Color Categories Are Not Arbitrary

Paul Kay
University of California, Berkeley

Recent, well-controlled studies in cross-language color naming and cross-language tests of color memory and learning have made important contributions to our understanding of which aspects of cross-language color naming and nonverbal response to colors may and may not be attributed to pan-human properties of color appearance. Valuable as these results are, some studies have led to more relativistic conclusions than their results justify. In particular, these conclusions ignore the issue of whether there exists across languages a statistical tendency toward basing color terminology systems on black, white, and the four Hering opponent hues.

Keywords: *color; color terms; color naming; semantics; linguistic relativity; Whorf; linguistic universals; semantic universals*

CHALLENGES TO THE UNIVERSALS AND EVOLUTIONARY THEORY OF BASIC COLOR TERM NAMING

A theory of basic color term meanings based on the observation of semantic universals and evolutionary regularity in the naming of colors across languages was proposed by Berlin and Kay (1969).

Cross-Cultural Research, Vol. 39 No. 1, February 2005 39-55
DOI: 10.1177/1069397104267889

This model has undergone numerous revisions. I will refer to the various versions collectively as the UE model. A constant feature of all versions of the UE model has been the observation that there are universal constraints on the naming of colors, that it is not the case, for example, that "our partitioning of the spectrum consists of the arbitrary imposition of a category system upon a continuous physical domain" (Krauss, 1968, pp. 268-269).

Two recent studies have added important findings in the area of cross-language color naming. Levinson's (2000) study of Yélî Dnye[1] color naming has produced the first experimentally documented example of a language lacking a set of basic color terms that partitions the perceptual color space. These and related findings (e.g., Lyons, 1995, 1999) have required revision of the UE model to take account of such emergence hypothesis phenomena (Kay, 1999; Kay & Maffi, 1999).[2] Roberson, Davies, and Davidoff's (2000) study of Berinmo[3] color terms and related psychological tests failed to replicate some important results of Rosch's Dani work (Heider, 1972a, 1972b; Heider & Olivier, 1972), which had appeared to show a perceptual basis for the universal constraints on color naming observed by Berlin and Kay.[4] Neither of these studies, however, has produced information challenging the UE claim of universal constraints on cross-language color naming per se. Some explicitly relativist conclusions regarding color naming have nevertheless been drawn. For example Roberson et al. has written, "We will propose that color categories are formed from boundary demarcation based predominantly on language. Thus in a substantial way, we will present evidence in favor of linguistic relativity" (2000, p. 394). More recently, Davidoff (2001) has written,

> Our own cross-cultural research . . . indicates that perceptual categories are derived from the words in the speaker's language. The new data support a rather strong version of the Whorfian view that perceptual categories are organized by the linguistic system of our mind. (p. 382)

The present article will demonstrate that not only do the color naming data of Yélî Dnye and Berinmo fail to challenge the existence of universal constraints on color naming, these data provide strong evidence *for* universal constraints on color naming.[5]

BERINMO AND YÉLÎ DNYE COLOR NAMING

To test whether color naming in Berinmo and Yélî Dnye supports the hypothesis of universal constraints on color naming, a point location in the stimulus space was calculated for each Berinmo and Yélî Dnye chromatic color term, specifically, the centroid of the naming responses for that term.[6] MacLaury (1997, p. 467), on the basis of inspection of the full World Color Survey (WCS) data set (see Note 9), as well as the Mesoamerican Color Survey data set, isolated four chips in the stimulus array as representing the universal “elemental” hues: red, yellow, green, and blue. The test of compatability of the Berinmo and Yélî Dnye hue naming data with universal patterns of color naming consists in a comparison of the Berinmo and Yélî Dnye hue naming centroids with the MacLaury red, yellow, green, and blue elemental hues.

In the Yélî Dnye study, Levinson (2000) elicited names for the full Lenneberg and Roberts (1956) array of 40 equally spaced Munsell hues at 8 levels of lightness (Munsell value), plus achromatic chips at 10 levels of lightness.[7] (The full array of 330 colors is shown schematically in Figure 1). In the Berinmo study, Roberson et al. (2000) elicited names for a 20-hue array at 8 levels of lightness, which Rosch had used with the Dani. (The resulting 160-cell hue/lightness array omits every other hue column of the 320-cell hue/lightness array.)[8] In depicting the Berinmo hue naming centroids below, I have transformed the Berinmo 160-cell hue/lightness space into the 320-cell hue/lightness space, interpolating as necessary.

