ACTUALIZATION

LINGUISTIC CHANGE IN PROGRESS

Edited by

HENNING ANDERSEN

University of California, Los Angeles

Volume 219

Henning Andersen (ed.)

Actualization

Linguistic Change in Progress

ACTUALIZATION

LINGUISTIC CHANGE IN PROGRESS

Edited by

HENNING ANDERSEN

University of California, Los Angeles

PREFACE

In his opening address to the Thirteenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, held at the Heinrich-Heine University, Düsseldorf in 1997, the conference director, Dieter Stein, called for greater attention to the actual progression of language changes through time and encouraged the formation of what he called a 'chronological linguistics', which would investigate historically documented changes, past and present, with the aim of establishing the determinants of their gradual, orderly progression.

As it happened, one of the plenary lectures at the 1997 Düsseldorf conference provided support for Stein's call for a chronological linguistics by presenting a theory that makes explicit what appear to be the central notions in Sapir's understanding of drift. The paper, which is printed below (21–57), was well received, and several members of the audience suggested that its claims be evaluated against data from a variety of languages.

Accordingly a workshop on "Patterns of Actualization in Linguistic Change" was organized for the Fourteenth ICHL in Vancouver, B.C. in 1999, where contributions were presented by Kristin Bakken, Alexander Bergs and Dieter Stein, Vit Bubenik, Ulrich Busse, Susan Herring, Marianne Mithun, Piet van Reenen and Lene Schøsler, John Charles Smith, Alan Timberlake, and myself. Most of these contributions are contained in this volume in revised form. Also included is a written version of comments made at the time of the Workshop by Michael Shapiro.

I am grateful to the participants in the workshop for their enthusiastic support in planning the workshop and preparing this volume, to Lars Heltoft, Brit Mælum, and Michael Shapiro who served as discussants in the workshop, to the series editor, Konrad Koerner for his continued collegial support, and to my assistant Ji-Soo Kim, who helped prepare the volume for publication.

Los Angeles, California, May 2001   Henning Andersen

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

HENNING ANDERSEN
University of California, Los Angeles

0. *Preamble*

The aim of this collection of papers is to consolidate the observation that the progression of certain kinds of linguistic change typically is grammatically conditioned—any given innovation being realized in usage, as it is introduced, accepted, and generalized, over time, in one grammatical environment after another.

Although it has long been recognized that the progression of change more often than not is conditioned by social categories (age, gender, class) and categories of style (from citation forms to casual conversation), medium (written, spoken) and genre (poetry, prose, artistic, expository, etc.), the fact of grammatical conditioning has largely been overlooked. Yet, it has been observed with increasing frequency during the last few decades, as historical linguists have more and more turned their attention to the actual chronological attestation of historical changes. But the observation is not only of recent date. A careful reading of traditional historical grammars and works on dialectology will undoubtedly reveal many examples like the following.

In the history of Russian, the development of morphological expression for animacy—which spans the period from the 1000s to the 1700s in our ample textual record of the language—proceeded earlier and more widely in pronouns than in nouns, earlier in the productive singular noun declension than in the unproductive declensions, earlier in singular than in plural nouns, earlier in masculine than in feminine nouns, earlier in masculines and feminines than in neuter nouns, earlier in direct objects of verbs than in objects of prepositions, earlier in an adjacent object than in a postponed object, earlier in nouns denoting human than nonhuman animates, earlier in reference to a freeman than to a functionary, servant, or slave, earlier referring to healthy than to sick individuals, and earlier referring to adults than to adolescents or

children (Šaxmatov [1911] 1957:220–226, Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1965: 222–226, Klenin 1983, Krys'ko 1994, Klenin 1997).[1] See Table 1.

	Earlier	later
Word class	pronouns	nouns
Inflectional class	productive	unproductive
Number	singular	plural
Gender	masculine	feminine and neuter
Syntax	verbal object	prepositional object
	adjacent	non-adjacent
Lexical meaning	human	nonhuman
Reference	freeman	slave
	healthy	diseased
	adult	child

Table 1.

The similarity with the phonologically conditioned progression of sound changes is striking. For example, in the development of velars, palatalization occurs earlier in stops than in fricatives, earlier before high than before non-high vowels, earlier before unrounded than before rounded vowels, earlier directly contiguous to the conditioning vowel than across another segment, earlier before than after the conditioning vowel, earlier in the narrow domain of the syllable than across syllable boundaries (that is, in the wider domain of the word), earlier in stable environments than in alternating environments (cf. Timberlake 1981, Andersen 2001a:31).

	Earlier	later
Simultaneous features	stop	continuant
Contiguous features	high	nonhigh
	unrounded	rounded
Phonotactics	contiguous	noncontiguous
	before	after
	syllable	word
Morphotactics	stable	alternating

Table 2.

[1]The most recent major contribution on this topic, Krys'ko (1994), shows that the trickle of attestation begins somewhat earlier than was previously known. But the relative chronology of the general flow of attestation in each conditioned environment is not changed by these earlier dates. They do, however, motivate the use of the phrase "proceeded earlier" (rather than simply 'is attested earlier').

To anyone familiar with the notion of 'markedness', it will be evident from these examples that there is some correlation between the environments in which innovations occur earlier or later and the markedness values of the phonological, phonotactic, morphophonemic, morphosyntactic, clause-syntactic, lexical-semantic, referential, and other parameters involved. At the same time, in each case, there appears to be a distinct ranking of the diverse features or categories that condition the gradual actualization of the change. This suggests that the gradualness of such changes may afford us significant insights not only into the relation between speakers' grammars and speech performance but also into the cognitive foundations on which speakers' grammars are formed. Accordingly, we must acknowledge this observed, orderly gradualness of linguistic change, seek to describe as fully as possible the progression of documented instances of change, and endeavor to provide explanations for the observed patterns of actualization.

The papers that have been collected in this volume offer accounts of a number of changes attested in progress, or whose progression has been inferred, in various languages and periods. The papers are characterized very briefly below in Section 1. Several of them explicitly discuss the interpretation of the changes in terms of markedness. In this way they respond to the theory put forward in the position paper (pp. 21–57 below), which first stimulated this collective effort, as mentioned in the Preface. Several of the problems of interpretation in terms of markedness are taken up for discussion in Section 2.

