sigs. In 'lady', however, there are actually two tabs. While some signers may make the sign so as to miss grazing the chin with the thumb, the tab is still there for the user of the language; and this sign with its downward motion from the face region will still contrast with 'fine' or 'polite' in which the 5-dez moves directly, and often from below, to its point of contact on the breastbone. Whether the graze on the chin is real or apparent, the first tab is definitely signaled and  $\} [15] \downarrow^{*}$  or  $\} [15] \downarrow^{*}$  are correct transcriptions, not  $\} 5 \downarrow^{*}$ .

2.62. Another example of compounding and contraction will illustrate the morphophonemic change the Y-dez may undergo. The sign for the color yellow<sup>1</sup> is the same in colloquial and formal signing. The  $\underline{y}$  configuration of the right hand is given a twisting shake in zero tab:  $Y^{\omega}$ . 'Gold', for which the traditional etymology is 'earring-yellow', is formally a pinch on the ear lobe followed by the sign for yellow:  $\} X^{*} : Y^{\omega}$ . This sign also has the metonymic meaning 'California', and the most frequently observed form of it is a contraction in which the chereme Y has a configuration quite unlike  $\underline{y}$  in appearance. 'California colloquially is signed:  $\} Y^{*} \uparrow \omega$ . Although shown with three symbols, the sig motion is continuous because the dez configuration permits the touch even as the hand is moving forward and twisting. The Y-dez in this sign and many others has the allocheric configuration of spread hand with only the middle finger bent. The tip of the middle finger can thus be used for contact sigs in a way the more nearly  $\underline{y}$ -like allocher cannot.

2.7. The choice to analyze the phenomena just discussed as the result of compounding and contractive tendencies or processes to some extent rules out the treatment of such partials as the touched or grazed upper face and lower face tabs as prefix morphemes

which simply add the motion ‘male’ or ‘female’ respectively to a base morpheme. The treatment of the cheremes in the compound-contractions already examined is too various, and there are not anywhere near enough other evidences of a prefix-base structure.

However, the contrast between brow and lower cheek, tabs for so many signs which have ‘man’ and ‘woman’ as part of their semantic content, is enough to make two distinct signs for ‘cousin’ in the language. The dez is C, the hand a little more in pronation than for spelling c. The sig is @, a small circular motion, with or without slight contact with tab. This dez and sig at the brow and at the cheek or jaw make respectively ‘male-cousin’ and ‘female-cousin’. ‘Nephew’ and ‘niece’ use the same sig and the same two tabs, but their dez is **H**, the n of the manual alphabet.

2.8. Before discussing the fairly large class of initial-dez signs, of which the foregoing are examples, a few remarks may be made in summary. Morphophonemic change such as the English word ‘knife’ shows, the final phoneme appearing as /f/ or /v/ according to morphemic structuring, has a counterpart in sign language; the M-dez of ‘man’ and ‘brother’ becoming the 5-dez of ‘father’ and ‘grandfather’. Likewise the **3**-tab of ‘woman’ becomes the **v**-tab of ‘lady’. Prefix morphemes are not a fixture of the morpheme pattern, but compounding and contraction with concomitant morphocheremic change of several kinds are. Only one true suffix appears to operate; it is almost precisely analogous to the agentive suffix /-ər/ in English.

The sign for ‘body’ is made by dropping the flat or bent hands down along the sides of the body: tab [ ], double dez BB or MM, and sig **v** or **+**. The signs for ‘individual’ and ‘person’ are similar: **BB<sup>v</sup>**, and **KK<sup>v</sup>** or **KK<sup>?</sup>**; made a little out from the body, they may be taken as zero tab signs. The suffix sign, which will make ‘teacher’ of ‘teach’, ‘student’ of ‘learn’, ‘cook’, n. of ‘cook’, v, etc. is perhaps more nearly the zero-tab, **BB<sup>v</sup>**, but rapid signing and individual differences (allocheric as well as stylistic) make it hard to determine whether the suffix signed alone would be the sign for ‘individual’ or ‘body’. Some of the manuals describe the agent-noun as signed by base sign plus ‘body sign’. It seems likely that this sign, of French origin, may have developed into two by exploiting the trunk-zero tab contrast. For what it is worth, the jesting comment of an

informant may be added. He chided the writer for being introverted because he made the suffix sign with M-dez instead of B.

