At the Interface between Hierarchical Structuralism and Language Teaching

Katsuhiro Ohashi

Abstract:
Supposedly, the general perception is that as structural linguistics owes no debt to language teaching, so language teaching studies and practices owe none to structural linguistics. This seems so simply because structuralism has no obvious echo in the kind of language teaching of our time. In point of fact the profession is heavily indebted for the theories and findings of structuralism. Just think that professionals in the field of second language teaching today are fully corpus-minded in discussing usage and, to that degree, alert to the danger of normative strictures on it. There they are already being structuralist. This paper is an attempt to throw a certain amount of light on second language teaching on the basis of the structural linguistic idea of marked versus unmarked. Empirical studies demonstrate that marked forms are harder to cognitively process and more error-prone than unmarked forms. A fuller awareness of this realization on teachers' part is likely to work in favor of saving language learning from its inherent boredom, tedium, and pains to a considerable extent. Such is the discussion developed on the following pages.

Key terms: binary opposition, marked, unmarked, hierarchical structuralism, grammaticalization

1. Introduction

No educated reader of Ferdinand de Saussure's Geneva lectures can fail to notice his coherent attempt to approach the subject matter in terms of binary oppositions. Tables 1 and 2 set out major binarisms launched by the Swiss linguist for formulating the theoretical core of structuralism. Not that Saussure himself used all these terms. The term p*aradigme*, for instance, does not appear in *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916). Saussurean commentators, however, have been in the habit of referring to the original *les rapports associatifs* (associative relations) as *paradigme,* and not unreasonably. *Thesei* (conventionalism) and *physei* (nomenclaturalism) are another pair of terms that are not found in the same book, neither in the Greek originals nor in *isme* guises. Nonetheless, these are among pairs of oppositional ideas of unquestionable importance in any comprehensive discussion of Saussurean linguistics. There is nothing surprising about the fact that Saussure introduces an array of neologisms, for any conceptual innovation more or less entails terminological novelty. What should not escape our attention in effect is the way the majority of his terms are proposed as pairs.

Table 1 Symmetrical binary opposition

signifiant	signifié
syntagme	paradigme
linéarité	simultané
immutabilité	mutabilité

Table 2 Asymmetrical binary opposition

langue	parole
synchronie	diachronie
arbitraire	motivé
arbitraire absolu	arbitraire relatif
thesei	*physei*
forme	substance
descriptif	normatif

Attention must be paid to the distinction drawn above between binary oppositions in Table 1 and in Table 2 because Table 1 oppositions are purely Aristotelian[1] in that there is no priority premised between the two poles of each pair. *Signifiant* and *signifié,* for example, are postulated as two planes of a sign, neither of which is more important than the other, just as *syntagme* and *paradigme* are posited as absolutely interdependent and complimentary systems of language and neither of them is favored over the other. These are pairs of symmetrical binary opposition. On the other hand, Table 2 oppositions are asymmetrically paired in the sense that in Saussurean thinking the lefthand poles are privileged as essential to language over the righthand ones that are more or less marginalized as *accessoire*, as best shown by the subordination of *parole* to *langue* as the primary task of linguistics in Saussure's conceptualization (see Saussure 1916: III and IV). In short, Table 1 and Table 2 stand in contrast with the former representing non-hierarchical, symmetrical dichotomies and the latter hierarchical, asymmetrical relations. For the sake of better approaching the subject of discussion in this paper, the Table 2 class of dichotomies may profitably be termed Saussurean binarism as distinct from the Table 1 class that is a mere reuse of the Aristotelian binary opposition.

If the point of departure for modern linguistic science is Saussure's condemnation of nineteenth-century linguistic studies for their failure to distinguish between *langue* and *parole* (see Saussure 1916: I, III, and IV), his reliance on binary opposition is not simply a matter of categorization method preliminary to understanding the system of language, but is found to be part and parcel of the intellectual revolution he carried about single-handed.[2] This is probably the reason why the concepts of *langue* and *parole* have been abundantly borrowed by glossematicians, structural semioticians, generativists, not to mention structural linguists after Saussure, to formulate such bifurcations as 'schéma' versus 'usage,' 'système' versus 'procès,' 'discours' versus 'énoncé,' 'competence' versus 'performance.'

