1. **Introduction**

Linguists have always taken keen interest in comparing different languages with one another, but the aims underlying this pursuit have been varied. What attracts them most to it is perhaps the realization that since languages spoken in regions even far apart from one another have some striking similarities, they must have some underlying relationship. They want to explain the nature of this relationship, as Bloomfield says: "some languages resemble each other to a degree that can be explained only by historical connection. Some resemblance, to be sure, may result from universal factors, such features as phonemes, morphemes, words, sentences, constructions, and substitution-types, appear in every language; they are inherent in the nature of human speech. Other features, such as noun-like and verb-like form-classes, categories of number, person, case, and tense, or grammatical positions of actor, verbal goal, and possessor, are not universal, but still so widespread that better knowledge will doubtless some day connect them with universal characteristics of mankind" (Bloomfield, 1973:297 (1st Imp.,1933).
One is not sure whether the above statement of Bloomfield has inspired the recent research in the area of language universals, but one can surely see an obvious link between what he said in 1933 and what Greenberg, the highly celebrated universalist, said much later: "Underlying the endless and fascinating idiosyncracies of the world's languages there are uniformities of universal scope. Amid infinite diversity, all languages are, as it were, cut from the same pattern ... language universals are by their very nature summary statements about characteristics or tendencies, shared by all human speakers" (Greenberg, 1968:XV).

In fact, Greenberg remembers Bloomfield and reminds linguists of what he had said in 1933, namely, that the only useful generalizations about language are inductive generalizations (Bloomfield, 1973:20). Comparison of languages with one another, therefore, becomes crucial for any language universals. That is the only means for the empirical verification of any proposal regarding them. We believe this is clearly recognized by most linguists who are seriously interested in identifying the universal properties of language, and a lot of valuable research is being done in this area today. But, surely, this is not the only motivation that inspires linguists and, sometimes,
language teachers to compare any two languages. There are some other motivations as well. We shall now briefly talk about them.

2. **Motivations for comparing languages**

As already indicated, languages have been compared with one another from different points of view and with various aims in mind. Some types of comparison have been motivated by purely linguistic, while others by pedagogical aims. R.H. Robins (1975:306) mentions two types which are important from the linguistic point of view, and which work on rather different principles and with different aims in view. They are historical and typological. But apart from these, which are purely inductive in nature, there is another type which is motivated by the need to attest the validity of some of those proposals regarding language universals that linguists make from time to time. Chomsky (1965:30) claims that all languages are cut to the same pattern. It implies that the deep study of even one language, which may be one's mother tongue, can enable one to discover many fundamental properties of language that may be verified by a further study of other languages. This type of theoretically-oriented comparison is different in nature from the typological comparison of languages which is by and large taxonomic. Comparison of
source and target languages is considered important from the pedagogic point of view. It is believed by some language teachers that it makes it easier for a teacher to handle the problematic areas in teaching the target language. We will now look at these motivations one by one.

2.1 Historical

This type of comparison, known as 'comparative philology' in the nineteenth century, was motivated by a keen desire to understand the interrelationships between the languages of Greece, Italy and India. The main stimulus came from the discovery of Sanskrit by western scholars. As Lehmann (1968:19) says, "A part of the energy with which historical linguistic study was pursued in the nineteenth century derived from the discovery that the ancient and modern languages of much of India were related to the Germanic languages and to the classical languages as well." It greatly aroused the curiosity of linguists in the nineteenth century when they found that many words in the above languages which had similar meanings were also similar in phonetic form. This similarity could not be explained by means of onomatopoeia, sound symbolism, or even borrowing. It required some other explanation. The explanation offered was historical; as Robins (1975:309) says: "The other, and the
only plausible explanation is that the different word-forms related by one or more correspondences of phonetic composition are the result, after varying intervals of time, of the gradual divergence of the languages involved from an earlier linguistic situation in which their predecessors in time constituted something like a single language (itself, of course, like all languages, an abstraction and no doubt divided by isoglosses into regional dialects 2.1.1, 2.2)".