2.9. The use of a configuration for the initial letter of the word which most often translates the sign is a clear indication of a borrowing by the sign language from another language, but it cannot be taken as an indication of date. As noted (2.62) the French sign vocabulary of the nineteenth century used this principle for color signs, and l’Épée’s and Sicard’s methods, using both ‘natural’ signs and hand alphabet led to other ‘initialed-sign’. Sometimes the change from a French to an English environment brought a systematic revision: V-dez to G-dez for ‘green’, etc. However, the dez of the sign now in use may preserve a forgotten French borrowing: ‘stupid’, **^A<sup>x</sup>**, perhaps for ‘asine’.

The important points about this kind of sign formation, borrowing, or coinage are 1) that it does not argue a simple subordination of the one language to the other as the hand alphabet is subordinate to the graphemic system; 2) that a sign formed in this way may often be one of a group with related meanings and similar structure, as with ‘cousin’, ‘nephew’, ‘uncle’, ‘aunt’, or ‘law’, ‘rule’, and ‘principle’: **BL<sup>x</sup>**, **BR<sup>x</sup>**, **BK<sup>x</sup>**; and 3) that although as old as l’Épée, it is still a living principle of formation. Additions to the lexicon of the language by this means are not a fair indication of its use, as local groups of signers find it most useful for making place and personal names into signs, but only some of these achieve general currency, for example **C<sup>o</sup>**, ‘Chicago’; **K<sup>o</sup>**, ‘Philadelphia’, – (the **o** to show an abrupt arc, a **?**-shaped movement).

Such signs, especially those using zero tab, might be considered as abbreviations of the finger-spelled word. As a matter of fact that way of analyzing them will be as good as the cheremic when they are being considered as units in utterance. As has been remarked the sign language sentence is about equally tolerant of finger-spelled words and signs proper. The difference is analysis is important, though, when the sign or word itself is being examined, and the difference in motion—in signs significant, in spelling not so—is enough to show a different order of structure. Signing and spelling are also distinguished by their treatment of space or position. Although finger-spelling may be said to occur in the region we call zero tab, only **j** and **z** are structurally

like signs. And while some initial signs have zero as tab, others may have a body or configuration tab. In order words they structure exactly like signs.

### 3. Morphemics

3.0. Once the outlines of the cheremic system have been established and the patterning of cheremes into signs has been explored, a way is open to morphology proper, including syntax. Having described a sign cheremically or morphocheremically, the investigator may go to stretches of unanalyzed utterance and look for recurrent patterns. One of the first features to emerge from such investigation is that on the syntactic level other signals than the aspectual cheremes are operating. The analogy with the superfixes and intonation patterns of English (Trager and Smith, 1951) is not necessarily exact; but there is a clear indication that here in sign language a different level of structure has been reached.

3.1. A striking example of similarity with a significant difference is to be found in an extensive conversation (several hundred frames of 16 mm film taken at a film speed of 48 fps) among the project's filmed data. The two informants are discussing a trip taken a year before. Their face and bodily attitudes, though relaxed, show much interest and animation in recollecting various details of the experience. The general pattern of the conversation is that one signer recalls an episode and begins or concludes his narrative with the sign 'remember'. The other replies with 'remember', and goes on to relate something he connects with the episode, perhaps concluding also with 'remember'. And so back to the first for several such exchanges.

The form of the sign 'remember' both use is not the formal or isolated one a teacher-informant might give:  $\overset{\sim}{B}^{*v}AA^x$ , which is composed sign made from 'know' and 'seal'. Instead they use the colloquial sign  $A A^v^x$ . (The right fist moves downward in an arc, finishing with the ball of the thumb pressed on the nail of the left thumb. Most likely the arc-downward sig, which may actually cross in front of the face, is a vestige of the first element of the compound.) But while both informants in the filmed sequence use this colloquial form of the sign, both use it in ways which visibly

contrast, and the order of the sign in each utterance is not the determining factor. To clarify the discussion, let us make an anticipatory jump and say that one of the two uses is equivalent to the English sentence,  ${}^2Re{}^3m\acute{e}m\ ber{}^{\#}ll$ ; and the other to  ${}^3\hat{i} {}^2re{}^3m\acute{e}m\ ber{}^{\#}$ . The double-cross terminated form is always used in a response-like way, at the beginning of a signer's utterance; but the double-bar form, question-like, may occur at the beginning or the end.