1.   *The papers*
In the following pages I will briefly characterize the content of the contributions that follow and draw attention to individual problems of analysis some of them present. I mention first the position paper that gave the impetus to this collective effort (Section 1.1) and then the papers on evolutive changes by Bergs & Stein, Busse, Mithun, Schoesler, and Smith (Sections 1.2–1.6). Next come the papers on contact change by Bakken and Bubenik (Sections 1.7–1.8), and finally the more general papers by Shapiro and Andersen (Sections 1.9–1.10).

1.1   *Andersen*
In the position paper ("Markedness and the theory of linguistic change", 21–57) I begin by setting aside the controversies over the notion of Markedness, which I believe have arisen due to a misguided insistence on defining it in observational terms rather than grounding it independently of observation. I then offer evidence from several areas of culture suggesting that Markedness is a cognitive principle that underlies the organization of diverse

semiotic systems, including all areas of grammar, and proceed to show that Markedness values not only define synchronic systems, but are intimately involved in the actualization of change. Both in synchronic language states and in change, combinations based on Markedness equivalence appear to embody a Principle of Markedness Agreement. Against the background of these observations I present a conceptual analysis of Markedness contrasted with the classic logical relations of contrariety, contradiction, and conversity, explaining why the asymmetry of Markedness so naturally accompanies these other, strictly symmetrical logical relations.[2] The paper concludes with a confrontation of Markedness and the various observables (frequency, complexity, etc.) with which it has often been erroneously identified, and it is shown, on one hand, why Markedness values cannot always be directly inferred from observation and, on the other, how Markedness values, once they are ascribed to the categories of a grammar, may define the direction of its drift—a topic developed more fully in the Workshop paper on "Actualization and the (uni)directionality of change" (225–248).

1.2 Bergs and Stein

Alexander T. Bergs and Dieter Stein ("The role of markedness in the actuation and actualization of linguistic change", 79–93) explore the relation between Markedness and both the actuation and the actualization of change, examining two developments, the rise of English wh-relatives (which, who, whose, whom) and that of periphrastic do. The authors begin by illustrating the natural occurrence of marked elements in marked environments and then show how one and the same, hitherto unnoticed semantic category of social rank is relevant to both sets of data.

Apparently, wh-relatives were first established with highly marked antecedents, and progressed from reference to God through humans of high estate to humans in general. Periphrastic do gained currency first with subjects characterized as 'remarkable' in some respect, to whose narrated actions do-periphrasis lent special weight; and from there it spread to other contexts in which it fulfilled a similar function, at least at first, eventually being generalized. The authors draw attention to cross-linguistic parallels such as the lexical codification of this parameter of social rank in East Asian languages, citing examples from Thai and Burmese.

---

[2]Where it is appropriate and feasible I use capitalization to distinguish the explanatory concept Markedness, which is defined in logical and cognitive terms below (37–47), from the common-parlance notion of 'markedness'.

Both wh-relatives and do-periphrasis appear to have originated (been 'actuated') as changes from above and their initial actualization in marked environments then corresponds to the proposed Principle of Markedness Agreement.

1.3 Busse

Ulrich Busse ("The use of address pronouns in Shakepseare's plays and sonnets", 119–147) takes up the problem of the use of thou and you in Shakespeare's works, a particularly interesting body of data since Shakespeare lived and wrote during "the decisive period" in the gradual replacement of T forms by Y forms, 1550–1620, the period defined by the steepest ascent of the S-curve of the change. Busse examines the variant accounts of Shakespeare's usage in the existing literature and shows that the available data from the corpus argue against a simple markedness-as-frequency account, whether applied overall or to individual plays. Instead, the data call for a careful sorting of the works according to date of composition, genre and subgenre (verse vs. prose, drama vs. poetry, tragedy vs. historical drama vs. comedy, sonnet vs. other poetic forms) and social distance (public vs. private poems). It is also useful to compare observations made in this corpus with the pronoun usage in the same text types produced by other, contemporary writers. But most significantly for the purposes of this volume, Busse's investigation shows that an approach that views the just enumerated distinctions in terms of Markedness values yields a coherent and meaningful account of Shakespeare's pronoun usage both in terms of a synchronic typology of texts from around 1600 and in the perspective of the chronological progression of the pronoun change.

1.4 Mithun

Marianne Mithun presents an analysis of the development, from clauses, of a new category of locative terms in Iroquoian ("Actualization patterns in grammaticalization: from clause to locative morphology in Northen Iroquoian", 143–168). The data are provided through internal comparison within Mohawk with the addition of a few comparative glances at Tuscarora. The data support an account in terms of reanalysis based on structural ambiguity and gradual actualization along a gradient of locative categories that has parallels in unrelated languages.

The gradualness of the actualization is reflected in a number of features of the modern locatives. To mention a few, one locative still occurs as a main predicate, the others do not; several still occur with verbal affixes, while the rest do not; at the other extreme, the unmarked locative has been nominalized

to the extent that it combines with nominal allomorphs of incorporated forms and can even occur without a nominalizer. Thus, generally, the locatives meaning "beyond" and "in the middle of" show more verbal features than "beside", "under", "inside", and "place", and the last mentioned, very few indeed.

Mithun explicitly considers the relation between this gradual development and the possible Markedness values of the different locatives. It appears that there is a clear correlation with Markedness, particularly when the locatives are analysed in terms of more abstract semantic features. Thus, the locative that is most general in meaning is the most grammaticalized one. It is also the most frequent one and the only one to show significant allomorphy (cf. Greenberg 1966). The somewhat different degree of grammaticalization of the others correlates with their greater semantic or cognitive complexity. In this connection Mithun draws attention to the widespread grammaticalization gradient "*on > in > under > beside > back > front*" established by Svorou (1994), whose resemblance to the Iroquoian development is very suggestive; see further Section 2.2.

1.5 Schøsler

Lene Schøsler ("From Latin to Modern French: actualization and markedness", 169–185) discusses changes in French morphosyntax and syntax with the explicit intention of evaluating the proposed Principle of Markedness Agreement (Andersen 1990, 2001a).

Schøsler's first example, the loss of the Old French two-case system in the 1000–1400s, apparently was actualized largely in conformity with the Principle of Markedness Agreement, the case distinction being lost earlier in marked categories of nouns and pronouns than in corresponding unmarked categories (in adjectives before substantives, substantives before determiners, substantives and adjectives before pronouns, feminines before masculines, plurals before singulars, nonhuman nouns before human nouns); see Section 2.4. One major deviation is the class of personal names, which lose case marking earlier than appellatives, a particularly striking unconformity considering that among appellatives, case marking was lost last in nouns denoting humans; I return to this in Section 2.3. Schøsler presents the results of a separate examination of a text sample, which shows more case loss in main clauses than in subordinate clauses and more in direct discouse than in narration. On the syntactic and pragmatic level, then, the leading edge of the change was in unmarked categories; see Section 2.7.