This gave rise to a search for the proto-form of related languages, i.e., the parent language from which the languages belonging to a particular family emanated. These languages diverged from one another in course of time, but they still maintained considerable affinity. One of the major concerns of nineteenth century linguists was, thus, a historical study of Indo-European languages in order to discover the laws of systematic phonetic change. As a result of this, laws like Grimm's Law, Verner's Law etc., were proposed. It was a period of German scholarship. A group of German scholars believed that phonetic correspondences between the words of different languages were absolutely regular. This belief came to be known later as the 'Neogrammarian Hypothesis'. The hypothesis was briefly stated as follows: "All sound changes, as mechanical processes, take place according to laws that admit no exceptions (ausnälslose Lautgesetze) within the same dialect."
and the same sound will in the same environment always develop in the same way; but analogical creations and reformations of specific words as lexical or grammatical entities are equally a universal component of linguistic change at all periods of history and pre-history." (Quoted by R.M. Robins, 1969: 182-83).

The neogrammarian hypothesis was later challenged by people like Osthoff and Brugmann who showed that neither geographical dialect divisions, nor temporal divisions were as clear-cut as the neogrammarians had thought. Specialists in dialectology were the main critics of their universalistic hypothesis. Their minute study of dialect differences showed that besides correspondences of sound, there were other important factors also that were related to particular words as individual lexical items, such as the deflection of word-forms from their expected regular phonetic development by homonymic clash, excessive reduction in length, nearness or coincidence with taboo words, popular or false etymologies, loans from a neighbouring dialect for prestige, etc. Such factors were not predictable and could be explained only by means of the knowledge of actual circumstances. (Robins, 1969: 188).
What we have so far said may create the impression that the only focus of historical comparison was Indo-European languages. It is true that a major part of the time and energy of linguists was spent on that family of languages, but on the same basis of systematic correspondences in the phonetic structure of words of similar or related meanings, many other language families were also discovered such as the Afro-Asiatic which has five branches: (1) Egyptian, (2) Berber, (3) Cushitic, (4) Chad, and (5) Semitic. A large family to the south of Afro-Asiatic is Niger-Congo, having languages like Bantu, Swahili etc. Another large family is the Dravidian which has Telugu, Tamil, Kannada and Malayalam as its major members. Even in Europe there are language families other than the Indo-European like the Finno-Ugrian family having Lappish, Finnish, Estonian etc., as its members. There are the Sino-Tibetan family, having Chinese, Tibetan, Thai etc., and the Malayo-Polynesian family, having Indonesian, Melanesian, Micronesian and Polynesian as their members. There are many more language families besides them. It is not quite relevant to list all of them here. Our main aim in mentioning some of them is merely to show that such a genealogical classification of languages was the main aim of what is now known as comparative historical linguistics. It that scholars may be true/in this particular field were, as Lehmann (1968: 19) and has put it, "concerned with the origins/the early institutions
of mankind". The search for the proto-form of a family of languages like the Indo-European languages, remained for a long time one of their active concerns. It was perhaps part of a deeper search for the origin of language.

2.2 Typological

Besides comparative historical linguistics, there is another branch which Halliday (1964) calls 'comparative descriptive linguistics' whose theory and method are different from the former. This type of linguistics, which is generally known as 'Contrastive Linguistics', aims at comparing languages in order to find how they work, and not how they have evolved. Halliday believes that it has two fundamental principles: (1) describe before comparing, and (2) compare patterns, not whole languages (1964:113). It is these principles that are basic to any typological comparison of languages. Any such comparison tends to classify languages on the basis of certain features, phonological, morphological, syntactic, etc., which they share with one another. These features are surely those which they share apart from such features as all languages share by virtue of the nature of language as such. As the structure of a language can be analysed and described properly only by setting up different levels at which different kinds of features could be clearly
identified and studied, typological comparison implies comparison of language structures at different levels, and the setting up of different typologies according to them. As a result, we may have phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic typologies. (Robins, 1975: 335-351). The Prague linguists also consider such comparisons to be of the greatest value for any work in linguistic characterology; as Mathesius (1967:59) says: "Comparison of languages of different types without any regard to their genetic relations is of the greatest value for any work in concrete linguistic characterology, for it considerably furthers the right understanding of the real nature and meaning of the analysed linguistic facts."