Differentiating these appearances of the sign  $A A^v^x$  is a kind of activity which would be termed kinesic, if it accompanied speech, but here it must be linguistic in a strict sense because it operates to distinguish morphemes which are identical cheremically, yet syntactically in sharp contrast.

The sign 'remember' is signed with the hands identically by both informants, but the portion of the utterance equivalent to 'Remember?' or  ${}^2Re{}^3m\acute{e}m\ ber{}^{\#}ll$  is a combination of the sign with a distinctive 'look'. The signer looks directly at the person asked and slightly opens his face, that is, his eyebrows raise as his chin lowers. There may also be a slight jerk of the head backward.

The portion of the utterance, however, which equates with: 'Yes, I remember'; or 'I remember'; or . . .  ${}^2re{}^3m\acute{e}m\ ber{}^{\#}$ , consists of the sign accompanied by or even slightly preceded by a slight lowering of the eyes, or a tiny and downward, or both these minute eye and head movements.

The slightness of these movements cannot be over-emphasized. They are small and quickly done and stubbornly remained outside the writer's conscious observation until attention was focused on them by the problem of the two 'remembers'. Of kinesic behavior Birdwhistell (1952) notes that the time for signal and for response may be of the order of 1/10 second; and in conversation with the writer (1957) hazarded a guess that the deaf, communicating entirely through vision, might actually signal and respond in this fashion with a speed and prolixity beyond the ability of the untrained hearing person.

3.2. The writer is aware that the deaf are sometimes popularly supposed or even seriously said to exaggerate facial expression. Here is Tomkins trying to make status for the Indian sign language by disparaging the users of the sign language which may have supplied

a large part of the other system's lexicon: 'The deaf use a great deal of facial contortion and grimace' (1958, p. 8). This is not even as accurate as a charge an Italian might make that 'the English use a great many consonant clusters and splutter'. The latter statement contains a partial truth about the phonological structure of a language, but any truth the former has is confined to observation of the style of 'speech' of atypical users of the language. Attempts to teach articulation in the past sometimes led to strange or contorted facial movements, but speech therapists of today are as careful to teach 'normal' appearance as right pronunciation to their deaf pupils. The filmed data as well as all the communication behavior observed at Gallaudet College confirms the conclusion that the kinesic behavior of the educated deaf in American culture is nowhere sharply separated from the cultural norms. Indeed the dramatic productions of the college (presented entirely in sign language with a spoken translation read in approximate synchronization for the non-deaf) have shown large audiences that the appearance made by signers is not only 'normal' and pleasing but intensely and effectively dramatic as might be expected when both dialogue and action are visibly expressed in the body of the actor.

3.3. In this visual language system, facial activity need not all be employed on one level. The eye lowering and head dip that signify the response, not the question, function of 'remember' are on the order of 'suprasegmental' signals. But in one or two occurrences of the response use there is a smile visible for about the same time that the dip and the sig require. This smile which clearly indicates that the signer's memory is pleasant, even ecstatic, would seem to be paralinguistic with respect to the sign language. Its presence is not called for each time the sign itself is used response-wise, so that it has not the linguistic status of the head-eye dip; but its physical structure keeps it much closer to the visual linguistic activity than kinesthetic activity is to speech. However, considered by itself this level of visual behavior would seem to be very like kinesics in structure and 'meaning', as it is perhaps the closest communication link between the deaf and the hearing.

This part of the communication of the deaf, that is both the dip and the smile kind of activity, needs much more investigation; for it is the key to syntactical

structure. Moreover, it is perhaps a very large part of what the earlier students termed 'the natural sign language'. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet (*Annals*, 1847) writes of an experiment in this vein. Without using hands at all he 'signed' a story to a class in The American School. One way suppose that this successful communication is the close counterpart of the game that the linguistically curious play by applying stress, pitch, and juncture to a continuous and unvarying vocalization, a hum say, even carrying on fairly intelligible conversations in this way.