Descriptivism versus prescriptivism is another key opposition in Saussure's thinking. See how the opening chapter of the *Cours* bids farewell to normative viewpoints which had been deeply seated in pre-nineteenth-century European linguistic thought. To fathom out the magnitude of implications created by Saussure's pronounced rejection of prescriptivism, it will suffice to look at the second chapter of the same book, where he makes a succinct remark to the effect that if it is to be called a science, linguistics must describe the reality of language. Here, then, lies the importance of asymmetrical binary opposition in modern thinking about language, since the first avowed post-prescriptivist theorist on language in history had recourse to it in inaugurating

linguistics as a science.

2. Principle of markedness

It is in such a context of the modern linguistic tradition that we can situate Roman Jakobson's view of marked versus unmarked. That Jakobson presented himself as a Saussurean, it goes without saying, does not mean he was comfortable with the Saussurean inheritance throughout his long career. But while he was based in Europe, and especially where the method of categorization and hence theorization was concerned, Saussure's resurrection and application of the Greek binarism is known to have been congenial to the Russian linguist. Jakobson's development of the notion of distinctive features in phonology, which is often regarded as his main contribution to modern linguistics, would not have assumed the shape it actually took without the Russian structuralist following in the footsteps of his Swiss master in terms of classifying, reasoning, and theorizing strategy. Therefore, it must be borne in mind that when Jakobson was stimulated by his Prague colleague Nikolai Trubetzkoy to pioneer theorizing on marked versus unmarked in the 1930s, he was also influenced by the Saussurean version of binarism to embark on 'hierarchical structuralism.'

2. 1 Definition

The principle of markedness can be broadly interpreted as a view of language as a structure of asymmetrically valued pairs of opposites, of which the pole perceived to be a normal status is left unmarked, while the one perceived as a special status is marked by virtue of a specific grammatical element.[3] Clearly, marked versus unmarked is an example in point of hierarchical binarism. Examples of English shown in Table 3 are intended to illustrate this. To take the singular/plural opposition, the logic of English is such that being singular is a natural, normal status in speakers' collective consciousness and this shared consciousness is firmly entrenched in the form of the linguistic default (*ie*, zero marking), while being plural is a special, unique status in their collective mind and so the plural form is marked, most often by such suffixes as *-s* and *-es.* In the same way, being masculine is accepted as the normal status, it following therefore that a masculine form such as *actor, duke,* or *lion* is endowed with zero marking, whereas a feminine form like *actress, duchess,* or *lioness* is endowed with the mark *-ess* because being feminine is a unique status in the perception of the collectivity.

Table 3 A specimen of U/M

Unmarked	***Marked***
singular	plural
masculine	feminine
present-tense verb	past-tense verb
active voice	passive voice
indicative mood	subjunctive mood
affirmative construction	negative construction

As indicated above, the normal/special criterion as proposed here is a broad, generic ground on which to define

two poles of an oppositional pair. As hierarchical structuralism has progressed, a plethora of other defining criteria, of which a useful eleven are shown in Table 4, have been suggested by investigators. We have now an eclectic inventory of defining criteria about which practitioners of the principle like language teachers need to be selective when they apply it for their purposes. To account, for instance, for the shared perception of the inflectional plurals (*eg*, students, trees, boxes) as unmarked and mutational plurals (*eg*, men, teeth, mice) as marked, the regular/exceptional criterion is likely to make better sense than others. To determine why indicative mood is identified as unmarked and subjunctive mood as marked, it will be a better idea to introduce the frequency criterion. Be this as it may, in so far as Jakobson's conceptualization is concerned, the crucial aspect of the principle remains that it views the nonequivalence of the marked and unmarked poles as a linguistic representation of communally agreed-upon asymmetries inherent in a given socio-cultural reality. That seems a safe reaction to his oft-cited letter to Trubetzkoy written in 1930 when the idea of marked versus unmarked was in embryo:

> I am coming increasingly to the conviction that your thought about correlation as a constant mutual connection between a marked and unmarked type is one of your most remarkable and fruitful ideas. It seems to me that it has a significance not only for linguistics but also for ethnology and the history of culture, and that such historico-cultural correlations as life~death, liberty~non-liberty, sin~virtue, holidays~working days, etc., are always confined to relations *a*~non-*a*, and that it is important to find out for any epoch, group, nation, etc., what the marked element is.
> (Letter from Jakobson to Trubetzkoy, 26 November 1930, translated in Jakobson and Waugh 1979: 90)

Not just in the 1930s but throughout his career, Jakobson never privileged language as a possessor of the asymmetrical binary structure (see Battistella 1996: 131 for a relevant discussion). Furthermore, it is arguable that in his outlook linguistic binary oppositions are epiphenomena of the infinite hierarchies the world as mirrored in man's mind's eye is pregnant with. So that such a Jakobsonian viewpoint may get reflected, socio-cultural criteria are positioned superior to linguistic ones in Table 4.

Table 4 Defining criteria

Typology of criteria	***Unmarked***	***Marked***
socio-cultural	normal	special
	prototypical	derivative
	neutral	deviant
	core	peripheral
	general	specific
linguistic	regular	exceptional
	morphologically sparse	morphologically abundant
	more frequent	less frequent
	less informative	more informative
	easier to learn	less easy to learn
	assimilating	assimilated

2. 2 Application

Table 4 affords a precious opportunity for us to deepen insight into the role to be played by the principle not just in language description but in descriptions of language acquisition and language change as well. In this regard, the last two criteria in the table merit special attention.

As concerns the contribution of the principle to language teaching practices, professionals in the field of second language teaching can take this opportunity to be reawakened to the realization that unmarked forms require less effort to learn than marked forms (see Battistella 1996: 16)[4] and get this realization reflected in the order of target language teaching, so language acquisition will be a less painstaking and more pleasurable experience. In teaching vocabulary, for instance, beginning with 'boar,' 'hog,' 'sow,' 'bull,' 'ox,' 'cow,' 'stallion,' 'gelding,' 'mare' and then proceeding to 'pig,' 'cattle,' 'horse' would be like putting the cart before the horse because it is the second group of words (*ie*, hypernyms) that is general/unmarked and easier to learn than the first group of words (*ie*, hyponyms). Similarly, teaching hypotactic construction (*eg*, 'I know that she is a kind woman.') before paratactic construction (*eg*, 'She is a kind woman; I know that.') is not unlikely to be counterproductive because parataxis has been prototypical/unmarked historically; even in present-day English it remains prototypical, at least as far as spoken language is concerned, and easier to learn and use.

One big question lying at the interface between hierarchical structuralism and language teaching is this: To which degree should language teaching be based on grammaticalization? The notion 'grammaticalization' (*ie*, reliance on grammar) is proposed here as antidotal to 'lexicalization' (*ie*, reliance of vocabulary) in the sense that what is dealt with grammatically need not be dealt with lexically. Beginning inductively with a readily available example, two kinds of agent nouns, ending with *-er* and *-or* respectively, are supposedly taught *lexically* at the better part of high schools and universities spread across Japan. Teachers who clear up the point for the benefit of learners that the agentive suffix *-or* occurs in practice only if the original verb infinitive ends with *-ate* (derived from the Latin suffix *-ātus*) are in all probability few and far between despite the fact that this piece of grammaticalization can be backed up by examples within easy reach—educator (educate), operator (operate), articulator (articulate), moderator (moderate), creator (create), communicator (communicate), etc. Not only is an approach to teaching agent nouns based on the grammaticalization of English agent nouns ours for the asking, but if put into practice, it is expected to rescue learners from the tedium of rote learning. As things stand, however, such measures have not been taken, and regretfully individual learners are left with no small amount of memory-reliant vocabulary building task.