Roberson et al. (2000) do not report having used achromatic stimuli in their naming task, but they write:

> Berinmo has five basic color terms. . . . The names of the Berinmo terms are *wapa* (both the term for a European person and for white and all very pale colors); *kel* (the term for black, for charcoal or anything burnt, but also meaning dirty); *mehi* (the term for red and for the color of the fruit of the red Pandanus palm); *wor* (the term for leaves ready to fall from a tree and covering a range of yellow/orange/brown and khaki) and *nol* (the term meaning live and covering green/yellow-green/blue/and purple. (pp. 371-372)

These glosses indicate that *nol*, the term including green, blue, and purple, extends further into yellow than does English green: *Nol* is

VALUE (LIGHTNESS) →

		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
H	2.5R									1
U	5R									2
E	7.5R									3
	10R									4
↓	2.5YR									5
	5YR									6
	7.5YR									7
	10YR									8
	2.5Y									9
	5Y									10
	7.5Y									11
	10Y									12
	2.5GY									13
	5GY									14
	7.5GY									15
	10GY									16
	2.5G									17
	5G									18
	7.5G									19
	10G									20
	2.5BG									21
	5BG									22
	7.5BG									23
	10BG									24
	2.5B									25
	5B									26
	7.5B									27
	10B									28
	2.5BP									29
	5BP									30
	7.5PB									31
	10BP									32
	2.5P									33
	5P									34
	7.5P									35
	10P									36
	2.5RP									37
	5RP									38
	7.5RP									39
	10RP									40
		I	H	G	F	E	D	C	B	

Figure 1: Schematic Array of 320 Munsell Chromatic Colors

NOTE: Munsell notations are at top and left; World Color Survey notations are at bottom and right. All chips are at maximum chroma (saturation). An approximate color reproduction of this stimulus array can be viewed online at http://www.ICSI.Berkeley.EDU/wcs/study.html.

reported to include "yellow-green." *Wor*—which includes focal yellow—is not said to include any shades including a green component. The naming data tabulated in Roberson et al.'s (2000) Figure 2 (p. 373), present a contradictory picture as regards the *wor/nol* boundary. In Figure 2, the yellow term, *wor*, intrudes into the area that would be called green in familiar languages, and the extension of the *nol* term is concomitantly retracted to exclude yellowish greens. For example, if one compares Roberson et al.'s Figure 2 for Berinmo naming with their Figure 1, which reproduces Rosch's English naming results, one finds that every English green chip bordering yellow in English (Figure 1) is included in Berinmo *wor* ('yellow') in Figure 2, and similarly, no English yellow chip is included in Berinmo *nol*('green or blue or purple'). A number of Roberson et al.'s experiments involve the relative placement of the English yellow/green and Berinmo *wor/nol* boundaries. In the remainder of this article, I ignore Roberson et al.'s glosses with regard to the *wor/nol* boundary, basing all calculations on their tabulations of actual naming responses.

Notwithstanding difficulties regarding the *wor/nol* boundary, Roberson et al.'s (2000) glosses suggest unequivocally that Berinmo subjects would reliably name white and black chips *wapa* and *kel*, respectively, were such chips presented to them. (Levinson, 2000, as well, reports Yélî Dnye basic color terms for black and white.) Berinmo *mehi* appears to be an unremarkable term for red. The Berinmo *wor* term, focused in yellow and extended into orange, brown, and khaki, has many analogues among WCS[9] and Berlin and Kay languages. Judging from RDD's Figure 2—not their glosses—the extension of the term including focal yellow into the yellowish green area is similar to the situation in Hanuno'o, where the red/yellow/orange/brown term, (*ma*)*rara'*, also extends into the yellowish green area. The remaining grue term, *nol*, focused in green, is extended through purple, a common occurrence in the WCS data (Kay & Berlin, 1997, p. 200).