3.4. Having found that some of this visible activity has patterned syntactical uses, the writer looked back over much of the data and in retrospect reexamined many remembered sign language utterances. Many questions besides 'Remember?' were signed simply by the 'questioning look' with a sign. Another way of asking a question also appears, which is more formal and less frequent; that is 'making a question mark': the index hand draws the shape of the punctuation mark, or the finger crooks and straightens with a thrust,  $G^{(?)}$ , or  $G^{# \dot{p}}$ . This question mark sign permits an English question sentence order, and indeed that order and sign are most often observed in simultaneous English-Sign use, especially in lecture or faculty meeting situations. The facially signaled question will often have a genuine sign language word order.

For example an informant on film signs:

$\circ F^{xxx} \quad f-o-r-d \quad \sim M^{# \wedge} \quad AA^{~~} \sim$

Word-for-sign this is

'pontiac' 'ford' 'better' 'which'.

He makes it a question by the 'look' that means question to anyone in our culture. If we show that look symbolically by  $2$  the sign sentence may be written:

$\circ F^{xxx} \quad f-o-r-d \quad \sim M^{# \wedge} \quad AA^{~~} \sim_2$

and translated now:

Which do you like better, Pontiac or Ford?

The translation is still approximate because one cannot be sure whether 'like better' and 'be better' are distinct in this teen-age signer's thinking.

The same kind of checking for patterned occurrences of the eye-head dip shows that it not only marks a response as in the 'remember' use but also serves as

a much more frequent way to signal first person singular than the sign "I". A student to whom the figurative use of the word backlog was unfamiliar suddenly interrupted the explanation, signing in a split second:

$\text{[]B}^{\uparrow} \text{AA}^{\uparrow\text{c}}$

That is, 'have' and 'behind'. But the head-eye dip beginning at the same time as the first sign indicated he was saying what might be translated as

I have [something] behind; or

I'm keeping [something] in reserve.

Even with only these two signals, the 'dip' and the 'query-look', a beginning can be made in defining verbals in the language. Those signs which pattern with both appear to be verbal; those with the dip may be; those with the dip may be; those with the query-look may be, but are also likely to be query signs like 'how', 'why', 'what', and 'who', which do not pattern with the dip.

Another signal functioning on the syntactic level is the negative head shake. This movement is for the deaf as well as the hearing in our culture sufficient answer alone to some questions, and with other kinesic signals may range from a decisive denial or refusal to a confidential assent. But the head shake as a kinesic signal is a grosser movement than the movement which in a sign sentence signals negation. The sign  $\text{X}^{\text{b}}$ , 'should' is also 'should not' when this minute head shake accompanies it. So small is this non-kinesic, syntactical head shake that the writer and his associates scanning and transcribing a filmed conversation missed it until the self contradiction of the informant's utterance without a negative sent us back to look beyond the tab, dez, and sig signals.

This shake, symbolized **3**, patterns with many of the signs which the dip, symbolized **1**, makes into first person singular verbals, but with **3** they become first person singular negative verbals. Some examples:

The illogical but often heard 'I don't think it's a good idea', has a close equivalent in signs:

$\text{3}^{\wedge} \text{G}^{\text{c}} \text{BB}^{\text{c}} \text{I}^{\text{c}}$

'I don't have it', is but one sign with the negation signals:  $\text{3}[\text{]B}^{\uparrow}$

A signer asked, 'How was the movie?' might reply either:

or:  $\text{[]B}^{\text{c}} \text{1}$  'I enjoyed it.'  
 $\text{3}[\text{]B}^{\text{c}} \text{1}$  'I didn't enjoy it.'

Here it will be noted that the sig of 'enjoy' also differs in the two replies. The change from rubbing the heart region with a small circular motion to approaching it and moving the hand sharply away two inches may be occasioned simply by physiology. Like patting the stomach and rubbing the head, the head shake and circular rubbing may be difficult for some persons to do. Or the change may be to shorten sig duration so the head shake will be seen. Or it maybe more symbolic; just as the sign  $\text{G}_A \text{G}^{\text{c}}$ , 'to', contrasts directionally with the sign  $\text{G}_A \text{X}^{\text{c}}$ , 'from', so the sig of 'not-enjoy' may be an approximation of a directional opposite of the 'enjoy' sign's sig, the rubbing motion being opposed by the quick, checked retreat of hand from chest.