For another example, Modern English has a fairly clear-cut distribution of the voiceless fricative /ɵ/ and the voiced fricative / ð / to content words and function words respectively such that the /θ/-words are contentives (*eg*, thank, think, thatch, thing, thorn, thirsty, thorough)[5] and the / ð /-words are functors (*eg*, the, this, that, them, there, then, thus, though) [6]. In the present writer's observation, the majority of locally published textbooks of English have done less than justice to this well-delimited distribution, with the inevitable consequence that learners have to take pains to learn to pronounce one *th* word after another by heart for the above-stated reason that what is not done grammatically has to be done lexically. The point of the current discussion is that with regard to the opposition between grammaticalization and lexicalization, it is grammaticalization that should be construed as unmarked on two criterional accounts: in the first place, grammaticalized target items are premised to be regular; in the second place, they require the less effort to learn to the degree that grammaticalization-

based learning is less memory-costly and least prone to the risk of randomization in learning. How to maximize grammaticalization in teaching is a debate residing at a crossroads where the principle of markedness meets language teaching, and is a potentially profitable one at that to the extent that it is expected to serve crucial pedagogic purposes.

Even more revealing than the preceding discussion is Jakobson's proclamation of the involvement of the marked versus unmarked asymmetry in causing language change. In the words of Jakobson (1932: 12), "The asymmetrical structure of the linguistic sign is an essential prerequisite for language change." Thus assigning to his own principle a role as the mainspring of language change, the Prague-based Jakobson elucidates the mechanism by which internally motivated language change keeps happening. Language is inherently unstable and ceaselessly changing. This must be accepted as a given inasmuch as the linguistic sign is arbitrary and hence intrinsically susceptible to change (see Saussure 1916: General Principles II). Given this intrinsic defenselessness of language against change, what Jakobson does is to suggest the substitutability of the unmarked for the marked and supply by so doing a theoretical basis on which to account for internally motivated language change. To get a clearer picture of his general point, it will be helpful to look at a few examples of changes motivated linguistically (*ie*, internally).[7]

Table 5 Reduction of inflections

(indicative/present)	***OE(West-Saxon)***	***ME (East Midland)***		***ModE***
singular 1st	hīere	hēre	[unmarked]	hear
2nd	hīerst	hēr(e)st	[marked]	hear
3rd	hīerþ	hēres		hears
plural 1st, 2nd, 3rd	hīeraþ	hēres		hear
		hēre(n)		

*OE and ME are represented here by their most influential dialects.

It is not without reason that the three divisions of the history of English are sometimes referred to as the stages of full inflections, leveled inflections, and lost inflections respectively. By common consent, the reduction of inflections that obtained stage by stage through the course of the history is one of the reasons that justify the partitioning of the history into Old English (OE), Middle English (ME), and Modern English (ModE) periods. Why and how this reduction occurred is a fair question to ask because a close parallel is hard to draw with most other European languages as regards this specific pattern of evolution. Studies ascribe the occurrence to the two main backgrounds: for one thing, Old English words generally had the heavy stress on the initial syllable and this contributed to the weakening of unstressed inflected endings (see, for example, Quirk and Wrenn 1994: 10-11); for another, the so-called Viking raids exposed the English to a prolonged contact with Old Norse speakers in which various sorts of bilingualism emerged, leading up to the eventual decay of inflections (see Jespersen 1905: 81-82; Barber 2008: 157). A conflation of these two explanations seems to be convincing enough to minimize, if not dissolve, the big question. But on the strength of Jakobson's doctrine of markedness, we can add one more to these existing solutions. It can plausibly be argued that around the time in the ME period

when the final unstressed *e* lost its sound [ə] (Burrow and Turville-Petre 2005: 20) the perception of 'hēre' as the unmarked form was spread throughout the membership of the collectivity, relegating all the other inflected endings to the marked status on the grounds that 'hēre,' occurring as it did in conjunction with the first-person singular subject, was most frequently used and that it was morphophonetically shortest of all. This is to say, 'hēre' had functioned as assimilator and all the other forms had been assimilated into that norm. Analogously, this theory can also explain why the *-s/-es* endings of the third-person singular verb are often dropped by inadequately able non-native speakers of present-day English. It is more than presumable that the marked '(he) hears' form gets absorbed into the unmarked '(he) hear' form precisely because 'hear' is more frequent, morphophonetically shorter, and easier to use.