On the basis of inspection of the original Berlin and Kay (1969) data, the Mesoamerican Color Survey data, and the WCS data, MacLaury (1997, p. 467) has proposed four chips in the 320 Munsell hue/lightness space as representing the universal elemental hues. These are shown in Figure 2. Naming centroids have been calculated for each of the chromatic terms for Yélî Dnye from the data presented in Levinson (2000, Figures 2, 3, and 4) and for Berinmo from unpublished data generously furnished by Roberson et al. (2000) and are shown on the following figures.

		VALUE (LIGHTNESS)→								
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
H	2.5R									1
U	5R									2
E	7.5R									3
	10R									4
↓	2.5YR									5
	5YR									6
	7.5YR									7
	10YR									8
	2.5Y									9
	5Y									10
	7.5Y									11
	10Y									12
	2.5GY									13
	5GY									14
	7.5GY									15
	10GY									16
	2.5G									17
	5G									18
	7.5G									19
	10G									20
	2.5BG									21
	5BG									22
	7.5BG									23
	10BG									24
	2.5B									25
	5B									26
	7.5B									27
	10B									28
	2.5BP									29
	5BP									30
	7.5PB									31
	10BP									32
	2.5P									33
	5P									34
	7.5P									35
	10P									36
	2.5RP									37

Figure 2: Elemental Chromatic Colors (indicated by •)

SOURCE: MacLaury (1997, p. 467).

NOTE: Munsell notations are at top and left; World Color Survey notations are at bottom and right. All chips are at maximum chroma (saturation).

VALUE (LIGHTNESS)→

HUE ↓	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
2.5R			•Y						1
5R									2
7.5R									3
10R									4
2.5YR									5
5YR									6
7.5YR									7
10YR									8
2.5Y							•		9
5Y						Y			10
7.5Y									11
10Y									12
2.5GY									13
5GY									14
7.5GY									15
10GY									16
2.5G				•					17
5G				Y					18
7.5G									19
10G									20
2.5BG									21
5BG									22
7.5BG									23
10BG									24
2.5B									25
5B									26
7.5B									27
10B									28
2.5BP				•					29
5BP									30
7.5PB									31
10BP									32
2.5P									33
5P									34
7.5P									35
10P									36
2.5RP									37
5RP									38
7.5RP									39
10RP									40
	I	H	G	F	E	D	C	B	

Figure 3: Elemental Chromatic Colors (indicated by •) and Yélî Dnye Naming Centroids (indicated by Y)

NOTE: Munsell notations are at top and left; World Color Survey notations are at bottom and right. All chips are at maximum chroma (saturation).

VALUE (LIGHTNESS) →

HUE ↓	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
2.5R			•Y	B					1
5R									2
7.5R									3
10R									4
2.5YR									5
5YR									6
7.5YR									7
10YR									8
2.5Y							•		9
5Y						YB			10
7.5Y									11
10Y									12
2.5GY									13
5GY									14
7.5GY									15
10GY									16
2.5G				•					17
5G				Y					18
7.5G									19
10G									20
2.5BG									21
5BG									22
7.5BG				*B					23
10BG									24
2.5B									25
5B									26
7.5B									27
10B									28
2.5BP				•					29
5BP									30
7.5PB									31
10BP									32
2.5P									33
5P									34
7.5P									35
10P									36
2.5RP									37
5RP									38
7.5RP									39
10RP									40
	I	H	G	F	E	D	C	B	

Figure 4: Elemental Chromatic Colors (indicated by •) and Yélî Dnye Naming Centroids (indicated by Y), Predicted Grue Centroid (indicated by *), and Berinmo Naming Centroids (indicated by B)

NOTE: Munsell notations are at top and left; World Color Survey notations are at bottom and right. All chips are at maximum chroma (saturation).

Figure 3 shows the location of the naming centroids for Yélî Dnye red, green, and yellow expressions elicited by Levinson (2000), along with the MacLaury (1997) elemental hues. Levinson (2000) mentions a class of blue-denoting expressions, which he characterizes as the least lexicalized, least reliable, and least generally shared of the hue expression classes elicited in the naming task. Although the focal choices for the blue expressions are reported (Levinson, 2000, Figure 5), the naming responses are not. Hence, no centroid calculation for the Yélî Dnye blue naming data is possible. Impressionistically, prediction of the location of the Yélî Dnye hue centroids from the MacLaury elemental chromatic colors and the UE model appears confirmed.

