

Phonology and Language Use

JOAN BYBEE

University of New Mexico




CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PHONOLOGY AND LANGUAGE USE

A research perspective that takes language use into account opens up new views of old issues and provides an understanding of issues that linguists have rarely addressed. Referencing new developments in cognitive and functional linguistics, phonetics, and connectionist modeling, this book investigates various ways in which a speaker/hearer's experience with language affects the representation of phonology. Rather than assuming phonological representations in terms of phonemes, Joan Bybee adopts an exemplar model, in which specific tokens of use are stored and categorized phonetically with reference to variables in the context. This model allows an account of phonetically gradual sound change that produces lexical variation, and provides an explanatory account of the fact that many productive sound changes affect high frequency items first. The well-known effects of type and token frequency on morphologically conditioned phonological alterations are shown also to apply to larger sequences, such as fixed phrases and constructions, solving some of the problems formulated previously as dealing with the phonology-syntax interface.

Joan Bybee is the author of several books and articles on phonology, morphology, language universals, and linguistic change. Most recently, she served as a coeditor for both *Essays on Language and Function Type* (1997) and *Modality in Grammar and Discourse* (1995). Dr. Bybee is Regents' Professor of Linguistics and Chair of the Department of Linguistics at the University of New Mexico.



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS

General editors: S. R. ANDERSON, J. BRESNAN, B. COMRIE,
W. DRESSLER, C. EWEN, R. HUDDLESTON, R. LASS,
D. LIGHTFOOT, J. LYONS, P. H. MATTHEWS, R. POSNER,
S. ROMAINÉ, N. V. SMITH, N. VINCENT

Phonology and Language Use

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS

In this series

- 72 LUIGI BURZIO: *Principles of English stress*
- 73 JOHN A. HAWKINS: *A performance theory of order and constituency*
- 74 ALICE C. HARRIS and LYLE CAMPBELL: *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*
- 75 LILIANE HAEGEMAN: *The syntax of negation*
- 76 PAUL GORRELL: *Syntax and parsing*
- 77 GUGLIELMO CINQUE: *Italian syntax and Universal Grammar*
- 78 HENRY SMITH: *Restrictiveness in case theory*
- 79 D. ROBERT LADD: *Intonational phonology*
- 80 ANDREA MORO: *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*
- 81 ROGER LASS: *Historical linguistics and language change*
- 82 JOHN M. ANDERSON: *A notional theory of syntactic categories*
- 83 BERND HEINE: *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces and grammaticalization*
- 84 NOMI ERTESCHIK-SHIR: *The dynamics of focus structure*
- 85 JOHN COLEMAN: *Phonological representations: Their names, forms and powers*
- 86 CHRISTINA Y. BETHIN: *Slavic prosody: Language change and phonological theory*
- 87 BARBARA DANCYGIER: *Conditionals and prediction: Time, knowledge, and causation in English*
- 88 CLAIRE LEFEBVRE: *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar: The case of Haitian Creole*
- 89 HEINZ GIEGERICH: *Lexical strata in English: Morphological causes, phonological effects*
- 90 KEREN RICE: *Morpheme order and semantic scope: Word formation in the Athapaskan verb*
- 91 APRIL MCMAHON: *Lexical phonology and the history of English*
- 92 MATTHEW Y. CHEN: *Tone sandhi: Patterns across Chinese dialects*
- 93 GREGORY T. STUMP: *Inflectional morphology*

Supplementary volumes

- LILIANE HAEGEMAN: *Theory and description in generative syntax: A case study in West Flemish*
- A. E. BACKHOUSE: *The lexical field of taste: A semantic study of Japanese taste terms*
- NIKOLAUS RITT: *Quantity adjustment: Vowel lengthening and shortening in early Middle English*

Phonology and Language Use

JOAN BYBEE

University of New Mexico



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Joan Bybee 2001

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2001

Printed in the United States of America

Typeface Times Roman 10.25/13 pt. System QuarkXPress [BTS]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Bybee, Joan L.

Phonology and language use / Joan Bybee.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in linguistics ; 94)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-58374-8

1. Grammar, Comparative and general – Phonology.
 2. Linguistic change.
 3. Grammar, Comparative and general – Morphology.
 4. Universals (Linguistics)
- I. Title. II. Series.