Looking at phonetic typologies, one can easily see that certain languages share a number of sound features; for example, a feature like glottalization can be one basis of classification. There are many languages in different parts of the world in which consonants are quite regularly and systematically glottalized, while there are others in which such a feature is not found. There may be other features like clicks and implosives that some languages use and others do not. Besides them, an articulatory process like retroflexion may be another criterion for typological classification. But it should be remembered that such a classification may
sometimes cut across the geneological classification made by
the methods of comparative historical linguistics. It is
possible for phonetic habits to spread across genetic family
boundaries as a result of the movement of population, foreign
rule, bilingualism etc.

Like phonetic typologies, there may be phonological
typologies also, based upon certain features of phonological
systems used by different languages. One broad classification
that easily comes to mind is between tone languages and those
which do not use tone as a contrastive phonological feature.
Syllable structure may be another basis of classification
where consonant clustering in the initial and final position
may be used as specific criteria.

The above are some of the typologies at the phonetic and
phonological levels which constitute the primary level of a
language. Let us now look at the secondary level. Looking
at the morphological level, we find the famous typological
classification of languages into three types: isolating or
analytic, agglutinative and fusional or inflecting types,
proposed by Wilhelm von Humboldt. It will be wrong to assume
that there are pure types anywhere. In fact, one will have to
agree with Robins who says (1975:342): "Features of isolation,
agglutination, and fusion are usually to be found in most
languages, though in different proportions, and as a mode of typological classification, the three types are best regarded as directions towards which languages approach with greater or lesser purity. If the three types were arranged as a triangle, each language could be placed at some approximate point therein after a statistical analysis of its word-structure patterns. Much before Robin, Sapir had recognized this fact. He says (1971:123): "In any case it is very difficult to assign all known languages to one or other of these groups, the more so as they are not mutually exclusive. A language may be both agglutinative and inflective, or inflective and polysynthetic, or even polysynthetic and isolating as we shall see a little later on".

Sapir also suggests another scheme of typological classification, namely, of analytic, synthetic and polysynthetic types. An analytic language, he thinks, is one that either does not combine concepts into single words at all (Chinese), or does so economically (English and French). A synthetic language is one in which concepts cluster more thickly (Latin, Arabic and Finnish) and a polysynthetic language is one which is more than ordinarily synthetic (Chinook and Navaho). But at the same time Sapir warns us that although these are useful distinctions, these too must not be applied exclusively, or our classification will again be superficial (Sapir, 1971:127-28)
We can now have a look at some schemes of typological classification in the field of syntax. Greenberg (1968) is an important name in that field. After having looked into the structure of a large number of languages, he discovered some typologies of word order. Considering their relative orders of subject, verb and object in declarative sentences, he says that the vast majority of languages have variant orders, but a single dominant one. He thinks that logically there can be six possible orders: SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV and OVS. Of these six, only three normally occur as dominant orders. The three which do not occur at all, or at least are excessively rare are VOS, OSV, and OVS. What is common in these is that the object precedes the subject. On this basis Greenberg proposes his first language universal.

Universal: In declarative sentences with nominal subject and object, the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object (Greenberg, 1968:76-77).

This is a disputed claim now, as languages having the object preceding the subject have been discovered. In fact, it is claimed now that languages with all the six orders of elements indicated above exist. (Pullum, 1977; Derbyshire and Pullum, 1977)
Greenberg looks at other aspects of syntactic structure also, for example, the relative order in which demonstratives, articles, numerals, quantifiers and nouns occur in different languages, the placement of the genitive before or after the noun, the inversion of statement order in questions, etc. (Greenberg, 1968:73-113).