Berinmo hue naming centroids were also calculated and compared with the MacLaury elementals and the Yélî Dnye naming centroids. In deriving a prediction for the naming centroid of the *nol* term in Berinmo, account must be taken of the fact that this is a grue term, not a green term. As a consequence, we predict the centroid of the naming responses for this term to fall halfway between elemental green and elemental blue. Figure 4 compares the Berinmo hue naming centroids with the MacLaury elemental chromatic colors and the Yélî Dnye hue naming centroids. We see that the naming centroid for *nol* is, as predicted, the chip halfway between the green and blue elementals. Again, prediction of local hue naming responses from universally posited elemental colors is impressionistically confirmed. In Figure 4, each of the six naming centroids of the two languages is observed to be a chip either identical to or adjacent to a chip predicted by the UE model using the MacLaury elemental chromatic colors.

Table 1 gives the comparison of the elemental hues and the hue naming centroids of the two languages in tabular form.

STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF IMPRESSIONISTIC FINDINGS

The impression that the Berinmo and Yélî Dnye hue naming data are closer to universal tendencies than would be expected by chance is now subjected to statistical test. Because Berinmo and Yélî Dnye have been claimed to provide challenges to the UE model, no unfair advantage for the UE hypothesis is gained by assuming these languages to be representative of the world's languages. Both languages yield three hue centroids. We are thus

TABLE 1
Berinmo and Yélî Dnye Hue Naming Centroids Compared With MacLaury's (1997) Universal Elemental Hues

Elemental Hues	*Red* *G1 (2.5R/4)*	*Yellow* *C9 (2.5Y/8)*	*Green* *F17 (2.5G/5)*	*Blue* *F29 (2.5PB/5)*
Berinmo	*mehi* (red) F1 (2.5R/5)	*wor* (yellow) *D10 (5Y/7)*	*nol* (grue) *F23 (7.5BG/5)*	
Yélî Dnye	red terms G1 (2.5R/4)	yellow terms D10 (5Y/7)	green terms F18 (2.5G/4)	—

looking for the joint probability of two independent events; each of these events involves for a particular language with three hue naming centroids both the centroid pattern observed for that language, π_o, and the centroid pattern predicted for that language by the UE model and the MacLaury elementals π_e. Specifically, for each language, we need to separately calculate the probability p that, if each of the 320 cells has an equal probability of receiving a hue centroid, a pattern of three hue centroids will be observed that is as close to π_e as π_o is. The probability of the joint, two-language event will then be the product of the values of p for the two languages. (It turns out that p values for the two languages are the same, so we will only have to make one calculation of p and square that result.)

The calculation of p and p^2 is shown in Figure 5. We first quantify the idea of how close pattern π_o is to pattern π_e. To do this, we imagine the 320-cell hue chart curled into a cylindrical grid with 40 columns and 8 rows, where the leftmost and rightmost columns of the rectangular chip array are adjacent columns on the cylinder. Berinmo has three basic hue terms. Yélî Dnye has either three or four established hue categories; in either case, we have naming data for three: red, yellow, and green. In the case of Yélî Dnye, the null hypothesis is that the hue naming centroids will bear no particular relation to the red, yellow, and green elementals, and the alternative, UE, hypothesis is that the former will be "close" to the latter. As an initial quantification of "closeness" between π_e and π_o, we designate a target area for each predicted chip to consist of the 3×3–chip minimal square that consists of the predicted chip and the eight chips surrounding it. Assuming the UE predicted *nol* grue target for Berinmo to be the chip exactly intermediate between universal green and universal blue (F23, 7.5BG/5), the

---

Given:

(1) a cylindrical surface marked off into 40 columns and 8 rows, producing 320 cells,
(2) designation of 3 non-overlapping target regions, each containing 9 cells;

Find:

the probability p that each of 3 cells chosen at random will belong to a distinct target region.

$$p = 27/320 \times 18/320 \times 9/320 = 4{,}374 / 32{,}768{,}000 = .00013$$

and

$$p^2 = .00000002$$

In general, for n total cells and t target areas, each of size s, the probability p of t successes when choosing t cells is

$$P = \prod_{i=1}^{t} s_i / n$$

Figure 5: Framing the Problem in Terms of Probability

TABLE 2
Varying the Size of the Target Region

s	p	p^2
9	.00013	.00000002.
25	.00286	.000008.
49	.02154	.0005.