P217.3 .B93 2001

414 – dc21

00-045525

ISBN 0 521 58374 8 hardback

To my parents

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvii
1 Language Use as Part of Linguistic Theory	1
1.1 Substance and Usage in Phonology	1
1.2 Some Basic Principles of a Usage-Based Model	6
1.3 The Creative Role of Repetition	8
1.4 Frequency Effects	10
1.5 Phonology as Procedure, Structure as Emergent	14
1.6 Organization of the Book	16
1.7 Language as a Part of Human Behavior	17
2 A Usage-Based Model for Phonology and Morphology	19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 The Rule/List Fallacy	20
2.3 Organized Storage	21
2.4 Morphological Structure Is Emergent	23
2.5 Rules and Schemas Compared	26
2.6 Frequency Effects	28
2.7 Units of Storage	29
2.8 Phonological Units	31
2.9 From Local to General Schemas	31
2.10 Conclusion	33
3 The Nature of Lexical Representation	35
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 The Phonemic Principle	35
	ix

3.3	A Cognitively Realistic Model of Phonological Representation	37
3.4	Linguistic Evidence for Detailed and Redundant Storage	40
3.5	Usage-Based Categorization versus Phonemic Representation	45
3.6	Phonetic Detail in the Lexicon – Variation and the Early Involvement of the Lexicon and Morphology in Change	54
3.7	A Model for Sound Change	57
3.8	Special Reduction of High-Frequency Words and Phrases	60
3.9	Conclusion	62
4	Phonological Processes, Phonological Patterns	63
4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Phonetic Etiology and Its Limits	65
4.3	Articulatory Gestures	69
4.4	Patterns of Change and Constraints on Processes	77
4.5	Segments as Emergent Units	85
4.6	Generalization over Syllable-Initial and Syllable-Final Position	86
4.7	Phonotactics	88
4.8	Conclusion	95
5	The Interaction of Phonology with Morphology	96
5.1	Introduction	96
5.2	Morphological versus Phonological Conditioning	97
5.3	Lexical Storage of Complex Forms, Both Regular and Irregular	109
5.4	Lexical Strength	113
5.5	Paradigmatic Relations Expressed as Lexical Connections	117
5.6	Lexical Classes: Productivity Due to Type Frequency	118
5.7	The Interaction of Lexical Strength and Lexical Connection	124
5.8	Product-Oriented Schemas	126
5.9	Phonological Similarity in Gangs	130
5.10	Conclusion	135

6	The Units of Storage and Access: Morphemes, Words, and Phrases	137
6.1	Introduction	137
6.2	Phonological Representations of Words	138
6.3	Morphemes within Words	144
6.4	Phrases and Constructions with Alternations	157
6.5	Conclusion	166
7	Constructions as Processing Units: The Rise and Fall of French Liaison	167
7.1	Introduction	167
7.2	Final Consonant Deletion in French	168
7.3	Grammatical Constructions and Liaison	171
7.4	Loss of Liaison as Regularization	177
7.5	Syntactic Cohesion as Frequency of Co-occurrence	185
7.6	Taking the Phonology Seriously	185
7.7	Conclusion	187
8	Universals, Synchrony and Diachrony	189
8.1	Universals and Explanation	189
8.2	Searching for Universals	191
8.3	Phoneme Inventories	197
8.4	Two Main Mechanisms for Phonological Change	199
8.5	Syllable Structure	204
8.6	More Evidence against Universals as Purely Synchronic	211
8.7	Diachronic Sources for Formal Universals: The Phonemic Principle and Structure Preservation	212
	References	217
	Author Index	231
	Subject Index	235
	Languages Index	238

Figures

2.1	Lexical connections for [ɛnd] in <i>send, lend, trend, blend, bend.</i>	page 22
2.2	Lexical connections for the [b] in <i>bee, bet, bed, bad, ban, bin.</i>	23
2.3	Phonological and semantic connections yield Past in <i>played, spilled, spoiled, banned, rammed.</i>	23
2.4	The emergence of the -ing suffix in <i>play, playing; ban, banning; ram, ramming; spoil, spoiling.</i>	24
2.5	A network of formatives.	25
3.1	Exemplar representation and associations.	52
4.1	Tract variables and associated articulators proposed by Browman and Goldstein.	70
5.1	The different relations in three sets of Singular-Plural forms.	116
5.2	Relations among some forms of the verb <i>cantar</i> 'to sing'.	118
5.3	Family resemblance structure for the <i>mentir</i> class.	133
8.1	The relations among three tiers of crosslinguistic phenomena.	210

