



Second language acquisition and written language; a new perspective for the study of rock art

ENRIQUE RUIZ ALBA

Assuming that the Rock art centers were schools of learning and that the passing of knowledge from one generation onto the next one takes and took place there, we can deduce that classes and learning sessions occurred in different occasions under different motivations.

The same way we find a chalk a marker and a board not deleted in any present classroom, we find designs, materials and instinctively tend to interpret what happened there? The problem is that interpretation can only be made on a functional context in other words when all the components are present and interact as a system, but the absence of any of these components disfunctionalizes it. In other words without a student, teacher or materials the context is not complete and puts us in an interpretative level almost immediately. It becomes a fight between recreation and interpretation; either or, happen to be deviations in the study of Rock Art. They would only separate us from getting to the true meaning of these centers and this is what usually happens to investigators in the matter.

Based on these assertions we have to come up with profound reflections for three important questions:

What took place in these sites?

Why did it take place?

How this process took place?

A class would only make sense with a teacher, an audience and an object to be taught, any other context where these three components do not merge; it is a disfunctionalized context which is meant to be analyzed under a different strategy. We believe teaching and learning took place there, we believe the solving of many issues that afflicted pre Neolithic groups came to an end with the teaching and learning of a variety of topics.

The vehicle of neolitization becomes the classroom where this paradigm would be presented and processed. So, the what, why, and how share a commonality: everything regards to the speed and precision of the Acquisition process in other words how quick and effective the process of learning is or was.

Krashen (1988) mentions *"Acquisition requires meaningful interaction in the target language - natural communication - in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding."*

Reconstruction, codification, decodification, reassembling of images, association, recurrence and comparison are ways investigators have conducted the attempt on interpreting these sites but without much success. Probably and due to the implicit need of recreation which indeed is impossible to reproduce to its fullest, especially when the context seems to be incomplete.

The idea of what a context is in Archeology is barely applicable in the study of Rock Art, but then again; all investigations seem to use the same formula of recreation previous to interpretation.

The context for the study of Rock Art should use its own cultural features like location, cultural routes, to understand the relation between them and of course the magnitude of the sites just to relate to them in terms of

hierarchy.

Now, hierarchy by itself is quite alternative, the only way of referring to these places by category is recognizing their function in other words the use they had, we can even say; the kind of teachings that took place in each site.

Based on this assertion, we believe there were religious and ceremonial places, places for the processing of materials like workshops and butcheries or everything that has to do with production, and probably more categories should be added to the list.

The role of the Theory of second language acquisition for the birth of written language

Another advantage of using the Theory of second language acquisition is implicit, if there were a mother tongue and some designs represented the sounds and encoded a meaning in the first language, the ceremonial sessions would have been efforts to expand and broadcast the message; as a consequence: we encounter "written language"

We will not be discussing the categories or requisites for the existence of written language by the contrary, we will be concentrating our effort in the occurring of this phenomena; the sheer necessity for conveying a meaning implies the existence of a class and classrooms. These designs can be language explanations acting as prompts for the spoken language in a speech, a conference, a class or lectures.

A lot has been said in regards to the preceding of the spoken language in order to be represented by written scripts that provide a permanent record, some would say meta language rather than giving a proper personality to the written form.

If we can list some properties of the written language the existence of it in the old Peru would be implicit.

Bygate (1998) and Ur (1996) studied some linguistic characteristics of the written language; these are:

Vocabulary, some words exist primarily in the written manner. The same for the Rock Art in Peru, by recurrence we find a lot of llamas and other camelidos in multiple sites at different chronologies and varied ecosystems, the only way to make sense to this is by the sheer predominance of this signs-words of the written language over the spoken one. Said in other words people gave these signs the treatment of vocabulary and basic vocabulary.

Grammar, Halliday (1985) Mentions that written language is more contextualized making more references to names and places. This Lexical density phenomena is observed in different supports where some forms dominate the scenes and landscapes.

Probably serving as guiding lines to establish a controlled session.

Punctuation, even when we do not have stress marks or any other form of modern punctuation in Rock Art, it seems to us pretty obvious the sense of contrasts



between designs and motives, the use of colors, the position, recurrence and direct amount of shapes and forms alike is an indicator of this. People wanted to make sure we would be able to differentiate some designs from others, but for some reason we are still trying to figure them out.

Permanency of writing (Derrida, 1992). Mentions the writing as a substitute for the memory in his effort to give the written language a lost hierarchy to the spoken one.

We can certainly include the Rock Art designs as ways of recording what has been lost by society memory and a form of recreating and inducing our minds into cognitive learning. It can also be a way of polishing and presenting a final product, a way of introducing a motive as the encoder of a message, so the class will have a purpose and the final purpose will be articulated to a wholesome of other motives which also encoded more messages.

The link between readers and writers is another feature of the written language, regardless of the context a relationship will exist either with the writer dead or alive and the reader.

Status. Writing often has higher status than speech because its permanent form allows it to record laws, contracts etc. In modern societies 'serious' literature is written down as novels, not improvised as oral epics; poetry is found in books, not folksongs. In many societies, holy writings capture the very words of

God. Chomsky 1995, a main component in Noam Chomsky's Minimalist Program is revealingly called 'Spell Out', not 'Speak Out'. This is just a way of giving hierarchy to the written language as an initiator and recorder of any significant human act.

Simply put, capacity of recording, ability of enduring and lasting presence of hierarchy and categorization act as a wholesome of elements of evolutive forces and development and all this certainly took place in Peru.

Enrique Ruiz Alba
San Marcos University.
E-mail: enriquemanuelruiz@gmail.com

Bibliografía

- BYGATE, M. 1998. Theoretical perspectives on speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 20-42
- CHOMSKY, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- DERRIDA, J. 1992. *Acts of Literature*, (ed. D. Attridge). Routledge, New York.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- KRASHEN, Stephen D. 1988. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall International.
- UR, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.