NOTE: $s \geq 81$ would cause overlap in target areas.

UE prediction that every naming centroid falls in a distinct target area is exactly confirmed for each language, as we noted in connection with Figure 4 and Table 2. What is the probability that three cells chosen at random from the 320-cell array will fall, one each, in the three target areas? That probability p is given by

$$p = 27/320 \times 18/320 \times 9/320 = 4{,}374/32{,}768{,}000 = .00013. \qquad (1)$$

The probability p represents the chance occurrence of three observed centroids in a single language landing in each of three distinct nine-cell, non-overlapping target areas, when each of the 320 cells of the space has an equal probability of being hit. For two independently chosen, three-hue-term languages, the probability of both achieving success by this criterion is

$$p^2 = .00000002. \tag{2}$$

In general, for n cells and t target areas, each of size s, the probability P of t successes in choosing t cells is given by

$$P = \overset{t}{\underset{i=1}{\pi}} s_{i/n} \tag{3}$$

The most stringent, least powerful, test—other than one requiring direct hits on single predicted chips—is the one we have just assessed, where the size s of the target square is nine (see Table 2). The next largest target square has five cells to a side, $s = 25$, and the next largest after that has seven cells to a side, $s = 49$. (Nine cells to a side, $s = 81$, would cause overlapping target areas.) Whichever test we choose, the result in favor of the UE hypothesis of closeness of observed hue centroids to predictions from UE theory is significant, as shown in Table 2. Statistical testing thus confirms the impression of Figure 4 and Table 1, that the observed locations of naming centroids for Berinmo and Yélî Dnye hue terms are closer to those predicted by the UE model and the proposed universal elemental chromatic colors than would be expected by chance.

CONCLUSION

Berinmo and Yélî Dnye have been claimed elsewhere to present special problems for the UE theory of color naming universals. The present analysis of the color naming patterns in these two languages fails to support such arguments and rather supports the UE hypothesis of universal constraints on cross-language color naming.[10] Roberson et al. (2000) showed that the performance of Berinmo subjects in a variety of experimental tasks involving colors and color words failed to replicate the performance of Rosch's Dani subjects. They also showed that where the boundaries between color terms differ in Berinmo and English, these differences correlate with differences in color cognition: Berinmo speakers exhibit enhanced color discrimination from memory across Berinmo category boundaries—but not across English boundaries—whereas English speakers show the reverse pattern. Kay and Kempton (1984) obtained an analogous result for simultaneous judgments of similarity among color chips. These judgments were shown to be influenced by language-specific lexical boundaries in a comparison of English speakers with speakers of Tarahumara, an unaffiliated language of Mexico that lacks a lexical distinction between green and blue. Demonstrations such as these, which show that differences in color naming between languages can influence nonlinguistic behavior toward colors should not, however, be taken as evidence that color naming varies without constraint across the world's languages. Berlin and Kay (1969) emphasized the fact that different languages have different numbers of basic color terms, and so color term boundaries cannot be universal. Berinmo color naming does not depart in any major respect from that found in other languages of the world with five major color terms. Roberson et al.'s (2000) results appear to be consistent with Davies's view that "the inferential load [that Rosch's Dani work] is required to support is too heavy" (Davies, 1997, p. 186). Neither the Berinmo nor the Yélî Dnye data, however, weaken the hypothesis that there exist universal constraints on cross-language color naming; indeed, they strengthen it.

NOTES

1. Yélî Dnye is a language isolate spoken on Rossel Island in the Louisade Archipelago, Papua New Guinea.

2. Levinson's (2000) Yélî Dnye results were widely available in preprint form before the published paper appeared.

3. Berinmo is the name given by Davidoff, Davies, and Roberson (1999) for the language of "a remote, previously unstudied, hunter-gatherer tribe . . . which lives on the upper reaches of the Sepik River in Papua New Guinea" (p. 203). No information is given by these authors regarding the genetic affiliation of this language, if any. To my knowledge, the name Berinmo did not appear in the literature prior to Davidoff et al.