3.5. The isolation and description of the sign language sentence as a syntactic unit await further study, but it seems likely at this point that the patterning of the aspectual cheremic elements with the head and eye kind of supra-aspectual elements will furnish the clues to the syntactic structure. For instance, a kind of 'terminal juncture' in signing is to be seen perhaps in a general relaxation at the end of an utterance of one sort. It may be taken as similar to the 'dropping' of the voice, but the dropping of the hand or hands that made the last sign is more a feature of the general somatic change than it is a separate signal. Similarly, the utterance which is followed by a reply, which seeks perhaps an opinion on what has just been signed, ends with a kind of upward or outward 'focus': eyes, face, hands may join in passing the conversational ball to the viewer.

Much more remains to be done also in establishing exactly what are the structural principles of the sign language sentence, the overall pattern, and how dialect and idiolect patterns utilize one or another part of the total possible pattern. For it is apparent now that just as any speaker's variety and complexity of syntactical patterns will vary according to his age, intellectual habits, and education, to name a few factors, and the extent of his vocabulary will be similarly determined, so the sign language user will differ in his employment of

the resources of the language. But there is another way that signers may show difference in selection from the overall structural patterns. Presumably his language habits will be more or less affected by the extent to which English is his second language. The bilingual person may only in an occasional 'slip of the tongue' superimpose the patterns of one language on another; but two languages, which can be used simultaneously, may be more strongly drawn into syntactical conformity.

Again, more study is needed. Some informants, members of the college faculty, whose sign sentences may often be translated into idiomatic English sentences by a word-for-sign rendering without change in order, say frankly that they sign 'differently' in other situations. The difference may be analogous to the writer's different ways of speaking with superiors, subordinates, family, children, intimate friends, and others; but there is also the strong possibility that along with the usual stylistic differences there is a greater or less similarity to English syntax in these different situational levels of sign use.

3.6. While the cheremic analysis of the sign language seems to be complete enough to make a number of observations about the formation and use of signs, the writer is aware that the period of the study is all too short to have arrived at a complete and exhaustive analysis. Other ways of analyzing cheremes are likely and possible; and judging by the list of symbols, more may still be done to establish the true isolates or structure points of the language.

The other kinds of signals, such as the head dip or 'questioning look' are only beginning to be analyzed, and a number of pre-linguistic, paralinguistic, and to coin still one more term, dualinguistic data remain to be considered.

Nevertheless, the work so far accomplished seems to us to substantiate the claim that the communicative activity of persons using this language is truly linguistic and susceptible of micro-linguistic analysis of the most rigorous kind. And the cheremic and morphocheremic analysis at its present stage will make possible the preparation of a lexicon, now in progress, which can be more than an English-Sign language word-list. The lexicon will arrange entries according to the sign language elements, or cheremes, and will give some indication of morpheme class and

function class, as well as etymologies based on structural and historical principles and approximate translations.

Moreover, the analysis here presented seems to offer a sound basis, whatever its faults and inconsistencies, for further analysis and description of the structure of this unique, most useful, and linguistically interesting language. Perhaps it is not futile to hope that this work and what it will lead to may eventually make necessary the change of a famous definition to read: 'A language is a system of arbitrary symbols by means of which persons in a culture carry on the total activity of that culture.' Important as speech and hearing are in human culture, the symbol using capacity in man is anterior, as this symbol system of those deprived of hearing demonstrates.

#### 4.1. Glossary of Terms

ALLOCHER, any one of that set of configurations, movements, or positions, i.e. cheremes, which signal identically in the language.

ASPECT, a structural division (analogous to 'segment') of sign language activity, into constituents for position, configuration, and motion (analogous to 'vowels' and 'consonants').

ASPECTUAL CHEREME, a tab, dez, or sig (see below).

CHEREME, that set of positions, configurations, or motions which function identically in the language; the structure point of sign language (analogous to 'phoneme').

CHEROLOGY, the structure, and its analysis, of the isolates or units of the phenomenon level of the sign language of the deaf.

DEZ, designator; that configuration of the hand or hands which makes a significant motion in a significant position.

FINGER SPELLING, communication activity involving perception of or presentation of successive hand configurations representing the letters (and ampersand) of English orthography.

GESTURE, unanalyzed communicative movement.

MANUAL ALPHABET, a set of 19 configurations, three orientations, and two movements which

give 27 visible symbols for the alphabet and ampersand, used for communication by deaf, and by deaf-blind persons who have a knowledge of a language and its writing system.

SIG, signation; the motion component or aspect of sign language activity; specifically motion of a significant configuration (dez) in a significant position (tab).