Like syntactic typology, we may have semantic typology also. It is this kind of typology which Ullmann (1968) tries to suggest when he says: "Some languages are remarkably rich in words with specific meanings, while others utilize general terms and neglect unnecessary details. French is usually regarded as a highly "abstract" language, whereas German is fond of "concrete" particular terms" (p.227). He treats 'concrete' and 'abstract' here as synonymous with 'particular' and 'general'. He claims that if a sufficient number of languages are examined from this point of view, the relative frequency of particular and general terms may become a useful criterion in linguistic typology. Besides the above criteria, languages are also found differing in lexical systems dealing with particular subjects like kinship.

We have so far given a brief account of some of the well-known diachronic and synchronic motivations for comparison of different languages. We shall now proceed on to other types of motivation.
2.3 Theoretico-Universalistic

A third view is that different languages are examined and compared not for their own sake, but for the sake of developing a general theory of language. This is the view taken by Chomsky, and several other linguists. Chomsky says: "The correct statement of the grammatical principles of a language is not primarily of interest in itself, but only in so far as it sheds light on the more general question of the nature of language, that is, the nature of universal grammar. The primary interest of a correct grammar is that it provides the basis for substantiating or refuting a general theory of linguistic structure which establishes general principles concerning the form of grammar" (Chomsky, 1969:7).

Here the purpose of comparison is purely theoretical. A typical instance of such an approach is Ladefoged's Preliminaries to Linguistic Phonetics which is the result of his analysis of phonetic data from more than one hundred languages from different parts of the world. About the aim of all this massive comparison and analysis he says: (1973:4): "The ultimate aim of this book is to assist in the development of a set of features which would be appropriate for phonological descriptions". Ladefoged wants to propose a comprehensive set of distinctive phonetic features for characterizing sound segments. Such features will claim
universality and will be an important part of the general theory of language. Not only Ladefoged, but many other linguists also are deeply involved in this pursuit.

Similar studies have been launched in syntax by other linguists who want to test whether the same constraints hold in all possible languages. The inadequacy of the phrase-structure model, and the adequacy of the TG modal have been tested by studying a large number of well-known and even obscure languages. It is only such a study that gave the clue to Postal (1964) that Mohawk is a language that cannot be described within the phrase-structure model.

Although Chomsky himself has not closely examined the data from many languages other than English, he very much emphasizes the importance of linguistic universals. He says (1969:27-28): "A theory of linguistic structure that aims for explanatory adequacy incorporates an account of linguistic universals ... the main task of linguistic theory must be to develop an account of linguistic universals that, on the one hand, will not be falsified by the actual diversity of languages and, on the other, will be sufficiently rich and explicit to account for the rapidity and uniformity of language learning, and the remarkable complexity and range of the generative grammars that are the product of language learning."
Chomsky, therefore, assigns top priority to the search for formal and substantive universals in developing linguistic theory. Generativists are all the time engaged in either proposing or testing both kinds of universals by means of a close study of numerous languages of the world. There are also a number of interesting proposals regarding both formal and substantive universals to-day. If one looks at different types of generative grammars proposed to-day, one will come across some of these. Besides the universal constraints on transformations proposed by Ross (1967) and others, a recently developed model of grammar, the Relational Grammar, has its own universal constraints. It proposes an Accessibility Hierarchy and all kinds of universal constraints related to it. Johnson (1974) and other supporters of this model claim to have proposed these constraints after having carefully looked into the structure of a large number of languages belonging to different language families. The research is still on. The main question before generativists to-day is: what are the universal properties of human language? With this is tied up Chomsky's genetic hypothesis that the human child is born with a schema of these properties in his brain, which is a highly controversial issue in linguistics to-day.

Now one may think that such a study of languages is not strictly comparative in nature. That may be only partly
true, as comparison is implicit in the study of different languages even for theoretical purposes. But it is surely not typological comparison. At this point let us recall Robins's statement, namely, that typological comparisons group languages together by their jointly exhibiting features of some sort in common, other than those features which are exhibited in common by all languages and which form part of the nature of language. (Robins, 1975: 335-36). It is the very structure of language which is the chief concern of the above kinds of comparative studies. Features that all languages share in common is the main issue before linguists who are engaged in the above venture. Since many such features are not obvious they have to be discovered by applying both inductive and deductive procedures.