Schøsler's second example is a complex of changes often associated with the loss of case in Old French, the change in word order (from the putative

Late Latin OV to Old French VO) and the changes in subject marking (from verb inflection to obligatory subject pronouns). The development of V2 word order and the loss of person inflection in the verb proceed earlier in unmarked environments than in marked and so appear to be conditioned by Markedness Agreement. But the loss of Pro-drop starts in subordinate clauses and is attested earlier in the interlocutor persons than in the 3rd person and earlier in referential than in nonreferential 3rd persons, and so it appears to proceed earlier in marked environments than in unmarked. This evidently calls for an explanation; see Section 2.4.

Schøsler's final example shows how the reorganization of the French tense system is reflected earlier in direct discourse than in narration and earlier in prose than in poetry, in conformity with the Principle of Markedness Agreement.

1.6 Smith

John Charles Smith ("Markedness, functionality, and perseveration in the actualization of a morphosyntactic change", 203–223) reviews the loss of object agreement in the participles of Romance compound tenses in the dual perspectives of markedness and functionality. As for the former, Smith relies on the understanding of 'markedness' that equates it with observed frequency (see the critique below 50–51). Smith's functional perspective makes appeal to perceptual factors and processing strategies. The change examined, which appears to have followed largely parallel courses in several Romance languages, has been actualized in a succession of steps that are easily defined in terms of syntactic environments, which Smith subsumes in four hierarchies (208; see Section 2.1 below). The question then posed is whether these hierarchies can be accounted for in terms of markedness-as-frequency. Smith evaluates each of the four hierarchies, and finds that markedness-as-frequency alone cannot explain them all. Next he evaluates them in terms of functionality (as in Smith 1996, 1997) and finds that, on the whole, agreement has been lost first in contexts where it had least functional value. In other words, it appears that the slight advantage in decoding that object agreement contributes has acted as a brake on the actualization of agreement loss (214). Still, in some French dialects agreement is preserved in one environment where it contributes no advantage in decoding: agreement with an object relative pronoun is maintained longer when the relative's antecedent is a pronoun that varies for gender than when it is a noun with inherent gender. After a brief look at the influence of pragmatic factors—genre, medium, and style—for which there is little unequivocal evidence available, Smith concludes that neither

functionality nor markedness provides completely satisfactory explanations for the step-wise actualization of this change.

Smith's critical examination of the potential explanatory value of markedness-as-frequency is very instructive and can serve to highlight several of the perennial problems in applying this notion. Accordingly three of the hierarchies he defines will be discussed in some detail below. It will be apparent there that if a slightly different approach is taken in the analysis of the conditioning environments, the gradual actualization of the Romance loss of object agreement turns out to conform rather well with the Principle of Markedness Agreement: on the whole, agreement has been lost earlier in marked than in unmarked environments; see Sections 2.1, 2.4.

1.7 Bakken

Kristin Bakken's "Patterns of restitution of sound change" (59–78) offers an account of the modern reflexes, in dialects of Norwegian, of two medieval sound changes whose effects have been partly reversed, *l*-loss (before consonants other than *d, t*) and what she calls 'delateralization' (*-ll-* > (*-dl-* >) *-dd-*; cf. Sicilian *steḍḍa* for STELLA 'star'). The questions raised by the modern data are whether they reflect lexical diffusions that were arrested (and reversed); what role dialect contact played in the apparent restitutions; whether they are the result of rule loss or they proceeded lexeme by lexeme; and, if the latter, what factors determined the progression of the restitutions. The available data are a set of lexemes in dialect variants from three periods (1698–1821, 1920–1970, and contemporary) and placenames containing the relevant lexical stems, attested at various times. Bakken's thorough discussion of possible interpretations concludes that the modern data reflect regular sound changes and a later replacement of individual lexemes by competing forms introduced through contact with other dialects, in particular the administrative (standard) languages.

The gradual progressions of the restitutions are shown to correlate grosso modo with differences in relative word frequency in spoken usage, suggesting that some lexemes—those denoting commodities of trade, for instance—may have been more common in interdialectal communication and hence more exposed to competition from borrowed variants. As is typical in such cases, placenames, and especially microtoponyms, preserve reflexes of the medieval sound changes with the greatest fidelity. (One is reminded of such textbook examples as the German isoglosses between northern *-ss-* and southern *-ks-* (*ses* ‖ *seks, os* ‖ *oks, wassen* ‖ *waksen*), where deep in the *-ks-* area placenames like *Vosberg* (with *vos-* for southern *fuks* 'fox') bear witness to the earlier much

larger distribution of the northern reflex of **-hs-*, and which thus indicate how the old isogloss has been displaced toward the north; cf. Bach 1950:56.)

Some remarks on the application of Markedness considerations to cases such as this are offered in Sections 2.5–2.6.

1.8 Bubenik

Vit Bubenik ("On the actualization of the passive-to-ergative shift in Pre-Islamic India", 95–118) presents an account of the drift from accusative to ergative structure in Indian languages. The account thematicizes the continued use and, significantly, continued development of earlier stages of the language—Sanskrit in Early Middle Indic, Sanskrit and regional Prākrits in the middle period, Sanskrit, Prākrits, and Apabhraṃśa in Late Middle Indic—in continuous diglossic and polyglossic contact with local vernacular varieties. The attested developments progress conditioned by a variety of grammatical, pragmatic, stylistic, and register categories, in part apparently reflecting the Principle of Markedness Agreement, but the observed usage appears to be considerably complicated by the vertical contact relations. The internally motivated, evolutive changes (from below) are partly countered by the maintenance of the more archaic, higher diglossic variants, but still gradually have an impact on them.

Bubenik's account draws on several contemporary conceptions of syntactic change, but it is mainly couched in terms of the theory that views innovations as marked and their generalization in usage as the result of a markedness shift. Section 2.6 below offers some remarks on this question.