Tables

3.1	American English Schwa Deletion: Poststress Vowels Preceding Unstressed Sonorant-Initial Consonants Tend to Delete (Hooper 1976b)	<i>page 41</i>
5.1	The Effects of Word Frequency on <i>t/d</i> Deletion in Regular Past Tense Verbs (Non-Prevocalic Only)	112
5.2	Count of Verbs Used by French Nursery School Children During Play (Guillaume 1927/1973)	120
5.3	A Semiproductive Verb Class of English (Bybee and Moder 1983)	127
5.4	Examples of Strong Preterits in Spanish Compared to Regulars	134
5.5	Family Resemblance Structure for Strong Preterits in Spanish	134
6.1	The Variable Reduction of /s/ in Argentinian Spanish (Terrell 1978, Hooper 1981)	140
6.2	The Variable Reduction of /s/ in Cuban Spanish (Terrell 1977, 1979, Hooper 1981)	140
6.3	Percentage of Occurrence of Word-Final /s/ before a Consonant, Vowel, and Pause in Two Dialects of Spanish	142
6.4	Rate of Deletion for Regular Past Tense Compared to All Other Words of Comparable Frequency (403 Tokens or Fewer)	147
6.5	Rate of Deletion According to Token Frequency for All Non-Past Participle Tokens of Medial <i>d</i>	149
6.6	Rate of Deletion in the Past Participle Suffix	150
6.7	Rate of Deletion in the First Conjugation Past Participle Suffix vs. /d/ Following /a/ Overall	151

6.8	Rate of Deletion in the Second and Third Conjugation Past Participle Suffix vs. /d/ Following /i/ Overall	151
6.9	Deletion/Retention Rates for High- and Low-Frequency First Conjugation Past Participles	152
6.10	The Forms of Two Spanish Verbs with <i>ue</i> and with <i>o</i>	154
6.11	The Relation between the Transparent vs. Pragmatic Uses of <i>I don't know</i> and the Full vs. Reduced Vowel Variants	161
6.12	Number of Items Preceding and Following <i>don't</i>	163
7.1	Number of Instances of Liaison for the Forms of the Verb <i>être</i> 'to be'	180
7.2	Ågren's Findings for Auxiliaries and Following Infinitives	183

Acknowledgments

The idea for this book and the perception that it was needed arose in the context of the community of researchers who investigate the way language use gives rise to grammar. Indeed, it was these workers in usage-based functionalism, most notably my long-time friend Sandy Thompson, who first supported and encouraged a book that would show how principles that had been successfully applied to the explanation of morphosyntactic patterns could also be applied to phonology. This book was originally intended for these linguists and their students. However, the encouragement and support of phonologists was also forthcoming once the idea of the book was broached. I am grateful to Janet Pierrehumbert in her role as editor for Cambridge University Press for supporting this project and for giving me extensive comments and suggestions on the first draft of the manuscript. I am also much indebted to Martin Haspelmath, José Ignacio Hualde, and Carmen Pensado for their careful reading of the first draft and their detailed comments and questions. I am particularly grateful to José Ignacio Hualde for comments that caused me to rethink certain issues. In addition, suggestions from Jürgen Klausenburger and Robert Kirchner also led to revisions of the manuscript. Discussions with each of these individuals helped me develop a deeper understanding of the phenomena treated here, as well as an improved presentation of my ideas.

For assistance in researching and editing, computing, and formatting, I am grateful to Dawn Nordquist and Catie Berkenfield. Also, Dawn Nordquist coded and helped me analyze the data discussed in Section 6.3.3, with the assistance of Rena Torres-Cacoulllos. Aaron Smith also assisted at various stages of the project. Thanks are also due to my colleague Caroline Smith for consultation on various issues in the

phonetics literature. To the many students who have posed interesting questions and problems over many semesters and to those whose research answered some of these questions, I am extremely grateful for the stimulation.

The University of New Mexico has provided research support in the Regents' Professorship I was awarded in 1996, and the College of Arts and Sciences has provided teaching relief in the form of a Research Semester in the spring of 1999. My parents, Robert and Elizabeth Bybee, have provided donations, matched by the Exxon Foundation, that made possible research assistance. Without these sources of support, this work would certainly have taken much longer to emerge.

And, finally, many thanks to Ira Jaffe, for the generosity and good humor with which he contributes to the peaceful home and working environment that we share.

1

Language Use as Part of Linguistic Theory

1.1 Substance and Usage in Phonology

This book introduces into the traditional study of phonology the notion that language use plays a role in shaping the form and content of sound systems. In particular, the frequency with which individual words or sequences of words are used and the frequency with which certain patterns recur in a language affects the nature of mental representation and in some cases the actual phonetic shape of words. It is the goal of the present work to explore to the extent possible at the present moment the nature of the relation between the use of linguistic forms on the one hand, and their storage and processing on the other.

To someone approaching linguistics from other disciplines, it might seem odd that language use has not been taken into account in formulating theories of language. However, since language is such a complex phenomenon, it has been necessary to narrow the field of study to make it manageable. Thus we commonly separate phonology from syntax, synchrony from diachrony, child language from adult language, and so on, constantly bearing in mind that interactions exist that will eventually have to be taken into account. We then go on to formulate theories for these domains – a theory of syntax, a theory of phonology, a theory of language acquisition – knowing all the while that the ultimate goal is to encompass all these subfields in one theory of language.