2.4 Pedagogical

Fries (1945:9) says: "The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner". Lado strongly supports him. He says (1974:1): "... in the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease or difficulty in foreign language learning ... A practical confirmation of the validity of our assumption has
come from the work of linguists who study the effect of close contact between languages in bilingual situations. They report that many linguistic distortions heard among bilinguals correspond to describable differences in the languages involved."

Lado, therefore, recommends comparison of the learner's mother tongue with the target language purely with a view to facilitating learning. Others also recommend it with the same kind of utilitarian aim of improving the methods and results of language teaching. (Gerhard Nickel, 1971:2). The strong pleas of Fries and Lado have led to what is now known as the strong contrastive analysis hypothesis, which can be phrased as: "We can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student." (Lado, 1974:vii)

This hypothesis is opposed on different grounds by several linguists and pedagogues. A purely linguistic objection is one voiced by Wardhaugh (1969:177) who says: "An evaluation of this strong version of the contrastive analysis hypothesis suggests that it makes demands of linguistic theory, and, therefore, of the linguist that he is in no position to meet. At the very least this version demands
of the linguist that he have available a set of linguistic universals formulated within a comprehensive linguistic theory which deals adequately with syntax, semantics, and phonology. Furthermore, it requires a theory of contrastive linguistics into which complete linguistic descriptions of the two languages being contrasted can be plugged so as to produce the correct sets of contrasts between the two languages."

A purely pedagogical objection to the strong hypothesis would be that if there are dissimilarities in structure between one's mother tongue and the target language, one cannot jump to the conclusion that all of them pose the same amount of difficulty in learning. Besides, it is not always easy to decide whether the difficulty is due to dissimilarity between the languages, or to any other intra-linguistic factors. In any case, the available evidence (Jain, 1974) suggests that any neat prediction of learning difficulties on the basis of comparison of the mother tongue and the target language is nearly impossible. That seems to be the reason why a weaker hypothesis is now put forward in place of the stronger one. Wardhaugh (1969:186) says: "The CA hypothesis does not prove to be workable, at least not in the strong version in which it was originally expressed. This version can work only
for one who is prepared to be quite naive in linguistic matters. In its weak version, however, it has proved to be helpful and undoubtedly will continue to be so as linguistic theory develops."

The weaker hypothesis rejects prediction and emphasizes the role of contrastive analysis in merely explaining the learner's difficulties, as is said by Johansson (1973:15): "It is now recognized that CA should be used to explain difficulties which have already been observed rather than predict such difficulties. In other words, CA should be used as part of the explanatory stage in error analysis". Johansson adds that some useful hypothesis about errors not present in the data could, however, be formulated on the basis of CA, but those hypotheses have no predictive value, and have to be tested.

The weaker hypothesis is acceptable to most people to-day. Even those who reject CA on theoretical grounds recognize the practical utility of this hypothesis. For instance, Richtie (1967) and Wolfe (1967) who subscribe to the transformational theory reject CA on the ground that in as much as the deep structures of different languages are very much alike, anyone trying to learn another language already knows a great deal of it. What he does not know are the
differences of surface structure which are unique for each language. He has to acquire those rules by which the target language relates its deep structures to its surface structures, and ultimately to phonetic representations. Even if some of these rules are similar in any two languages, their combinations in different language systems will be so different that no useful purpose will be served by any superficial contrastive statements.

But in spite of the above line of argument, Richtie supports the weaker hypothesis and tries to explain the interference phenomenon by using the TG theory of CA. He uses distinctive feature hierarchies, rule-cycling and morpheme-structure in order to explain why a Russian is likely to say 'tink' and a Frenchman 'sink' for English 'think' (Richtie, 1968: 183-97).

Along with the weaker hypothesis of CA, error analysis has also aroused a lot of interest in the teachers. It has proved an effective check against the excesses of contrastive analysis. It is now clearly realized that each learner has his own strategy and pace of learning. The whole process of learning may be controlled by an internal syllabus which every learner probably has. (Corder, 1973:268). Before he is able to master the language, the learner may have at every
intermediary stage a kind of interlanguage having deviant features. (Selinker, 1974). These features are explained more adequately by means of error analysis than contrastive analysis.