1.9 Shapiro

Michael Shapiro's contribution offers "a philosopher's-eye view of language" ("Markedness, causation, and linguistic change: a semiotic perspective", 182–201) and addresses questions of the nature of grammatical competence, of realism and nominalism, of causality, and of markedness. In the first section of the paper Shapiro argues that the basic units of phonology (distinctive features) are not signs, he advocates a return to Saussure's (and a long philosophical tradition's) conception of signifiant and signifié as inseparable parts of the language sign (as this is traditionally understood), and he suggests that encoding and decoding both are based on abductive inference. In Section 2 he discusses the adverse consequences of the tradition of nominalism for Chomsky's research project and argues that only a realist linguistics, such as the Peircean-inspired 'neo-structuralism' he advocates, can pose correctly the problem of the relation between language and the brain, which, as he argues, does not call for a neuropsychological explanation of

language, as in the common view, but rather for a linguistic explanation of (the evolution of) the higher cortex.

Parts 3 and 4 of the paper are more directly germane to the theme of this volume. In Section 3 ("Semiosis and linguistic change: efficient and final causation") Shapiro sketches the conceptual underpinnings of the distinction between efficient causality and the often misunderstood teleology. In Section 4 ("Markedness") he addresses one of the key problems discussed in the Workshop in Vancouver, a problem that is thematicised in John Charles Smith's contribution, viz.. whether actualization is guided by Markedness values or by "perceptual factors and processing strategies". In Shapiro's perspective it is clear that the very formulation of this problem is based on a misunderstanding. See further Section 3.

1.10 *Andersen*

Andersen's Workshop paper "Actualization and the (uni)directionality of change" (225–248) describes the place of actualization—the only observable aspect of change—in a theory of change; shows how the theory of Markedness proposed in Andersen 2001a makes it possible to understand change as a projection of synchronic variation onto the diachronic axis; and tries to clarify the relation between historical change events, the domain of the language historian, and the generalized 'change schemas' that the historical linguist can use to advantage in investigating the origins of types of linguistic change.

2. *Discussion*

In the following paragraphs I comment on some of the issues of interpretation that are exemplified in the papers summarized in the preceding pages.

The comments are organized under the following headings: Clines and hierarchies (Section 2.1), Specific vs. generic categories (Section 2.2), Variation in Markedness values (Section 2.3), Alteration vs. loss (Section 2.4), Markedness, restoration, and restitution (Section 2.5), and Markedness and the *S*-curve (Section 2.5).

In several places the relation between innovative and traditional variants is in focus. To save words, I will occasionally refer to such covariant elements as I-variants and O-variants, with I for "innovative, incoming" and O for "older, outgoing".

2.1 *Clines and hierarchies*

It is customary to represent gradations, whether synchronic or diachronic, in terms as close to the level of observation as possible, and most often such

gradations are presented and referred to as *clines* or *hierarchies* without much attention to the fact that there can be a cline between the values of a feature (or the opposite terms of a category), but different features (or categories) form a hierarchy. The distinction between clines and hierarchies is essential for interpretations in terms of Markedness, for Markedness defines the relation between the values of individual features (or categories)—whether they form an actual cline or are contradictories (47–48)—whereas the relation between different features (or categories) is a matter of their different hierarchical *rank*. For the purpose of Markedness interpretations, then, one needs to analyse each observed gradation into the distinct features (or categories) it involves. Only if this step is taken can the Markedness values within individual categories be distinguished from the categories' different rank.

In some instances this is rather unproblematic. Consider Smith's "Hierarchy 4" (208), which shows the progression of agreement loss in relation to number and gender: "Masculine Plural > Feminine Plural > Feminine Singular". What this gradation shows is that number agreement (Singular^U vs. Plural^M) is lost earlier in the unmarked than the marked gender (Masculine^U vs. Feminine^M), and that number agreement is lost earlier than gender agreement. The greater tenacity of gender agreement shows that the reference-based category of Number ranks lower (is less central) than the lexical category of Gender. This is probably a typological characteristic of the Romance languages.

Sometimes a little more analysis is called for. This seems to be the case with Smith's "Hierarchy 3. Person of Clitic Pronoun" (213–214 below). Here the proposed hierarchy "{First Person, Second Person, Third Person Reflexive} > 3rd Person Nonreflexive" should surely be separated into two, one for the category of Person, the other for that of Reflexive. The first of these would define the progression Exophoric^M (first and second person) vs. Unspecified participant deixis^U (exophoric or endophoric third person). Smith mentions the fact that in some languages, apparently, the Markedness values in the category of Person are different (211). Perhaps these are languages in which the primary distinction is defined not in terms of deixis, but in terms of speech-act role, with an opposition of Interlocutor^U > Noninterlocutor^M Person. This possibility illustrates how apparent cross-linguistic variation in Markedness values may reflect language-particular categories that have similar purport but are categorized differently. I return to this question below (see Section 2.3).

The second progression involved in Smith's "Hierarchy 3" is Reflexive > Nonreflexive, which is independent of the category of Person and hence should be examined independently in each of the three persons, singular as well as

plural. Smith cites word frequency data (from Spanish, French, and Italian) to show that the reflexive *se*, respectively *si*, is less 'marked' (actually, just more frequent) than the nonreflexive third-person direct object. But frequency counts of morpheme shapes without regard to their function are probably not very useful. Leaving aside the minor fact that in Spanish, the apparent reflexive *se* serves as an allomorph of nonreflexive *le* in certain clitic sequences, consider that in all three languages the distinctions direct vs. indirect object and singular vs. plural are syncretized in the reflexive *se*, respectively *si*, but not in the nonreflexive third-person pronouns; this alone would make for a high relative frequency of the *se/si* forms. And consider the fact that in all three languages medio-passive verbs are marked with (historically speaking) 'reflexive pronouns' that cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered synchronic direct objects. In view of the difference in syntactic scope, it seems more reasonable to posit the Markedness values Reflexive^M vs. Nonreflexive^U. Whether these values correlate directly with text frequency can only be established through a word count that examines reflexive and nonreflexive pronoun forms with a view to their diverse functions. Such a count should naturally include first and second person pronouns, in which reflexive and nonreflexive functions happen to be syncretized. It seems possible that the outcome will correlate with the progressions Exophoric^M (first and second person) > Unspecified participant deixis^U (exophoric or endophoric third person) and Reflexive^M > Nonreflexive^U Clitic Pronoun.

2.2 *Specific vs. generic categories*

In some instances it may be useful to recognize the generic category to which specific conditioning categories belong.