Early in the twentieth century, a proposal was made to distinguish the shared knowledge that a community of speakers has from the actual uses to which that knowledge is put (de Saussure 1916). Many researchers then focused their attention on the structure of that shared knowledge (called 'langue' by Saussure and 'competence' by Chomsky

1965) and paid little attention to language use in real time. The focus on competence, or the structure of language, turned out to be extremely productive. Structuralism provided linguists with a workshop of analytic tools for breaking down the continuous speech stream into units, and these units into features; structuralism postulated hierarchical relations among the units and assigned structures to different levels of grammar, organizing language and the people who study it into subfields – phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics.

The present work proposes to demonstrate that the focus on structure needs to be supplemented with a perspective that includes more than just structure, a view that includes two other important aspects of the language phenomenon – the material content or substance of language, and language use. The SUBSTANCE of language refers to the two polar ends – phonetics and semantics – that language molds and structures, the two ends between which language forms the bridge. LANGUAGE USE includes not just the processing of language, but all the social and interactional uses to which language is put. For present purposes, in the context of phonology, the frequency with which certain words, phrases, or patterns are used will be shown to have an impact on phonological structure. I will return to a discussion of these two aspects of language and the role they play in past and future theories after describing some recent developments in linguistics and related fields that suggest a need for an enlarged perspective on language.

In the domain of morphosyntax, a substantial development beyond structuralism has already taken place. The content of grammatical categories has been studied as a substantive rather than a structural matter, for example, in crosslinguistic studies of subject, topic, noun, verb, tense, aspect (Comrie 1976, 1985, Dahl 1985), mood, and so on. Also use is being studied as a prime shaper of syntactic structure (Givón 1979, Haiman 1994, Hopper and Thompson 1984, and others) and morphological structure (Bybee 1985, Bybee et al. 1994, DuBois 1985). So far, no comparable development has occurred in phonology, but there are several indicators that it is time to open up the field to new questions and new sources of data and explanation.

Despite having looked carefully at matters of structure, having defined and redefined units such as phoneme and morpheme (or formative), having shifted and reshifted levels such as phonemic and morphophonemic, we find that problems and questions still remain. Units and levels do not submit to definitions that work for every case. We still do not have strict definitions of even the most basic units, such as

segment, syllable, morpheme, and word. Instead we find variation and gradience commonplace in empirical studies, and we find phonological phenomena intimately bound up with lexicon and morphology, syntax, discourse, and social context.

Developments from outside linguistics also point to a new view of language. Studies of natural categorization by psychologist Eleanor Rosch and her colleagues have had an impact on the way that linguists view categories, including word meaning (Lakoff 1987), grammatical classes such as gender (Zubin and Köpcke 1981), verb classes (Bybee and Moder 1983), grammatical functions such as subject and topic, and phonetic categories (K. Johnson 1997, Miller 1994, and other 'exemplar' approaches to phonetic categories). In particular, these studies show that the way human beings categorize both nonlinguistic and linguistic entities is not by discrete assignments to categories based on the presence or absence of features, but rather by comparison of features shared with a central member. All category members need not have all of the features characterizing the category, but a member is more central or more marginal depending on the number and nature of shared features. Moreover, Nosofsky (1988) has shown that the perceived center of a category can shift toward the more frequently experienced members.

A second development important to linguistic modeling is the development of computer models that can reproduce apparent 'rule-governed' behavior as well as probabilistic behavior using parallel distributed processing (Daugherty and Seidenberg 1994, Rumelhart and McClelland 1986, and others). In such models, labeled connectionist models, structures are not given in advance (i.e., innate), but take their form from the nature of the input, just as neurological matter is structured by the input it receives. Connectionist models, then, are quite compatible with usage-based theories of language. Langacker (1987) and now Ohala and Ohala (1995) argue that storage of linguistic percepts should be like the storage of other mental percepts.

Yet a third recent development applicable to a large array of sciences is the study of complex systems and their emergent properties. The basic idea behind emergence as it will be applicable here is that certain simple properties of a substantive nature, when applied repeatedly, create structure. Lindblom et al. (1984) are, to my knowledge, the first to apply the notion of emergent structure in linguistics. They illustrate emergence in the following way:

Termites construct nests that are structured in terms of pillars and arches and that create a sort of 'air-conditioned' environment. The form of these nests appears to arise as a result of a simple local behavioral pattern which is followed by each individual insect: the pillars and arches are formed by deposits of glutinous sand flavored with pheromone. Pheromone is a chemical substance that is used in communication within certain insect species. Animals respond to such stimuli after (tasting or) smelling them. Each termite appears to follow a path of increasing pheromone density and deposit when the density starts to decrease. Suppose the termites begin to build on a fairly flat surface. In the beginning the deposits are randomly distributed. A fairly uniform distribution of pheromone is produced. Somewhat later local peaks have begun to appear serving as stimuli for further deposits that gradually grow into pillars and walls by iteration of the same basic stimulus-response process. At points where several such peaks come close, stimulus conditions are particularly likely to generate responses. Deposits made near such maxima of stimulation tend to form arches. As termites continue their local behavior in this manner, the elaborate structure of the nest gradually emerges. (Lindblom et al. 1984: 185-186)