Table 6 Regular/Unmarked: -es/-s [Plural morphology]

Germanic	geese, sheep, feet, teeth, men, women, mice, lice
	childer, brether
	children, brethren (brothers), oxen, shoen (→shoes), kine (→cows), eyen (→eyes) , housen (→houses)
Greek	noumena, phenomena, oases, parentheses, analyses, syntheses, symbioses, theses
Latin	data, agenda, curricula (curriculums), criteria, media (mediums), memoranda (memorandums), quanta,
	loci, foci (focuses), fungi, topoi, stimuli, syllabi (syllabuses), gladioli (gladioluses)
Greco-Roman	formulae, nebulae

Narrowing down the range of discussion to one of the hyponyms of the superordinate *inflection*, the same account can be given of *declension*. Here, what has sponsored the assimilation of the marked form to the unmarked is the originally Middle English desinences *-es/-s*[8], which got progressively accepted as the normal/unmarked forms in the course of the history of English. As glimpsed in Table 6, history has evolved in such a way that marked plural desinences of Germanic and Latin origins have been increasingly absorbed into the unmarked -es/-s forms. Desinences of Greek and Greco-Roman origins have been safe probably because they are protected by the specific register in which they are used. The reason why mutational plurals are resilient to change is explicable in terms of the reversal of perception. That is, where *geese, sheep, feet, teeth*, etc. are concerned, being plural is perceived to be normal/unmarked, for as Battistella (1996: 54) notes, "Plurality is unmarked for nouns that generally occur in pairs or groups."

Table 7 Ø-ed-ed (Unmarked) /Other forms (Marked) [Conjugation]

Present	**Past**	**Past participle**
abide	abided (abode)	abided (abode)
awake	awaked (awoke)	awaked (awoke)
baby-sit	baby-sitted (baby-sat)	baby-sitted (baby-sat)
broadcast	broadcasted (broadcast)	broadcasted (broadcast)
burn	burned (burnt)	burned (burnt)
dream	dreamed (dreamt)	dreamed (dreamt)
kneel	kneeled (knelt)	kneeled (knelt)
leap	leaped (leapt)	leaped (leapt)
light	lighted (lit)	lighted (lit)

Turning to the other hyponym of inflection called *conjugation*, we see the same assimilatory force operative. It is unmistakably observable that the unmarked *Ø-ed-ed* pattern has been holding sway as assimilator of other patterns. Users of present-day English are eye-witnesses of the way the *Ø-ed-ed* patterning is growingly winning over the other kinds of patterning. This situation can trace back to the perception shared by the community of English speakers as far back as the OE period when roughly three quarters of English verbs conjugated weakly (Quirk and Wrenn 1994: 40). The strong conjugation must have been perceived as exceptional/marked since the earliest OE times.[9]

3. Epilogue

In the last part of Chapter VI of the *Cours*, Ferdinand de Saussure ventures an innovative classification of world languages into *le type grammaticale* and *le type lexicographique*. As Harris (1987: 150) suggests, this could be another of his expression of dissatisfaction with nineteenth-century linguistic inquiry, of which A. W. Schlegel's typology of languages is considered to be one triumph. In Saussure's alternative classification, grammatical languages are typified by Proto-Indo-European and Sanskrit, whereas lexicographical languages are represented by Chinese (see Saussure 1916: VI). Not that Esperanto is cited by Saussure, but this language, invented in 1887 by Ludwig Zamenhof, can justifiably be called the most grammaticalized language known to history. To take a selected number of morphosyntactic examples, Esperanto is armed with only about 1,500 root words in the first instance, yet it is so devised that by means of affixation learners are able to pile thousands of logically learnable words on that foundation. See Tables 8 and 9, which combine to demonstrate that learners of Esperanto have only half as many lexemes to remember as learners of English, for the righthand portions of Esperanto words in the tables can be acquired *grammatically* by attaching the prefix *mal-* or the infix *-in-* to the roots. The intriguing thing here is that the Jakobsonian approach to language is already discernible in the ontogenesis of the artificial language created thirty years in advance of the rise of structural linguistics.