This is exemplified by Smith's "Hierarchy 2. Identity of Preceding Direct Object", which captures the progression "{Topics, Interrogatives, Exclamatives} > Relatives > Clitic Pronouns" (208). It is perhaps not immediately obvious why topics, interrogatives and exclamatives would form a natural class, or why they would be more or less marked than relative pronouns. However, from the point of view of information structure—which seems to be the generic category conditioning this progression—interrogatives are the topics of interrogative clauses, and exclamatives are the topics of exclamatory clauses. Together with the simple declaratives, these are the basic categories of main clause. Relative pronouns, on the other hand, are the (functional equivalent of) topics in relative clauses. This part of the progression, then, can be understood as a manifestation of the common distinction between nouns^M and pronoun^U topics. The second part of the

progression, "relatives vs. clitic pronouns", represents another distinction in information structure—the distinction between topical^M and nontopical^U presupposed participants. The former are restricted to the relative clauses, the latter, occur freely in all clauses—hence their presumptive markedness values. Thus the progression can be restated as Topic object nouns^M > Topic object pronouns^U and Topic pronouns^M > Nontopic pronouns^U.

In other cases it may be necessary to analyse observed linguistic categories into more abstract, semantic categories that are not necessarily directly expressed. A possible example is the progression identified in Mithun's paper, "place" > "inside" > "under" > "beside" > "in the middle of" > "beyond". Mithun's comparison of this with the widespread grammaticalization gradient "*on > in > under > beside > back > front*" established by Svorou (1994) (165) is very suggestive indeed. But perhaps a more precise understanding of the progression of the Iroquoian development can be attained if the locatives are resolved in terms of the cognitive dimensions involved. One tentative analysis: adessive^U ("place") vs. inessive^M ("in"), contiguous^U ("under", "beside") vs. noncontiguous^M ("near"), single^U point of reference (the preceeding locatives) vs. multiple^M points of reference (the following), relation to several referents^U ("between, in the middle of") vs. to referent(s) and speaker^M ("beyond").

2.3 *Variation in Markedness values*

Since the concept of Markedness was first introduced into linguistics, linguists have envisaged the possibility that one and the same category may be ascribed different values in different systems. In his reply to the letter in which Trubetzkoy first adumbrated the notion of phonological markedness, Jakobson pointed to the importance this concept would have also outside linguistics—for anthropology and cultural history, for instance—and illustrated this with several examples, one of them being the different values that may be ascribed to life and death (1985:162).

More often, perhaps, an appearance of such system-specific Markedness values arises when similar areas of purport (such as the three persons) are defined by different categories in different languages (in casu, deixis or participant role), as suggested in the discussion above, Section 2.1).

Schøsler's contribution points to a detail in the history of French that seems hard to reconcile with Markedness theory and may call for such consideration. In the loss of case distinctions in Old French, human nouns retain case longer than nonhuman nouns, but case loss proceeds earlier in personal names than in appellatives. This is surprising if one assumes that personal names are a subcategory of human nouns, as is usually done. But

perhaps this is not a necessary assumption. In fact, quite unlike common nouns, names have no descriptive content (leaving aside occasional connotative content); they function as individualized deictics (*Zeno* means "the one named *Zeno*"). This suggests the possibility that personal names may be categorized (in some languages or universally) as a subclass of pronouns—in which case their role in the hierarchy of categories that condition the progression of case loss in Old French is in accord with the Principle of Markedness Agreement.

2.4   *Alteration vs. loss*

In Andersen (2001a:33–35) it is acknowledged that changes progress differently depending on their character. As mentioned there, it may be the case that change from above typically progresses from marked to unmarked environments, change from below, the other way around. Clarification changes similarly may typically spread from marked to unmarked environments, whereas obscuration changes may typically be actualized earlier in unmarked than in marked environments. The essential point in understanding these differences is that innovative variants may be valuated differently—as marked or unmarked in relation to established variants—in different kinds of change and hence will be compatible with different environments, according to the Principle of Markedness Agreement. See further Section 2.6.

In some instances an observed change can be interpreted in more than one way. The loss of morphological case in Old French, for example, poses such a dilemma. The development can be viewed as the introduction of the unmarked case form into one environment after another, as Schøsler suggests (174). But then the progression does not correlate well with the Principle of Markedness Agreement. Alternatively, the development can be viewed as the loss of a grammatical distinction. If this is the essence of the change, one would expect it to be actualized earlier in marked than in unmarked environments, for it is commonly the case that distinctions combine more readily with the unmarked than with the marked term of the same category; this is the Principle of Compensation, first formulated by Brøndal (1943:105; cf. Andersen 1974, 1979; Battistella 1996:24 with further references). If this consideration is valid, it would not be surprising to see the case distinction linger longer in unmarked than in marked environments. This is the interpretation I have put forward in the summary above (Section 1.5).

Similar considerations seem to be called for in interpreting the loss of direct object agreement in Romance discussed by Smith (see Sections 1.7, 2.1). Agreement is abandoned earlier when the controller follows than precedes, earlier when it is a noun than a pronoun, earlier when it is a topic than when it

is presupposed, earlier when it is an exophoric person than third person, earlier when it is reflexive than when not. In Gascony some dialects loose agreement with relatives earlier when the antecedent is a noun than when it is a pronoun. The one notable deviation from this marked-before-unmarked pattern is that number agreement is lost earlier in the masculine than the feminine (Section 2.1).

Schøsler describes the development of obligatory subject-person marking in Old French, which progresses earlier in marked than in unmarked environments (subordinate before main clauses, exophoric persons before third, referential before nonreferential third person). It is tempting to view this as another instance of loss—"the loss of Pro-drop" Schøsler calls it. But perhaps it should be understood as a clarification change.

It is interesting that both in the loss of case in Old French and in the loss of object agreement in Romance, apparently, the changes progressed earlier in unmarked styles and genres than in marked. This is consistent with their being internally motivated changes.

2.5   *Markedness in restoration and restitution*

Bakken's paper (59–78) makes no explicit reference to Markedness, but its discussion of the reintroduction of long-lost phonotactic combinations naturally raises questions of motivation and, hence, Markedness. First of all, the Norwegian data suggest that a distinction should be drawn between 'restoration' and 'restitution'.

There are *restorations*, in which the loss of a constraint (say, through phonological reanalysis) allows underlying representations to resurface. Restorations are typically grammatically conditioned in that 'original' morpheme shapes are restored only in environments where they were subject to alternation. In such internally motivated changes, where the (typically gradual) curtailment of a rule allows formerly underlying (or intermediate) representations to surface, the innovative variants are unmarked, and the change results in simplification—first in the relation between underlying and surface forms, eventually, when the rule has been curtailed and lexicalized out of existence, of speakers' grammars.