Lindblom et al. point out that the importance of this notion for linguistics is that structure can be explained without attributing a 'mental blueprint' to the creatures creating the structure – that substance and form are intimately related (see also Hopper 1987, Keller 1994). Note further that in this example and others of emergence in complex systems, substance and form are related via the *PROCESS* by which the structure is created.

If we apply emergence to language, the substance and use interact to create structure. The substance in question includes both phonetics and semantics. Phonetic substance has always been included in the field of phonology. Only a few phonologists have ever proposed that phonology is independent of phonetics (see Postal 1968). On the contrary, most phonologists see phonetics as motivating phonology (for a recent statement, see Hayes 1999). They have perhaps not always been serious enough about pursuing the phonetic facts, however. One prominent feature of generative phonology has been its disdain for the 'low-level' phonetic properties of speech, properties that presumably border on performance.

Semantics, on the other hand, has been considered irrelevant to phonology. This would not seem to be such a serious allegation to level at phonologists, except that phonological descriptions and theoretical works are full of references to notions such as morpheme and word boundaries – both of which delimit meaningful units – as well as to specific grammatical categories or specific morphemes. Generative phonologists and Optimality Theory phonologists have proceeded as

though the content of these categories did not matter. I have shown in Bybee (1985) that the phonological fusion of morphemes reflects their degree of semantic fusion, and in the chapters of this book, I will explore further the relation between grammatical and lexical units and phonological structure. Generative theories have largely neglected such topics: even though morphological decomposition has played an important role in the development of generative theories from *The Sound Pattern of English* to Lexical Phonology and Optimality Theory, the semantic derivations that should parallel the phonological ones have never been attempted.

While substance has found its way into phonology from both the phonetic and semantic end, *USE* has been systematically excluded from structuralist theories altogether. As mentioned earlier, distinctions such as *langue* versus *parole* (de Saussure) and competence versus performance (Chomsky) were specifically designed to set up a mental object that is separate from the uses to which it is put and to designate the mental object as the proper domain for linguistics. Of course, there is some value in distinguishing mental representations from the social activities upon which they are based, but totally excluding factors of use from consideration ignores the potential relation between representation and use. It is certainly possible that the way language is used affects the way it is represented cognitively, and thus the way it is structured.

In fact, a good deal of progress in morphology and syntax has been made in explaining specific phenomena by making just this assumption. It has been shown that syntactic structures are the result of the conventionalization of frequently used discourse patterns (e.g., DuBois 1985, Givón 1979), and that grammatical morphemes develop from lexical morphemes in particular constructions through increases in the frequency of use and through extension in use to more and more contexts (Bybee et al. 1994, Haiman 1994). Greenberg (1966) has demonstrated that markedness effects are directly related to frequency of use, with unmarked members of categories being the most frequent, and Tiersma (1982) has shown that this hypothesis also explains cases of local markedness in morphology. Psycholinguists have long known that high-frequency words are accessed faster than low-frequency ones, and I have argued that high-frequency irregular morphological formations tend to maintain their irregularities precisely because of their high frequency (Bybee 1985, Hooper 1976b). In all of these findings we have a dynamic aspect – language structure is becoming or remaining

because of the way language is used. Thus the emphasis on the static, synchronic language as the object of study has given way to the view of language as slowly, gradually, but inexorably mutating under the dynamic forces of language use.

Very little attention has been given to phonology in this usage-based approach to language, yet these same ideas CAN be applied to phonological phenomena with very interesting results. It is the purpose of this book to explore the phenomena that have traditionally been studied as phonology, reevaluating structural notions in terms of use and substance. The successes of structuralism in its various guises are not being discarded. Rather structural notions will first be empirically evaluated to ascertain their viability, then the basis of such notions will be considered, and the role that substance and especially, use, plays in the phenomena will be discussed. The phenomena discussed here point to a deep involvement of phonology with lexicon and grammar, and a role for both token and type frequency in shaping phonological structure. A dynamic view of language is taken here, one that integrates both synchronic and diachronic sources of explanation.¹

1.2 Some Basic Principles of a Usage-Based Model

The ideas that I will apply to phonology are for the most part already present in the literature and are now shared by a number of linguists, phoneticians, and psychologists. A brief statement of these ideas follows.