2.5 **Semantico-grammatical**

By semantico-grammatical type of comparison we mean a comparison of two languages, may be one's mother tongue and the target language, on a notional basis; this may be done by first establishing a particular area of meaning that two languages share; and then examining what grammatical resources these languages use to represent that. One interesting feature of such a comparison may be to see how similar the grammatical systems that represent the same area of meaning are. This kind of approach is gaining some favour now. After examining the structuralist and transformational generative approaches in relation to certain areas of syntax in English, French and Chinese, Van Buren (1974: 279-311) comes to the following conclusion: It is logically impossible to engage in contrastive analysis without postulating common categories of one sort or another, since it is logically impossible to compare any two entities without using the same frame of reference. This frame of reference has to distinguish explicitly between deep and surface structure phenomena. So
the structuralist theory cannot provide that framework. Nor can the type of TG theory developed by Chomsky (1965) provide that, as it cannot claim at this stage that the deep structures of any two languages can be identical. At most it can support a similarity hypothesis which cannot go beyond claiming that the deep structures may be closely similar. This cannot provide an adequate framework for contrastive analysis, as it requires identity condition which clearly lays down some common ground where the languages are identical with each other. Such a common ground can be only that of meaning which different languages realize by different formal mechanisms. Corder (1973:243) supports this by saying: "If identity of structure exists between two languages then it appears it does so only at the more abstract level of semantic structure. This implies that it is only in terms of the meanings which can be expressed that two languages are identical". It is often said by people that there is nothing said in one language that cannot be said in another. This is the whole basis of translation from one language to another. It is only this kind of notional approach which, Van Buren (1974:294) says, "reflects the identity condition on deep components and provides a set of useful 'heuristic constraints' on contrastive statements". The common categories carry only semantic information. Besides explanatory purposes, Van Buren thinks that even for pedagogic purposes a semantically
based contrastive analysis is quite adequate, as it may be expected to throw light on problems of grading in language teaching.

A similar view is expressed by Allen (1953:100) when he says: "There is the theoretical possibility of an identification via situational-contextual criteria". Catford (1965) follows Halliday when he makes it an explicit criterion for translation equivalence. He says that two texts can be in a relationship of perfect equivalence only when they "are relatable (to at least some of) the same features of substance" (p.50). This substance may be of any kind, but for meaning equivalence it has to be situation substance which the lexical and grammatical elements of a language embody. Following Firth (1968), Catford affirms that the categories belonging to different languages carry meanings unique to those languages. He, therefore, rules out any transfer of meaning in translation from one language to another. That may be true, but surely there is a common area of meaning that different languages represent by means of similar or dissimilar linguistic devices. For total translation, Catford makes it an absolute condition that the texts be relatable to the same set of contextual features.

These contextual features must be in the universe of discourse which constitutes the bilingual culture of a
bilingual speaker. Verma (1971) draws our attention to the fact that in any comparative analysis the universe of discourse contains the cultural matrices associated with the languages to be compared. He draws on Pike's formulation of bilingualism which suggests that there is a hyper-system of cultural matrix in which two languages are brought into relationship. (Pike, 1960) There may be a very large area of conceptual overlap, or what Verma calls 'shared component' in that system. "A shared cultural matrix," Verma (1971:7) says, "is essential for any kind of relationship including the relationship of equivalence between two languages."

A similar view is expressed by Kachru (1976) who says that concept equivalence is central to contrastive analysis. Halliday seems to have this in mind when he emphasizes the establishment of comparability as one of the three conditions essential for comparative statement and treats translation, which implies concept equivalence, as basic to it (Halliday, McIntosh, Strevens, 1964:114).