Distinct from such changes are *restitutions*, such as those exemplified in Bakken's paper, which ensue from contact with a closely related language variety (dialect or sociolect) with pronunciation norms that happen to be phonologically more conservative in some respect. It is natural for the linguist who is familiar with the historical phonology of a dialect to focus attention on the reintroduction of 'original' phonological shapes. But in reality such restitutions owe their appearance of phonological unity largely or entirely to

the linguist's expert construal of the data and do not differ from other phoneme *substitutions* in individual lexemes that may occur through dialect contact (cf. Andersen 1988:40–44). Such a set of restitutions or substitutions is not a phonological change—or even a single change in the sense of a bounded, internally coherent historical event in the given community's tradition of speaking. It is, properly speaking, just a subset of a series of individual replacements of local word shapes with borrowed ones, part of a smaller or larger relexification, motivated by the individual word shapes' greater utility in interdialectal communication and hence defined in pragmatic and semantic terms. The progression of such a relexification begins as an elaboration of speakers' grammars, as elements of a local tradition of speaking are matched with marked covariants appropriate for specified pragmatic purposes. It runs to completion lexeme by lexeme, as the traditional elements one by one fall into disuse, superseded by the borrowed, more widely used, more viable alternatives. (See further Section 2.6.)

Bakken's data, and especially those obtained in recent informant interviews, are a nice illustration of such a course of events.

2.6 *Markedness and the S-curve*

It is a well-known fact that when a change is in progress in a speech community, the innovated element typically increases in frequency of occurrence in a way that can be diagrammed with an *S*-shaped curve. For a number of reasons the slow-fast-slow progressions captured by *S*-curves are usually not observed in the textual record, the most obvious reasons being that the written attestation does not conform to any consistent sampling method, written usage is often a compromise between writing norms and spoken usage, written texts may reflect a haphazard assortment of such compromises, and some texts may be directly copied from or otherwise based on material written by earlier writers and hence contain reflections of earlier norms of writing or spoken usage. The historical linguist consequently has to make do with whatever evidence can be drawn from the written attestation, but can reasonably assume behind this attestation a regular *S*-curve progression in spoken usage, as for instance Bubenik does (96).

It is often assumed that any innovative element (I-variant) is marked in relation to the element it is called on to replace (O-variant). This assumption is surely correct for some innovations (though not for all; see below). When a marked I-variant is widely adopted and gains currency in a speech community, it may, at some point, be judged to be unmarked—through a revaluation by some speakers or a reanalysis by new cohorts of learners or a combination of the two. If the I-variant was at first limited to specific environments, its

reinterpretation as unmarked allows it to spread to unmarked environments and thus to gain ascendancy in community usage and eventually supersede the O-variant.

The change in the variants' Markedness value is sometimes referred to as a 'markedness shift'. Bubenik (96) credits Simon Dik with this term, but note that in Dik's view markedness is identified with frequency; hence the 'markedness shift', in this conception, is merely the observable (or assumed) change in the ratio of I-variants to O-variants, in the middle of the *S*-curve, from 49% : 51% to 51% : 49% of usage tokens. In the restatement offered in the preceding paragraph, by contrast, the Markedness shift is described as occurring in speakers' grammars (revaluation) and between speakers' grammars (reanalysis). This makes it possible to understand the observable changes in relative frequency as actualizations (cf. Andersen 2001a:51; see further p. 238).

In speaking of Markedness, however, it is essential to define the categories with respect to which a given pair of variants is ascribed value. In the case of such complex grammatical systems as the diglossic or polyglossic grammars discussed in Bubenik's paper, evidently, distinct sets of appropriateness norms exist for the diverse, complementary functions the conjoined (partial) grammars conventionally serve. Accordingly, elements that are O-variants (marked as obsolescent or obsolete) in the norms of a lower diglossic grammar may be neutral and stable (unmarked) in a higher grammar. And well-established, neutral elements of a lower grammar may be I-variants, proscribed or marked as novel in the higher grammar.

It is very useful to see the historical development of such complex linguistic traditions subjected to historical analysis, as in Bubenik's paper, not least because they draw attention to the prominent role of convention in the usage norms of natural languages. In this regard studies of diglossia offer an instructive perspective on the often facile appeal to 'processing ease' as a determinant of change, which is a recurrent theme in the history of the discipline.

3. *Conclusion*

All the papers in this volume are contributions to the long-standing dialog on the determinants of linguistic change.

Most of the papers exemplify the grammatical conditioning of attested changes and evaluate the extent to which their progression can be interpreted in terms of Markedness and the Principle of Markedness Agreement.

The focus on Markedness in the position paper to which most of the Workshop papers responded naturally raised the question whether change is

better understood in a Markedness perspective, which views a grammar as a kind of value system and change as a manifestation of the inherent asymmetries of such systems, or from a speech-processing point of view, which endeavors to explain change and the gradualness of change as resultants of the relative strengths of encoding and decoding factors.

It is interesting to note that this disjunction, which has been debated off and on for several generations now, is put in a new light in the philosophical piece by Shapiro (196–200). Shapiro argues that language change belongs to the category of 'finious processes' described by Charles S. Peirce, that is, the nonmechanistic processes that "act in one determinate direction and tend asymptotically toward bringing about an ultimate state of things" (198). In this view, any finious process is the result of fortuitous variation plus a principle of selection.

If this is a correct understanding of language change, then the disjunction between speech-processing factors and Markedness relations as determinants of change is resolved with a 'both-and'. Encoding and decoding conditions produce the fortuitous fluctuation in speech production and perception which is not change, but without which no change could occur. The usage categories against which speakers evaluate this fluctuation allow it to be reanalysed as variation. And the inherent asymmetry of these categories, their Markedness values, provides the persistent skewing—the slant, as Sapir called it—that transforms the variation into change as it is transmitted through successive cohorts of speakers (cf. Andersen 1989, 1990, and 2001b:236–246).

REFERENCES

Andersen, Henning. 1974. "Towards a typology of change: bifurcating changes and binary relations". *Historical Linguistics. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Historical Linguistics,* I–II ed. by John M. Anderson & Charles Jones, vol. II, 17–60. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Andersen, Henning. 1979. "Phonology as semiotic", *A Semiotic Landscape. Proceedings of the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* ed. by Seymour Chatman, 377–381. The Hague: Mouton.