1. Experience affects representation. The use of forms and patterns both in production and perception affects their representation in memory. High-frequency words and phrases have stronger representations in the sense that they are more easily accessed and less likely to undergo analogical change. Low-frequency words are more difficult to access and may even become so weak as to be forgotten. The lexical strength of words may change as they are used more or less in different contexts. Patterns (represented as schemas, see below) that apply to more items are also stronger

¹ The phonological theory developed here is quite different from Natural Generative Phonology (NGP) (Hooper 1976a). For while NGP had very concrete lexical representations, much involvement of morphology and the lexicon with phonology, and the same view of the relation of synchrony to diachrony, it was a structuralist theory and provided no means of representing the impact of language use on language structure.

and more accessible, and thus more productive than those applying to fewer items. This is in contrast to modular approaches in which representations and rules or constraints are all static and fixed, and in which all rules or representations in the same component have the same status (for instance, all being equally accessible no matter how many forms they apply to).

2. Mental representations of linguistic objects have the same properties as mental representations of other objects. Of course, this is the simplest assumption we can make – that the brain operates in the same way in different domains. One consequence of this assumption is that mental representations do not have predictable properties abstracted away from them, but rather are firmly based on categorizations of actual tokens. As Langacker (1987) and Ohala and Ohala (1995) have pointed out, if predictable properties are taken away from objects, they become unrecognizable. (See Chapter 2 for further discussion.)
3. Categorization is based on identity or similarity. Categorization organizes the storage of phonological percepts. What form this categorization takes is an interesting question and one that can be approached through phonetic and psychological experimentation as well as through analogies with findings in other perceptual domains. From structural linguistic analysis we can already identify many different types of relations among linguistic objects – for example, the relation between two phonetic tokens of the same word, that between tokens of the same morpheme in different words, and that between two similar phones in different words in the same or different contexts.
4. Generalizations over forms are not separate from the stored representation of forms but emerge directly from them. In Langacker's terms, there is no 'rule/list separation' (see Chapter 2). Generalizations over forms are expressed as relations among forms based on phonetic and/or semantic similarities. New forms can be produced by reference to existing forms, but most multimorphemic words are stored whole in the lexicon.
5. Lexical organization provides generalizations and segmentation at various degrees of abstraction and generality. Units such as morpheme, segment, or syllable are emergent in the sense that they arise from the relations of identity and similarity that organize representations. Since storage in this model is highly

redundant, schemas may describe the same pattern at different degrees of generality (Langacker 2000).

6. Grammatical knowledge is procedural knowledge. Anderson (1993) and Boyland (1996) distinguish declarative or propositional knowledge (e.g., 'Washington, DC is the capital of the United States') from procedural knowledge (how to drive a car, tie your shoelaces, and so on). While linguistic knowledge is in part declarative (in the sense that we can cite the meanings of words, for instance), much linguistic knowledge is procedural (Boyland 1996). A native speaker can form an acceptable sentence quite automatically, yet be unable to explain how this was done or to list what the properties of an acceptable sentence are. Thinking of grammatical constructions as procedural units has profound consequences for our view of phonology. Phonology then becomes a part of the procedure for producing and decoding constructions, rather than a purely abstract, psychological system.

1.3 The Creative Role of Repetition

Usage-based functionalism emphasizes language as a conventionalized, cultural object. In order to understand the nature of language, we need to understand what it means for behavior to be conventionalized. Haiman (1994, 1998) discusses grammar as ritualized behavior and points to various properties of both ritual and grammar that are the result of repetition. It is useful here to distinguish between a ritual and a convention: though both represent repeated behavior, a ritual can be individual and idiosyncratic, but a convention is agreed upon socially and evokes a consistent response in other members of a society (Tomasello et al. 1993). What both concepts have in common is that their structure is shaped by repetition. The following is a summary of some aspects of language that are shaped by repetition.

Through repetition we get lexical strength – strong, easily accessible representations, such as a greeting when you see someone you know or responses such as 'thank you' and 'you're welcome'; that is, any kind of learned automatic response. It is repetition that ritualizes these responses and makes them readily available. These are just extreme examples of a general phenomenon that pervades linguistic representation – repetition leads to strength of representation (Bybee 1985).

Repetition also leads to reduction of form. This is true of nonlinguistic gestures such as making the sign of the cross. It is true in non-human rituals: among chimpanzees (according to Plooi 1978, cited in Haiman 1994) the original gesture of lying down is reduced to just leaning slightly backwards. And it is true of language in many obvious cases. Greetings become reduced, (*how are you* becomes *hi*), grammaticizing phrases with increasing frequency reduce and compress (*going to* becomes *gonna*), and, in less obvious cases, there is a general frequency effect in reductive sound changes (see Section 1.4).