Table 8 Morphology (A Case of prefixing)

	Unmarked	*Marked*
nouns	amiko (friend)	malamiko (enemy)
	espero (hope)	malespero (despair)
	sano (health)	malsano (illness)
adjectives	dekstra (right)	maldekstra (left)
	granda (big)	malgranda (small)
	varma (warm)	malvarma (cold)
verbs	helpi (help)	malhelpi (bother)
	havi (have)	malhavi (lack)
	fermi (close)	malfermi (open)

Table 9 Morphology (A Case of infixing)

Masculine/Unmarked	*Feminine/Marked*
patro (father)	patrino (mother)
frato (brother)	fratino (sister)
filo (son)	filino (daughter)
knabo (boy)	knabino (girl)
junulo (lad)	junulino (lass)
edzo (husband)	edzino (wife)
onklo (uncle)	onklino (aunt)
viro (man)	virino (woman)
sinjoro (Mr.)	sinjorino (Mrs.)

What is said about morphology can also be said about syntax. A look at Table 10 will convince one that Zamenhof's use of asymmetric binarism is volitional and deliberate. In the conception of articles, the notions of indefiniteness (zero marking) and definiteness (marking) are juxtaposed in a hierarchical way, and the same is true of the contrast between singular (zero marking) and plural (marking); when it comes to cases, with all the oblique cases synchretized as accusative, Esperanto rests content with only nominative (zero marking) and accusative (marking) cases; and so on. Most striking of all, the word classes of Esperanto are so designed as to fall into two categories: 'variants' (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs[10]) and 'invariants' (an article, pronouns, numerals, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.). Variants are so called because the same stem (eg, *dank-*) can generate a noun (*danko* 'thankfulness'), an adjective (*danka* 'thankful'), a verb (*danki* 'thank'), an adverb (*danke* 'thankfully') by means of suffixation. Beyond doubt, the rationale for this categorization consists in the augmentation of grammaticalization (or 'relative motivation' in structuralist terms) to be achieved by designating specific suffixes for the four contentive word classes, *viz*, *-o* (for nouns), *-a* (for adjectives), *-i* (for verbs), and *-e* (for adverbs). Thus at foundational levels, Esperanto grammar is reducible to a set of neatly paired oppositions. It is something of a reassuring experience to reflect at this distance of time that Zamenhof's spirit of civilizational harmony runs through the architectonics of the language of his own making in the form of his resolute will for a systematic simplification of it.

Table 10 Syntax

	Unmarked	*example*	*Marked*	*example*
article	Ø (indefinite)	Rozo estas floro. 'A rose is a flower'	la (definite)	La rozo estas bela. 'The rose is beautiful.'
number	Ø (singular)	unu rozo 'a rose'	-j (plural)	tri rozoj 'three roses'
case	Ø (nominative)	Mi amas lin. 'I love him.'	-n (accusative)	Li amas min. 'He loves me.'
mood	-as (indicative)	Se mi estas riĉa, … 'If I am rich, …'	-us (subjunctive)	Se mi estus riĉa! 'If I were rich!'
Sentential transformation	Ø (declarative)	Vi memoras min. 'You remember me.'	Ĉu…? (interrogative)	Ĉu vi memoras min? 'Do you remember me?'

That Esperanto is made not *a priori* (*ie*, created from scratch) but *a posteriori* (*ie*, based on existing languages) is not the only explanation of the ease with which one can learn and speak it. The fullest use that Zamenhof makes of the marked versus unmarked asymmetry so as to maximize and systematize grammaticalization in his creation is another secret of its simplicity. Whether it be a historical fortuity or not, the fact remains that some fifty years before hierarchical structuralism began to attract scholarly attention Jakobson's idea had already found a prophetic executor who was to immortalize a yet-to-be-born principle of markedness. Staying away from debating on academic foreshadowing, one thing for sure is that without the practical service rendered by his version of hierarchical structuralism, the enterprise of the Polish visionary would not have won such universal recognition as it now does.