Andersen, Henning. 1988. "Center and periphery: adoption, diffusion, and spread", *Historical Dialectology. Regional and Social* ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 39–84. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, 37.) Berlin & New York & Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andersen, Henning. 1989. "Understanding linguistic innovations". *Language Change. Contributions to the Study of Its Causes* ed. by Leiv Egil Breivik & Ernst Håkon Jahr, 5–28. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andersen, Henning. 1990. "The structure of drift". *Historical Linguistics 1987. Papers from the 8th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* ed.

by Henning Andersen & Konrad Koerner, 1–20. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 66.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andersen Henning. 1998. "Dialektnaja differenciacija obščeslavjanskogo jazyka. Paradoks obščix tendencij razvitija s različnymi lokal'nymi rezul'tatami". [The dialect differentiation of Common Slavic. The paradox of shared tendencies of development having distinct local outcomes.] *American Contributions to the Twelfth International Congress of Slavists. Cracow, Aug.–Sept. 1998. Literature. Linguistics. Poetics* ed. by Robert A. Maguire & Alan Timberlake, 565–600. Bloomington, Ind.: Slavica Publishers.

Andersen, Henning. 2001a. "Markedness and the theory of change". In this volume, 21–57.

Andersen, Henning. 2001b. "Actualization and the (uni)directionality of change". In this volume, 225–248.

Bach, Adolf. 1950. *Deutsche Mundartforschung. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben.* (Zweite Auflage.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag..

Battistella, Edwin L. 1996. *The Logic of Markedness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borkovskij, Viktor I. & Petr S. Kuznecov. 1965. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka.* [A Historical Grammar of Russian.] (Second edition.) Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk.

Brøndal, Viggo. 1943. *Essais de linguistique générale.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. *Universals of Language. With special attention to feature hierarchies.* (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor, 59.) The Hague & Paris: Mouton.

Jakobson, Roman (ed.). 1985. *N. S. Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes* (Janua Linguarum, Series Major, 47.) Berlin & New York & Amsterdam: Mouton.

Klenin, Emily. 1983. *Animacy in Russian.* Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.

Klenin, Emily. 1997. Review of Krys'ko 1994. *Russian Linguistics* 21.108–120.

Krys'ko, Vadim B. 1994. *Razvitie kategorii oduševlennosti v istorii russkogo jazyka.* Moscow: Liceum.

Šaxmatov, Aleksandr A. [1911] 1957. *Istoričeskaja morfologija russkogo jazyka.* Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosveščenija RSFSR.

Smith, John Charles. 1996. "Surfonctionnalité et hyperanalyse: l'accord du participe passé dans les langues romanes à la lumière de deux théories récentes". *Faits de langues* 8.113–120.

Smith, John Charles. 1997. "Types and tokens in language change: some evidence from Romance". *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: a Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th birthday* ed. by Raymond Hickey & Stanisław Puppel, 1099–1111. (Trends in Linguistics—Studies and Monographs, 101.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Svorou, Soteria. 1994. *The Grammar of Space*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Timberlake, Alan. 1981. "Dual reflexes of *dj* and a morphological constraint on sound change". *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 23.25–54.

MARKEDNESS AND THE THEORY OF LINGUISTIC CHANGE

HENNING ANDERSEN

University of California, Los Angeles

> L'opposition dans les faits linguistiques n'est pas un schéma que la science introduit pour maîtriser les faits, et qui resterait extérieur à ceux-ci. Son importance dépasse l'ordre épistémologique: quand la pensée linguistique range les faits d'après les principes d'opposition et de système, elle rencontre une pensée qui crée ces faits mêmes. (Pos 1938:246)

0.   *Introduction*

0.1   *Preamble*

To our structuralist predecessors our generation of linguists owes a rich heritage of technical vocabulary we use every day.[1] Much of this vocabulary was created for specific purposes, in specific structuralist theories, and was provided with more or less precise definitions, some terms even being defined, in true structuralist fashion, in relation to other terms. But in contemporary linguistics many of these lexemes have lost their status as terms and are used as common-parlance words. Among these is the term *markedness*, and the correlative terms *marked* and *unmarked*, which were coined (first in Russian and German; see below) and defined by Trubetzkoy and Jakobson in 1930 (cf. Jakobson 1985:162). That these lexemes are now common-parlance words is shown by the fact that they are used entirely in accordance with the principle of cooperation—you can use the word *markedness* freely without anyone demanding that you define what you mean by it. And if asked, most linguists are quite content with an informal characterization of, say, *unmarked* that equates it with approximate synonyms such as *simple, common, basic, default* and easily agree on a shared understanding of *markedness* as 'relative complexity or frequency' or, on a more abstract level, 'a sort of asymmetrical relation'.

0.1.1. An early indication that *markedness* had changed status from technical term to everyday word is, perhaps, Joseph Greenberg's monograph *Universals of Language* (1966). Here markedness is treated as a 'found object': it is described as a "Protean notion" that is acknowledged as being familiar to everyone, but thought to be badly in need of a definition. In other words, the monograph starts not from the understanding that markedness is a formal principle that *deductively* explains a variety of observed phenomena in language—which was the way Trubetzkoy and Jakobson first grasped it—but from the idea that the word *markedness* presumably refers to some characteristic, present in all the different observables that linguists intuitively recognize as instantiations of markedness—a single, unifying criterion that would serve as a guide in determining the markedness attributes of any observed phenomena, and which one might discover through an *inductive* search through the different instantiations of markedness.

As you may recall, Greenberg's search for such a single criterion was not successful, and as a consequence his monograph failed to resolve the conflict between the two predominant attitudes to markedness—in the sixties, when he wrote, as well as now, thirty-odd years later. One of these is to consider *markedness* simply a handy label for a large number of disparate observables; the other is to regard it as a hazy (non)concept that contributes nothing to linguistics. Greenberg, in the end, concluded that markedness attributes can at best be identified on the basis of a number of indications such as these: (a) unmarked terms often occur in positions of neutralization; (b) unmarked terms usually have greater relative text frequency; (c) unmarked terms show more allophonic or allomorphic variability; (d) unpaired phonemes are common in marked phoneme classes, and syncretism, in marked categories; (e) unmarked terms are often indicated by the features of basic allophones in phonology and by agreement a potiori in morphosyntax (1966:58–59). For a detailed analysis and critique of Greenberg's contribution, see Andersen (1989a).