Repetition also leads to the reduction of meaning. This reduction or bleaching of meaning can be related to what Haiman calls habituation, or the loss of impact due to repetition. Habituation is also a general phenomenon, not restricted to language or to humans. It is 'a decline in the tendency to respond to stimuli that have become familiar due to repeated or persistent exposure' (Haiman 1994:7). We recognize habituation in the trivialization by repetition of great music (Beethoven's Fifth Symphony) or great art (Van Gogh's sunflowers). We also find it in language in cases where the emphatic becomes the normal. For instance, in the French negative construction *ne . . . pas, pas*, literally 'step', was once an emphatic added to the original negative *ne*, but is now obligatory and nonemphatic.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, repetition leads to emancipation. In emancipation, instrumental actions are disassociated from their original motivation and are free to take on a communicative function instead. The military salute derives from the more instrumental gesture used in the Middle Ages when knights in armor greeted one another. They raised the visor of their helmet to show their faces as an indication of a peaceful greeting. The armor is gone, the visor is gone, but a reduced form of the gesture remains, though without its instrumental function. It no longer raises the visor, but it has been imbued instead with the function of communicating respect for the military hierarchy.

Applications of the principle of emancipation through repetition in language involve all sorts of cases of conventionalization, and most commonly, cases in which one communicative function is replaced by another. For instance, the inquiry into someone's current state of being, *how are you*, is not just reduced phonologically to *hi*, but also is emancipated from its original communicative value and now serves simply as a greeting. (A more conservative function of *hi* is found in some dialects of Black English where speakers commonly respond to *hi* with

fine). Emancipation is also richly illustrated in the process of grammaticization during which words lose their categoriality. For instance, verbs become auxiliaries and sometimes affixes, and also become disassociated from their lexical meaning and take on pragmatic or grammatical functions, as when *be going to* loses its motion sense and becomes a future marker.

Haiman (1994) demonstrates that the development of ritual is a common process in the animal kingdom, and by no means restricted to humans, or even primates, as dog and cat owners can attest. He further argues (Haiman 1998) that ritualization is the basis for the development of grammar. The process of grammaticization depends upon repetition and is characterized by the reduction of both meaning and form, by strong entrenchment of patterns, and by emancipation in the sense that forms in their grammaticizing constructions often shift from propositional meaning to discourse-oriented functions (Traugott 1989). Our understanding of the ritualization process can be applied to syntax, as Haiman has shown, but also to phonology, as we investigate the role of repetition in the structuring of phonological patterns and lexical representations.

1.4 Frequency Effects

Much is already known about frequency effects in language, and much remains to be learned. In this section, I will lay out the basic notions and terminology that will be taken up again in later chapters.

There are two ways of counting frequency of occurrence that are applicable to language: token frequency and type frequency. *TOKEN FREQUENCY* is the frequency of occurrence of a unit, usually a word, in running text – how often a particular word comes up. Thus *broke* (the past tense of *break*) occurs 66 times per million words in Francis and Kučera (1982), while the past tense verb *damaged* occurs 5 times in the same corpus. In other words, the token frequency of *broke* is much higher than that of *damaged*.

TYPE FREQUENCY refers to the dictionary frequency of a particular pattern (e.g., a stress pattern, an affix, or a consonant cluster). For instance, English Past Tense is expressed in several different ways, but the expression with the highest type frequency is the suffix *-ed*, as in *damaged*, which occurs on thousands of verbs. The pattern found in *broke* has a much lower type frequency, occurring with only a handful of verbs (depending upon how you count them: *spoke*, *wrote*, *rode*,

etc.). The penultimate stress pattern of Spanish has a very high type frequency, occurring with about 95% of nouns and adjectives that end in vowels (*abuéla*, *camíno*, *pronómbre*), while antepenultimate stress has a much lower type frequency (*claúsula*, *fonológica*). One can also count the token frequency of such patterns – that is, how often the pattern occurs in running text.

1.4.1 Token Frequency

Token frequency has two distinct effects that are important for phonology and morphology. In one frequency effect, phonetic change often progresses more quickly in items with high token frequency. This effect is particularly noticeable in grammaticizing elements or phrases that undergo drastic reduction as they increase in frequency. Thus *be going to*, which is becoming a future marker in English, is reduced to [ˈgʌfə] or even further reduced in phrases such as *I'm gonna* to [ˈaɪməfə]. Similarly, the conventionalized contractions of English are reduced due to their high frequency: *I'm*, *I'll*, *I've*, *can't*, *don't*, *won't*, and so on (Krug 1998). But the effect occurs on a more subtle level as well: regular sound change in many cases progresses more quickly in items of high token frequency. There is a tendency in American English for syllabicity to be lost in sequences of unstressed schwa + resonant, as in *every*, *camera*, *memory*, and *family*. This reduction is more advanced in words of higher frequency (such as those just named) than in words of lower frequency, such as *mammary*, *artillery*, *homily* (Hooper 1976b). The loss of final [t] or [d] after a consonant is also more common in words of higher frequency, such as *went*, *just*, and *and*. In fact, a general effect of token frequency on the rate of deletion has been found for 2000 tokens of final [t] or [d] (Bybee 2000b).²

If sound changes are the result of phonetic processes that apply in real time as words are used, then those words that are used more often have more opportunity to be affected by phonetic processes. If representations are changed gradually, with each token of use having a potential effect on representation, then words of high frequency will change at a faster rate than will words of low frequency.³ The streamlining of

² Further discussion of these examples and further references for other similar examples can be found in Chapter 3.