SIGN, the smallest unit of sign language to which lexical meaning attaches (analogous to 'word'); one of the two kinds of morphemes out of which sign language utterances are constructed (the other being the finger-spelled English word).

SIMULTANEOUS METHOD, a communicative activity, the official teaching medium at Gallaudet College, in which the speaker at the same time speaks (with or without audible voice) and signs utterances which are a translation of each other.

TAB, tabula; the position marking aspect of sign language activity; specifically the position in which a significant configuration (dez) makes a significant movement (sig).

## 4.2 Table of Symbols

### 4.2.1. Symbols for cheremes of position, TAB only:

Name	Symbol	Description
Zero tab	∅	The space in front of signer's body where hand movement is easy and natural – regions within the whole space
Face	○	The head itself and space around it
Brow	∩	The upper face from brows to hair line including temples
Mid-face	◦	The eyes, nose, or any point between ∩ and ∪ contrasting with them
Lower face	∪	The chin, mouth, or lips
Side face	)	The cheek, ear, or jaw
Neck	⌒	The space between chin and chest
Body or trunk	[ ]	The space from shoulders to hips inclusive
Upper arm	∖	The region of the biceps
Elbow	∩	The distal side of forearm, or elbow itself
Supine arm	∪	The proximal side of forearm or wrist
Prone arm	∩	The distal side of wrist or back or hand

### 4.2.2. Symbols for cheremes of configuration, DEZ (including some TAB):

Name	Symbol	Description
Fist	A, A/S, A <sub>t</sub>	The hand clasped with thumb in a, s or t, Fig. 1
Flat hand	B, 5	The open or spread hand, thumb out or as in b, Fig. 1
Curved hand	C, C <sub>#</sub>	The c and c <sub>#</sub> of Fig. 1
Retracted hand	E	The fingers clenched to palm; e, Fig. 1
F-hand	F	Thumb and forefinger touch, other fingers spread; f, Fig. 1
Index	G	Allocheric forms: g, d, l of Fig. 1
H-hand	H	The h, u, n of Fig. 1; first two fingers extended and joined
Pinkie or I-hand	I	The little finger projects from closed hand; i, Fig. 1
K-hand	K	The index, 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and thumb make k, Fig. 1
L-hand	L	The thumb and index make right angle; l, Fig. 1
Bent-hand	M	The hand makes a dihedral angle, one allocher is the m of Fig. 1
R-hand	R	The first two fingers crossed; r, Fig. 1
V-hand	V	The index and 2 <sup>nd</sup> extended and spread; v, Fig. 1
W-hand	W	The first three fingers extended and spread
Y-hand	Y	The thumb and little finger are spread out from fist; allocheric forms: middle finger bent in from spread flat hand; index and pinkie up from closed hand

### 4.2.3. Symbols for cheremes of motion, SIGS:

Name	Symbol	Description
Vertical motion	^	upward motion
	v	downward motion
	~	up and down motion
Lateral motion	>	Rightward motion
	<	Leftward motion
To and fro motion	z	Right and left motion
	T	Toward signer
Twisting motion	↑	Away from signer
	↓	To and fro
Twisting motion	∪	Supinative movement
	∩	Pronative movement
Twisting motion	∪	Oscillating twist
	∩	Oscillating twist

Carpal motion	η	Nodding or shaking motion, pivoting at wrist; may be proximal, distal, or both
Foral motion	□	Opening motion of a configuration
	#	Closing motion of a configuration
Approach	)(	Dez approaches tab*
Touch	×	Dex touches tab*
Graze	↑, →, or ↘	Dez brushes or slides across tab*
Link	⌘	Double dez clasp, hook, etc., or dez grasps tab
Enter	⊗ or ⊙	Dez is inserted or thrust through tab
Cross	‡	Double dez cross, one over other
Separate	÷	Linked, crossed, inserted, or adjacent dez moves away
Interchange	↔	Double dez or tab and dez hands reverse relative positions

\*If double dez the interaction is mutual.

4.24. Diacritical marks used with sig symbols

Name	Symbol	Description
Repeat	•	Sig motion is performed again (dot to right of sig symbol)
—	•	When dot is placed over sig symbol, sharp, staccato movement is indicated
Alternate	∞	Indicates that sig motion is performed in alternation by double dez
Reverse	↔	Indicates that left hand is dez, right is tab, etc.