0.1.2. More recent literature on markedness only serves as further illustration that the word has lost its terminological status. For example—to take a linguist who makes extensive use of the word—in Givon's writings, say, the two-volume *Syntax* (1984, 1990), *markedness* is not given a precise definition, but serves as a cover term for the range of substantive phenomena in which it is manifested, mainly complexity of expression, relative frequency, cognitive complexity (1990:945–966). Battistella's theoretically oriented monograph, *The Logic of Markedness* (1996) reports on numerous definitions and characterisations the word has been given since 1930. In this way, this work is a useful contribution to a history of the lexeme *markedness*. But despite its title,

the monograph does not offer anything like a logical analysis of what markedness is. It does not even analyse the differences between structuralist usage and poststructuralist usage.

0.2   *Issues in 'markedness'*

It seems to me that the existing literature on markedness from Greenberg (1966) to the present conflates a number of issues concerning this notion which can only be clarified if the issues are distinguished and approached one by one.

0.2.1. One issue is the synchronic one of what the word *markedness* means. This issue can be resolved only through an essentially lexicographic expedition through the current literature that would register the actual use to which the words *marked, unmarked,* and *markedness* are put and classify the words' referents. The outcome of such an undertaking would be useful as a purely descriptive stock-taking. It might perhaps be supplemented with judgements by a usage panel, in the style of the *American Heritage Dictionary*, which could establish what are customary (or appropriate), and what are unusual (or inappropriate) uses of these words according to the understanding of a representative sample of practicing linguists. Much of what is in Battistella (1996) can be appreciated as a first step towards such a study.

0.2.2. Another issue is a diachronic one, which calls for an investigation of several strands of development that would trace (i) the history of the words and terms for markedness and (ii) the history of the notion.

The former effort would recognize the varying terminology of different schools (e.g., the Copenhagen School's *intensive* vs. *extensive* distinction) and periods (e.g., Gm. *merkmalhaft*, Russ. *priznakovyj* (1930s) › Gm. *markiert*, Russ. *markirovannyj* (1950s and later), both, "marked"; cf. Jakobson [1971] 1971b). It would also pay attention to ways of speaking of markedness in the pre-terminological period, say, in nineteenth-century European linguistics or in medieval Arabic linguistics (see Owens 1988:199–220).

The history of the notion of markedness, by contrast, would trace different conceptions back in time beyond the explicitly named stages in the recent history of grammatical scholarship. It would pay attention, for instance, to such implicit recognitions of markedness as the organization of morphological paradigms in grammatical texts. Recall the traditional presentation of verb morphology in our Latin grammars, where the order of forms in paradigms mirrors the markedness relations of the respective categories in that singular (U) forms precede plural (M) forms, the forms of the present (U) tense precede those of the preterite (M), the paradigms for these two historical (U) tenses precede those for the future (M), the

tenses of the infective (U) aspect are presented before those of the perfective (M), the indicative mood (U) before the subjunctive (M), and so on; cf. Table 1. Comparable principles of organization can be discerned in bilingual Sumerian–Akkadian grammatical texts from Babylon (1900–1600s B.C.); see Jakobsen (1974). Grammatical texts in other ancient grammatical traditions await exploration.

Unmarked	Marked
Singular	Plural number
present	preterite tense
historical tenses: present, preterite	future tense
infective	perfective aspect
indicative	subjunctive mood
descriptive moods: indicative, subjunctive	directive mood: imperative
finite forms	nominal and adverbial forms: infinitive; participles, gerundive; supines, gerund

Table 1.

0.2.3. Finally, there is the analytic issue, which calls for an examination of the logical nature of markedness. On this issue, it seems we have been beating about the bush for most of this century. Looking back, one can see that among the structuralists, Hjelmslev alone had a precise understanding of markedness (1939:87; see Section 3.4.4 below), but he had no impact on the mainstream of linguistics at the time. Jakobson, on the other hand, who throughout his scholarly career served as an authority on markedness, consistently defined markedness in logically incoherent terms (cf. Section 3.2). When you compare Givon's characterization of markedness with Greenberg's, and Battistella's with Jakobson's, you have to conclude that the poststructuralist period has produced no advance in the clarity of this notion.

0.2.4. I want to return to the analytic issue towards the end of this presentation (Chapter 3), but I think it will be useful to give priority to some examples of the manifestations of markedness in synchrony (Chapter 1) and in diachrony (Chapter 2).

1. *Markedness in synchrony*

Much skepticism has been expressed in this century about the utility of the notion of markedness.

It is my impression that this skepticism has been characteristic, first of all, of linguists who by virtue of their personal cognitive style or academic training

(or both) are skeptical of anything that cannot be directly observed and tend to adopt what you might call a nominalist attitude to language and language description. To anyone who sees linguistic description as essentially a way for the linguist to organize his data—rather than as a hypothesis about the competence of the speakers of the language—markedness can easily seem readily dispensable. But secondly, many linguists who have understood markedness as primarily the difference in relative text frequency of opposites, or as a concept covering this and a number of other observable phenomena, have felt justified in considering the notion (and the word) redundant. A particularly eloquent discussion of markedness from these two points of view is contained in Roger Lass's *On Explaining Language Change* (1980).

I would like to shift attention from the question of the utility of markedness as a theoretical concept in linguistics to the reality of markedness as a principle of cognitive organization that is reflected in human behavior and apparently fundamental to it. It is only in this sense of markedness that we can appreciate the analytic thinking of our Sumerian and Akkadian-speaking colleagues working in applied linguistics almost 4000 years ago. I hope the examples I present here will be understood in this spirit.

1.1 *Ritual*

I begin with an example of the manifestation of dual symbolic classification in ritual.

On the island of Roti (an island southwest of Timor in Indonesia; see Fox 1973), the usual course of events in a funeral can be summed up briefly as follows (bracketed numerals refer to the terms in Table 2. First the coffin is brought to the house of the deceased amidst great uproar [1] and is put down outside the house, parallel to it at its west end. The coffin is then raised, carried under the roof [3], through the forecourt, and up the ladder into the house [5], which stands on piles. The corpse is laid out in the men's [7] (the eastern [9]) half of the house, its head [11] to the east [9] and feet to the west [13]. The corpse is then placed in the coffin with the same orientation, and the mourners are admitted to the house [1]. Subsequently the coffin is brought down into the forecourt, where it may be rested on the east side [9], still with the same orientation [13]. The deceased is then carried out of the house, feet first [12], and in this way the body is conducted in a noisy stampede [1] to the grave. At the side of the grave, which has been dug running east to west [13], the coffin is turned so that the corpse is headed [11] westward [10], and in this position the coffin is lowered into the grave for the decedent's journey to the land of the dead in the west [10].