³ This suggestion is found in Moonwomon (1992). Factors other than simple frequency are important, too. These are discussed in Chapter 3.

high-frequency words and phrases has the effect of automatizing production. Any motor activity that is repeated often becomes more efficient. The first effect of frequency, then, is to automate production (Boyland 1996). (For further discussion, see Chapter 3.)

The second effect of frequency seems to contradict the first, since it makes items more resistant to change, but it concerns change of a different kind. High frequency encourages phonetic change, but it renders items more conservative in the face of grammatical change or analogical change based on the analysis of other forms (Phillips 2001). For example, high-frequency forms with alternations resist analogical leveling: while English *weep* / *wept*, *creep* / *crept*, and *leap* / *leapt* have a tendency to regularize to *weeped*, *creeped*, and *leaped*, respectively, the high-frequency verbs with the same pattern, *keep* / *kept*, *sleep* / *slept* show no such tendency (Bybee 1985, Hooper 1976b). As a result, morphological irregularity is always centered on the high-frequency items of a language. This conservatism of much-used expressions can also be found on the syntactic level (Bybee and Thompson 2000). It has often been observed that pronouns show more conservative behavior than full noun phrases. English pronouns, for example, maintain distinct forms for nominative and oblique case, while nouns have lost these case distinctions. The position of pronouns sometimes reflects an earlier word order. Similarly, verbal auxiliaries, which are very frequent, often retain conservative syntactic characteristics. The English auxiliaries, for instance, retain the ability to invert with the subject, and they precede rather than follow the negative, both properties once shared by all verbs (Bybee to appear).

This conserving effect of frequency places some items outside the domain of the regular combinatorial patterns of the language. Their frequency gives them a high level of lexical strength. That is, they are so engrained as individual patterns that they are less likely to change even if general changes are occurring in the language. To account for this entrenchment effect, I have proposed (Bybee 1985) that representations are strengthened whenever they are accessed. This strengthening makes them subsequently easier to access and also more resistant to some forms of change.

1.4.2 Type Frequency and Productivity

Another major effect of frequency and thus of usage is the effect of type frequency in determining productivity. Productivity is the extent

to which a pattern is likely to apply to new forms (e.g., borrowed items or novel formations). It appears that the productivity of a pattern, expressed in a schema, is largely, though not entirely, determined by its type frequency: the more items encompassed by a schema, the stronger it is, and the more available it is for application to new items. Thus, the English Past Tense *-ed* applies to thousands of verbs and is much more productive than any of the irregular patterns, which are highly restricted in the number of verbs to which they apply (Bybee 1985, 1995; MacWhinney 1978; see also Chapter 5).

Since type frequency is based on the number of items matching a particular pattern, it is also relevant for determining the relative strength of phonotactic patterns, stress patterns, and other phonological patterns applying at the word level. Recent studies have shown that subjects' judgments of the relative acceptability of nonce items with occurring and nonoccurring phonotactic patterns are based on the distribution of these patterns in the lexicon. Patterns with high type frequency are judged to be more acceptable than patterns with low type frequency (Pierrehumbert 1994b, Vitevitch et al. 1997, and others; see Chapter 4.7). In addition, for classes defined by morphological, phonotactic, or stress patterns, type frequency interacts with the degree of similarity of the members of the class such that a smaller number of highly similar items (a 'gang') can also evince limited productivity (Aske 1990, Bybee and Moder 1983, Frisch et al. 2001; see also Chapter 5).

The importance of productivity of both phonological and morphological schemas to our understanding of cognitive representations of language cannot be overstated. Productivity provides us with evidence about the generalizations that speakers make, and it is important to stress that speakers' generalizations are not always the same as those devised by linguists on the basis of distributional evidence. Distributional evidence often recreates past stages of a language and does not reveal the restructuring and reanalysis that the patterns might have undergone. Productivity can be used as a diagnostic to determine which patterns are fossilized, and which represent viable schemas accessible to speakers.

1.4.3 Frequency Effects in Other Theories

The proposal that frequency of use affects representation suggests a very different view of lexical storage and its interaction with other