4.25 Symbols for gestures with syntactic significance:

Name	Symbol	Description
Affirm	1	Head bends very slightly forward and returns, or eyes lower and raise, or both together (written before symbols for sign nearest it in time)
Query	2	Face ‘opens’, eyebrows raise, eyes open wide, chin or mouth lowers (written after symbols for sign nearest it or at the end of a stretch of signing)
Negate	3	Head shakes (written before symbols for sign nearest its occurrence or at the beginning of a stretch of signing)

4.26. Conventions of sign language notation:

- 4.261. Signs are written left to right.
- 4.262. Left place symbol is tab.
- 4.263. Middle place symbol is dez.

4.264. Right place symbol or symbols are sigs.

4.265. Sig symbol to the right of another indicates successive motions.

4.266. Sig symbol under another indicates simultaneous motions.

4.267. Sig symbols as subscripts to tab or dez symbols indicate orientation of the configuration. Example:  $G_{\downarrow}$  indicates the Index hand pointing down.

4.268. Separation or juncture of compound signs is shown by slant bar or colon, / or :

4.269. A bar used with a tab symbol indicates relative position of tab and dez. Ex:  $B_{\downarrow} B_{\uparrow}$ , ‘open’, begins with the flat hands, palm down, in contact along the index fingers, and its sig is a separation accompanied by rotation outward from the elbow (supination).  $\bar{B}_{\downarrow} B_{\uparrow}$ , ‘window’, is signed by twice touching the little finger edge of the right hand (dez) against the index finger edge of the tab.  $A/A_{\downarrow}$ , ‘follow’, begins with the right hand half of the double dez behind and to the right of the left; then keeping same spacing both move away from body to the left. A dot used with a tab symbol indicates point of contact dez makes. Ex.:  $[:] G_{\times}$ , ‘conscience’.

5. Bibliography

American annals of the deaf.

1847ff. Official organ of the Conference of Executives of American Schools of the Deaf and the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. Editorial offices: Gallaudet College, Washington 2, D.C. [Cumulatively indexed every ten years through –1955; indexed annually from 1956.]

— 1858. 10.40–51.

— 1956. 101.222.

Arrowsmith, John P.

1819. The art of instructing the deaf and dumb. London.

Avery, C. B.




1948. The social competence of pre-school acoustically handicapped children. Journal of exceptional children 15.71–73.

- Bachman, G.; and Associates.  
1952. Health resources in the United States. Brookings Institute. 185.
- Barker, et al.  
1953. Adjustment to physical handicap and illness: a survey of the social psychology of physique and disability. New York, Social Science Research Council. 74–75.
- Beasley, W.C.  
1940. The general problem of deafness in the population. Laryngoscope 9/1940. 24–26.
- Bébian, M.  
1825. Mimographie, ou essai d'écriture mimique, proper a regulariser le langage des sourds-muets. Paris.
- Best, Harry.  
1943. Deafness and the deaf in the United States. New York, Macmillan. 147.
- Brunschwig, Lily.  
1936. A study of some personality aspects of deaf children. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Burchard, E.M.L.; and H.R. Myklebust.  
1942. A comparison of congenital and adventitious deafness with respect to its effect on intelligence, personality and social security. American annals of the deaf 87.241–50.
- Esper, E. A.  
1935. Language. In Murchison (ed.) Handbook of social psychology.
- Fay, E. A.  
1898. Marriages of the deaf in America. Washington, D.C., Volta Bureau.
- Gesell, A., and F. L. Ilg.  
1947. The child from five to ten. New York, Harpers. 119.
- 1953. Infant and child in the culture of today. New York, Harpers. 102.
- Getz, S.  
1953. The environment and the deaf child. Berkeley, California School for the Deaf.
- Higgins, Daniel D.  
1923. How to talk to the deaf. St. Louis. [3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Chicago, 1942.]
- Hiskey, M. S.  
1956. A study of the intelligence of deaf and hearing children. American annals of the deaf 101.329–47.
- Hodgson, Kenneth W.  
1953. The deaf and their problems. London [New York, 1954.]
- Klineberg, Otto.  
1940. Social psychology. New York, Holt. 46–51.
- Kroeber, A. L.  
1958. Sign Language inquiry. International journal of American linguistics 24.1–19.
- L'Épée, Charles Michel, l'Abbé de.  
1776. L'institution des sourds et muets, par la voie des signes méthodiques. Paris.
- Long, Joseph Schuyler.  
1918. The sign language; a manual of signs, being a descriptive vocabulary of signs used by the deaf of the United States and Canada. [2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Revised and enlarged, Council Bluffs, Iowa; reprinted Omaha 1944, 1949, 1952, and Washington, D.C. 1959.]
- Magarotto, Cesare; Dragoljub Vukotic.  
1980. Première contribution pour le dictionnaire international du langage des signes, terminologie de conference. Roma, Federation Mondiale des Sourds.
- Mallery, Lieutenant-Colonel Garrick.  
1880. Gesture signs and signals of the North American Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institute.
- 1881. Sign language among the North American Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institute.
- Meyerson, Lee.  
1955. A psychology of impaired hearing, in Cruickshank, William (ed.), Psychology of exceptional children and youth. New York, Prentice-Hall. 130–37.