4. Numerous others observed universal constraints on color naming. See, for example, the results of two large surveys reported in MacLaury (1997) and Kay, Berlin, Maffi, and Merrifield (1997), described further on, as well as the references in these works to studies of individual languages. The bibliography added by Luisa Maffi to the 1991 paperback reprinting of Berlin and Kay (1969) also contains citations of numerous individual-language studies confirming the general picture of cross-language constraints on color naming.

5. An earlier version of the universality and evolution (UE) model (Kay & McDaniel, 1978) asserted that established universals in color naming could be explained by known properties of the visual system, specifically the differential firing rates of classes of macaque LGN neurons found by De Valois, Abramov, and Jacobs (1966). Although grounding the phenomenal opponency of red/green and yellow/blue in monkey LGN firing rates was widely accepted in the vision community at the time, it has since been abandoned (Abramov, 1997; Abramov & Gordon, 1994; Derrington, Krauskopf, & Lennie, 1984). Kay and Maffi (1999, p. 746) explicitly reject the hypothesis that LGN firing rates provide a biological basis for the UE model. The Kay and Maffi model takes universal constraints on color naming to be based on presumed universals of color appearance—for example, on opponent red/green and yellow/blue phenomenal channels—but on no specific neural substrate, retinal, geniculate, or cortical.

6. Interpreting the size of interchip intervals in Munsell space as reflecting psychological distance is not generally accepted (see, e.g., Boynton, 1997, p. 139). Nevertheless, because Roberson, Davies, and Davidoff (2000) make this kind of interpretation throughout their article, I have followed their practice in the interest of consistency and have calculated the centroids of Berinmo and Yélî Dnye naming responses on the maximal saturation surface of the Munsell solid in the hue and value dimensions. It has not been possible to include centroid calculations for achromatic colors (specifically, black and white) for technical reasons involving the particular sets of stimuli selected from the full Munsell set. Although centroid calculations for naming responses employing the black and white terms of Berinmo and Yélî Dnye cannot be made from the available data, it seems clear that if statistically usable naming data for these terms were available, they would—by virtue of the fact that they patently are black and white terms—strengthen the case for universal constraints on color naming.

7. This same array was used by Berlin and Kay (1969), the World Color Survey (Kay et al., 1997), and the Mesoamerican Color Survey (MacLaury, 1997).

8. Both Levinson and Roberson et al. (2000) presented chips for naming one by one. Levinson presented chips in the constant random order employed in the World Color Survey. Roberson et al. randomized chip order for each subject. Both checked subjects for color vision deficiencies using the Ishihara plates and found none. Levinson tested 7 Yélî Dnye subjects, Roberson et al. tested 22 Berinmo subjects. Levinson used natural lighting. Roberson et al. employed a specially constructed display box that produced a light equivalent to CIE illuminant C.

9. The World Color Survey, directed by Brent Berlin, Paul Kay, and William Merrifield, collected—with the much-appreciated cooperation of many missionary linguists of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (now SIL International)—color naming data from 110 languages around the

world, averaging 24 speakers per language, insofar as possible monolingual, in situ, using the native language as the language of interview. Three hundred thirty color chips were presented in a fixed random order for naming by the local speaker, and best example ("focal") choices were elicited from a full array of the stimuli following the naming task. The focal responses do not figure in this report, only the centroids of the naming responses.

10. A variety of hypotheses have been advanced to explain these cross-linguistic constraints on color naming, several combining one or another general principle of economy of categorization with some mechanism that picks out special colors, for example, whatever mechanism produces the Hering opponent fundamentals (Kay & Maffi, 1999), the differential frequencies with which colors occur in natural scenes (Yendrikhovskij, 2001), and differential color saliencies arising from irregularities in the perceptual color solid (Jameson & D'Andrade, 1997).