Corder, who is more interested in the pedagogic application of contrastive analysis, also makes a very forceful plea for comparison within a common conceptual framework. He says (1973:243): "We may feel that the categories and relations involved in the deep syntactic components I have been talking about are pretty abstract. Unfortunately, they do not appear to be
abstract enough to serve as a common base for the comparison of languages. We have to look for something even more abstract - the components of the messages themselves. What we need is what in chapter 8, I called 'semantic based' grammar. I also said that whilst linguists are actively engaged in research into such grammars, we do not yet have any which meet even the weakest demands on adequacy. It looks, therefore, as if we shall have to manage as best we can in applied linguistics with a notional comparison of languages, and with ad hoc descriptions of those parts of the language which look as if they could yield to the inadequate knowledge we have."

3. Axes of Comparison

We have indicated above five different types of motivation for comparing languages with one another. Before we commit ourselves to any particular approach it would be proper to say something about different axes of comparison. It is normally believed that there are two such axes: formal and semantic, or contextual. Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964) suggest only those for marking similarities and differences between different languages. Catford (1965) also recognizes these axes when he talks about formal and contextual correspondence in translation. We will emphasize here only the context of situation. Corder (1973) adds one more. He thinks that
besides equivalences of form and meaning, there may be an equivalence of nomenclature also between any two languages. By equivalence of nomenclature he means the same terminology used for describing the languages to be compared. This is not very clear, as one does not know whether only formal, not semantic, terminology is involved here. Corder has listed only formal categories like singular, plural, count, mass noun etc., for this. This kind of equivalence may concern itself only with the names of those categories that different languages may have in common, but it cannot be very interesting unless formal and semantic similarities and differences in those categories are clearly brought out. Equivalence of nomenclature may have only a cataloguing function of indicating how far any two languages use the same nomenclature for its categories. For instance, the equivalence of nomenclature will tell us that English has a category called 'Article' to mark features like generic, non-generic, specific, non-specific, definite, non-definite etc., while Hindi does not have any such category. But this is not very interesting. Since Hindi does have features like specific/non-specific, definite/non-definite etc., in its semantic structure, a more useful approach would be to find out what alternative categories mark them in Hindi. Equivalence of nomenclature suffers from one basic difficulty, namely, that
categories in different languages are no eternal entities. They keep changing according to the judgement of linguists. At one time categories like future tense, different moods like imperative, indicative, subjunctive etc., cases like dative etc., were believed to be present in English, but many English grammarians have rejected them now. The same situation may hold for other languages. In view of this any equivalence of terminology, in terms of formal categories at least, will be only tentative.

But we may look at the equivalence of terminology from the semantic point of view also, and conceive a set of common semantic categories that different languages use for analysing their semantic structure. Although most of such categories still remain ad hoc on account of the inadequate development of semantics, they could form a useful basis for comparison. (1973)

This is probably not what Corder has in mind. Through equivalence of terminology he only wants to provide some preliminary basis for comparison. But Robins (1952:297) has suggested that "when word classes have been designated noun and verb etc., in the grammatical structure of two or more languages, valid comparisons can, of course, be made between the intralinguistic meaning of a word class within the structure of one language and the intra-linguistic meaning of a similarly designated word-class in another language. But such comparisons must be operationally subsequent to the designation
of the classes to be compared and cannot be the basis for such designations."

Let us say a few words about comparison at the formal and semantic levels. For comparison at the formal level in relation to a particular formal category, it may be necessary to observe all the formal constraints that the said category has in the languages to be compared. For that, as Halliday and others have suggested, the formal behaviour of the category in those languages has first to be described separately in each language. Describe before comparing is probably the right approach. It may either be a straight comparison between the two languages, putting them on a par with each other, or it may be a sort of transfer-comparison by treating one language as basic and juxtaposing the other to it. Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964:120) show the difference between these types of comparison by saying: "comparison in the normal way brings together two languages which have been separately and independently described, with the categories appropriate to each; such comparison is therefore neutral, as it were, and gives equal weight to the languages concerned. In transfer-comparison, on the other hand, one starts from the description of one language and then describes the second language in terms of the categories set up for the first."
For example, if we treat English as basic we could start, say, with modal verbs in it, and see how they compare with modal verbs in Hindi, if Hindi has such verbs. It requires, as Verma (1972) suggests, some metatheoretical framework of formal categories which could be identified cross linguistically and whose behaviour in different languages could be studied.