- Michaels, J. W.  
1923. A handbook of the sign language of the deaf. Atlanta, Ga.
- Paget, Sir Richard.  
The new sign language: notes for teachers. London W.C.1., Phonetics Dept., University College (n.d.).
- Pelissier, M.  
1856. L'enseignement primaire des sourds-muets mis a la portee de tout le monde avec one iconographie des signes. Paris.
- Pintner, R., I. S. Fوسفeld; and L. Brunschwig.  
1937. Personality tests of deaf adults. Journals of genetic psychology 51.305–27.
- Sicard, Roth Ambois Cucurron, l'Abbé.  
1808. Signes des mots, consideres sous le rapport de la syntaxe, a l'usage des sourds-muets. Paris.
- 1808. Theorie des signes. Paris.
- The silent worker.  
1948ff. Official Publication of the National Association of the Deaf. Office of publication: 2495 Shattock Ave., Berkeley 4, and California. [First published 1890–1928.]
- Streng, Alice; and S. A. Kirk.  
1938. The social competence of deaf and hard of hearing children in a public day school. American annals of the deaf.
- Teachers of the Schools at Waratah and Castle Hill, N.S.W  
1942. How to converse with the deaf in sign language as used in the Australian Catholic schools of the deaf. Newcastle, Davies & Cannington Pty. Ltd.
- Tervoort, Bernard Theodoor Marie.  
1953. Structurele analyse van visueel taalgebruik binnen een groep dove kinderen. Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandsche Uitg. Mij. (Summaries in English, French, Spanish & German.)
- Tomkins, William.  
1926. Universal American Indian sign language. San Diego, William Tomkins. (13<sup>th</sup> ed., 1958).
- Trager, George L.  
1949. The field of linguistics. Norman, Okla., Battenburg Press. (SIL:OPI.)
- 1958. Paralanguage: a first approximation. Studies in linguistics. University of Buffalo, Department of Anthropology and Linguistics 13:1–12.
- U.S. Office of Education.  
1937. The deaf and the hard-of-hearing in the occupational world. Bulletin 13.
- Valade, Y.-L. Remi.  
1854. Studes sur la lexicologie et la grammaire du langage naturel des signes. Paris.
- Voegelin, C. F.  
1958. Sign language analysis, on one level or two? International journal of American linguistics 24.71–77.

## Notes

Originally published as *Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers 8* (1960), by the Department of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Buffalo, Buffalo 14, New York. Reprinted by permission of the Departments of Linguistics and Anthropology, University of Buffalo. The editor wishes to express his appreciation to Robert D. Van Valin, Jr., Chair, Department of Linguistics and Don Pollock Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Buffalo for allowing reprinting of this article and to the typesetter somewhere who created and set all of the cheric symbols for Oxford University Press. A Preface and Table of Contents appear in the original document, but otherwise this text is reproduced per the 1960 version (2005 editorial adjustments appear in square brackets).

1. The principle of forming some color signs by shaking or twisting the configuration for the initial letter of the color's name is older than the American sign language. Pelissier (1856) shows these equivalents: vert, v shaken; jaune, j, i.e. I shaken. But rouge and present 'red' is  (finger brushes lips); noir, 'black', is  (edge of hand moves across brows); and brun, 'brown' is  (edge of hand, palm out, rubs cheek).