REFERENCES

Abramov, I. (1997). Physiological mechanisms of color vision. In C. L. Hardin & L. Maffi (Eds.), *Color categories in thought and language* (pp. 89-117). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Abramov, I., & Gordon, J. (1994). Color appearance: On seeing red—or yellow or green or blue. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *45*, 451-485.

Berlin, B., & Kay, P. (1969). *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkeley: University of California.

Boynton, R. M. (1997). Insights gained from naming the OSA colors. In C. L. Hardin & L. Maffi (Eds.), *Color categories in thought and language* (pp. 135-150). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Davidoff, J. (2001). Language and perceptual categorisation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *5*, 382-387.

Davidoff, J., Davies, I, & Roberson, D. (1999). Colour categories of a stone-age tribe. *Nature*, *398*, 203-204.

Davies, I. (1997). Commentary on Saunders, B.A.C. and J. van Brakel: Are there non-trivial constraints on colour categorization? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *20*, 167-228.

Derrington, A. M., Krauskopf, J., & Lennie, P. (1984). Chromatic mechanisms in lateral geniculate nucleus of macaque. *Journal of Physiology*, *357*, 241-265.

De Valois, R. L., Abramov, I., & Jacobs, G. H. (1966). Analysis of response patterns of LGN cells. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, *56*, 966-977.

Heider, E. Rosch. (1972a). Probabilities, sampling and the ethnographic method: The case of Dani colour names. *Man*, *7*, 448-466.

Heider, E. Rosch. (1972b). Universals in color naming and memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *93*, 1-20.

Heider, E. Rosch, & Olivier, D. C. (1972). The structure of the color space for naming and memory in two languages. *Cognitive Psychology*, *3*, 337-354.

Jameson, K., & D'Andrade, R. G. (1997). It's not really red, green, yellow, blue. In C. L. Hardin & L. Maffi (Eds.), *Color categories in thought and language* (pp. 295-319). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kay, P. (1999). The emergence of basic color lexicons hypothesis. In A. Borg (Ed.), *The language of colour in the Mediterranean* (pp. 53-69). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.

Kay, P., & Berlin, B. (1997). There are non-trivial constraints on color categorization. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *20*, 196-202.

Kay, P., Berlin, B., Maffi, L., & Merrifield, W. (1997). Color naming across languages. In C. L. Hardin & L. Maffi (Eds.), *Color categories in thought and language* (pp. 21-58). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kay, P., & Maffi, L. (1999). Color appearance and the emergence and evolution of basic color lexicons. *American Anthropologist*, *101*, 743-760.

Kay, P., & McDaniel, C. K. (1978). The linguistic significance of the meanings of basic color terms. *Language*, *54*, 610-646.

Kay, P., & Kempton, W. M. (1984). What is the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis? *American Anthropologist*, *86*, 65-79.

Krauss, R. M. (1968) Language as a symbolic process. *American Scientist*, *56*, 265-278.

Lenneberg, E. H., & Roberts, J. M. (1956). The language of experience: A study in methodology. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, *Memoir, 13*.

Levinson, Stephen A. (2000). Yélî Dnye and the theory of basic color terms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *10*, 3-55.

Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1999). Color in ancient Greek and Latin. In A. Borg (Ed.), *The language of colour in the Mediterranean* (pp. 27-68). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.

MacLaury, R. E. (1997). *Color and cognition in Mesoamerica*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Roberson, D., Davies, I., & Davidoff, J. (2000). Colour categories are not universal: Replications and new evidence from a stone age culture. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *129*, 360-398.

Yendrikhovskij, S. (2001). Computing color categories from statistics of natural images. *Journal of Imaging Sciences and Technology*, *48*, 409-417.

Paul Kay is a senior research scientist at the International Computer Science Institute, Berkeley, California, and professor emeritus of linguistics at the University of California–Berkeley. His principal research interests are in cross-language color naming and grammatical theory. He coauthored with Brent Berlin the definitive work on color categorization titled Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution *(University of California Press, 1969). He is the author of* Words and the Grammar of Context *(Cam-*

bridge University Press, 1997) and the editor of Explorations in Mathematical Anthropology *(MIT Press, 1971). Additionally, he has authored or coauthored numerous papers on color naming, grammatical theory, language variation, and other linguistic and anthropological topics.*