Looking now at the axis of meaning equivalence, we may say that the situation is different. The categories are mostly of an ad hoc or tentative nature. Attempts to discover a finite set of semantic features or a common pool of semantic universals, so to say, by means of which the semantic structure of any language could be described, and adequate comparisons between different languages could be set up neatly, have not yet met with great success. One such attempt is the theory of componential semantics which has impressed Nida so much that in his 'Science of Translation' (Language, 1969, Vol. 45) he goes to the extent of saying: "In transferring the referential content of the message one is not concerned primarily with the precise words or exocentric units (i.e. idioms), but with the sets of components. In fact, one does not really translate words but bundles of componential features. The words may be regarded essentially as vehicles for carrying the components
of meaning. In fact the words may be likened to suitcases used for carrying various articles of clothing" (p.492).

If such semantic components were in existence anywhere they would make comparison at the semantic level very easy indeed, but unfortunately, the theory is in serious trouble at the moment. In spite of hard work over a number of years no semanticist has been able to evolve any adequate set of universal semantic features. There are at present many theoretical objections against the theory (Bolinger, 1965, Weinreich, 1966, Lyons, 1974) which further dampen whatever hope it had once aroused.

Although it is difficult to reduce semantic structure to a neat set of features and formalize it, it does not mean that it is not possible to describe it even by informal means. We think it is. This arouses some hope for comparative studies within a common conceptual framework. As we shall show in the next chapter, a semantic topic like modality can be discussed and much can be said about various types of modality and/conceptual distinctions associated with it. That will provide a common conceptual framework for examining the modal categories in English and Hindi that we propose to compare.

4. The Framework chosen

Our approach in this dissertation will be primarily semantico-grammatical; that is to say, we shall try to
examine how modality has been represented in English and Hindi by means of certain grammatical categories. The main focus will be on the verbal group in the above languages. We shall examine which categories of the verbal group in each language realize different types of modality and illocutionary force and how they formally function in that language. In that connection we shall review the viewpoints of prominent grammarians of both English and Hindi regarding 'mood' which is considered by most of them to be a major category expressing modality in each language. Having done that we shall see if there are any sets of modal auxiliaries in English and Hindi, and if there are any, what their syntactic and semantic functions are. Although 'mood' and 'modal auxiliaries' are supposed to be the categories whose basic function is the expression of modality, verbal categories like tense also sometimes perform a modal function. We shall therefore examine such categories also from this point of view. Besides them, other categories like lexical verbs, adverbials, and adjectives etc., also sometimes perform a modal function. We shall not consider them, just because the main focus of the dissertation is the verbal group, especially on moods and modals, and we would not like it to get diffused by covering too many other areas.

As we have said, our approach in this dissertation will be semantic-grammatical. We have chosen this for various
reasons. Firstly, we wish to see how similar or dissimilar English and Hindi are in respect of modality, i.e., how far moods and modals represent modality of various types in each language. Although this sort of study may look somewhat typological, we are mainly interested in the problem of concept equivalence which Kachru (1976) considers central to any contrastive study. The study, therefore, starts with a conceptual framework of modality and illocutionary acts. We shall examine within that how the same categories of meaning are formally realized in English and Hindi by means of different moods and modals. Besides being useful to the field of translation between English and Hindi, it may prove quite useful for pedagogic purposes. If the task of learning a language is, as Halliday (1975) defines it, the task of learning how to mean, a discussion of the meaning potential and various kinds of options embodied in different types of modality, and their formal realizations in English and Hindi will be of great value for the teaching of English as a second language, at least to Hindi speakers. Comparison of English and Hindi from this point of view is likely to be of greater value to a teacher than a purely formal comparison. Corder (1973), as we have already pointed out, supports this view. Others also like Wilkins (1977) and Widdowson (1978) who advocate a communicative approach to the teaching of a language, as opposed to a purely structural approach, may also find our study interesting and useful.
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