Notes

1. About the Greek origin of the binary opposition, see Wilden (1987: 79) and Chandler (2002: 102). In both works, tribute is paid to Aristotle's *Metaphysics* where 'form/matter,' 'unity/variety,' 'natural/unnatural,' 'active/passive,' 'before/after,' 'whole/part,' etc. are instanced as illustrations of the symmetrical opposition. Also, Wilden (1987: 79-81) dwells on the ideological importance of *symmetry* in the kind of binarism advanced by Aristotle.
2. The flowing sentences are all quoted from the same section of Chapter III of the *Cours*:

> "Language in its entirety has many different and disparate aspects. It lies astride the boundaries separating various domains. It is at the same time physical, physiological and psychological. It belongs both to the individual and to society."
>
> "Indeed, amid so many dualities, linguistic structure [*la langue* in the French original] seems to be the one thing that is independently definable and provides something our minds can satisfactorily grasp."
>
> "A language as a structured system [*La langue* in the French original], on the contrary, is both a

self-contained whole and a principle of classification. (Trans. Roy Harris)

Reading the discourse including the above quotes is probably the fastest way to realize that Saussure is resolute to dissolve the muddled state of language in terms of binary oppositions. Chapter III as a whole may be read as a manifesto of Saussure's project in which binarism as a classification method and the scientific analysis of language he sets about to make cannot be divorced.

3. The use of 'grammatical (grammar)' here is structuralist in that it is not restricted to morphology and syntax. See Saussure (1916: General Principles VII).
4. Other than the report made by Battistella (1996: 16) to this effect, the following information offered by Chandler (2002: 112) is relevant: "It is notable that empirical studies have demonstrated that cognitive processing is more difficult with marked forms than unmarked forms (Clark and Clark 1977). Marked forms take longer to recognize and process and more errors are made with these forms."
5. The fact that 'through' (a preposition) is pronounced with the voiceless /θ/ can be explained in terms of functional shift: it started its career as a contentive (an adjective) and converted later to a functor (a preposition).
6. Adverbs in general meet the definitional requirements of content words. Exceptions are deictic adverbs like 'there,' 'then,' 'thus,' 'therefore,' 'thereupon,' etc. which are better categorized as function words.
7. The replacement of the so-called sexist terms (*eg*, chairman) by unbiased terms (*eg*, chair) is an externally (*ie*, socially or politically) motivated change. It lies outside the scope of our discussion. But the overshadowing of 'poetess'(marked) by 'poet'(unmarked) is an interesting case of a confluence of internal and external motivation.
8. The two plural desinences are arranged here in the order in which they appeared in history. From the older *-es* was derived the shorter *-s* form in the ME period.
9. Since the earliest times in the history of English, weak conjugation had taken pride of place as the unmarked assimilator of strong and irregular conjugations all along. What we witness in Modern English is the ever-increasing force of the *Ø-ed-ed* pattern as the most regular and simplest kind of weak conjugation. If weak conjugation in general is the old generation unmarked assimilator, the *Ø-ed-ed* may be called the new generation unmarked assimilator.
10. A limited number of adverbs are invariants. Examples include *almenaŭ* (at least), *ambaŭ* (both)*, ankaŭ* (also)*, ankoraŭ* (yet), *apenaŭ* (narrowly), *preskaŭ* (almost), *hieraŭ* (yesterday), *hodiaŭ* (today), *morgaŭ* (tomorrow), *jam* (already), *jus* (just), *mem* (self), *ne* (no, not), *nur* (only), *tre* (very), *tro* (too much).

References

Barber, C. (2008). *The English Language: A Historical Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Battistella, E. L. (1996). *The Logic of Markedness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burrow, J. A. and Turville-Petre, T. (2005). *A Book of Middle English* (3rd Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Chandler, D. (2002). *Semiotics: The Basics.* London: Routledge.

de Saussure, F. (1916/2005). *Cours de linguistique générale.* Paris: Payot.

de Saussure, F. (2008). *Course in General Linguistics* (Trans. Roy Harris). Illinois: Open Court.

Harris, R. (1987). *Reading Saussure.* London: Duckworth.

Jakobson, R. (1932). The Structure of the Russian Verb. In *Russian and Slavic Grammar Studies*, 1931-1981.

Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle (eds.), 1-14. Amsterdam: Mouton, 1984.

Jakobson, R. and Waugh, L. R. (1979). *The Sound Shape of Language.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jespersen, O. (1905). *Growth and Structure of the English Language.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Quirk, R. and Wrenn, C. L. (1994). *An Old English Grammar.* Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press.

Wilden, A. (1987). *The Rules are No Game: The strategy of communication.* New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.