

ADITI LAHIRI, (Ed.) **Analogy, levelling, markedness: Principles of change in phonology and morphology.** (Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 127). 2000. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. viii, 385.

The articles in this volume focus primarily on the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European languages. Most present the results of a second look at phenomena that have been well known for a considerable period of time.

Lahiri's introduction provides a well-documented discussion of *analogy* in scientific, mathematical, and philosophical perspectives and outlines the concept as it applies to morphology. We are advised that the research presented here considers the grammar "as a whole" in the operation of analogy and the interaction between phonology and morphology (11), "since both affect the grammar and are constrained by the grammar" (10), thus reflecting the post- (contra-) neogrammarian view that sound change and analogy are not categorically distinct operations.

Paul Kiparsky's "Analogy as optimization" argues that some analogical changes in Gothic affixation are driven by constraints on the forms of stems and on "syllable and foot well-formedness" (43). All the changes, K. says, increase conformity to the generalization STEM-FORM. Here, changes are not treated as cases of surface analogy, but of "STEM-FORM asserting itself in the morphology," especially in the *ja*-stems, where the issue is the underlying representation, not the outputs of the stem (*ibid.*)

Alan Dresher's "Analogical levelling of vowel length in West Germanic" sees analogical leveling as a prime suspect in Middle English vowel length alternations (47). He summarizes cases of long to short, and short to long leveling, which he accounts for as the byproduct of "selections" made during (first) language acquisition (54) (more about this supposition at the conclusion).

In “Hierarchical restructuring in the creation of verbal morphology in Bengali and Germanic: Evidence from phonology,” the editor traces cases of grammaticalization (phonological and morphological processes through which words come to function as affixes and clitics) in some Germanic languages and in Bengali, including the suggestion that the dental preterite of weak verb forms in Germanic may ultimately be derived from IE **dhē/dhō* ‘to do’ (91 ff.).

Renate Raffelsiefen’s “Constraints on schwa apocope in Middle High German” accounts for the seemingly idiosyncratic appearance of word-final schwa deletion in MHG with a hierarchical system of constraints whereby schwa disappears unless regulated by a senior constraint, and a constraint that paradigms, not words, be evaluated (125). The claim is made that schwa deletion occurs in all or no members of a paradigm. Implicit in this view is a definition of *paradigm*, a set of inflected forms whose distribution is determined by concord in the clause (137).

Frans Plank’s “Morphological re-activation and phonological alternations: Evidence for voiceless restructuring in German” raises the flag that phonology matters in grammaticalisation (171). The argument is exemplified by the relation of German adverb offspring *weg* [vek] of the noun *Weg* [ve:k], from which it was cut off when the noun underwent vowel lengthening. The adverb was grammaticalized via syntactic constructions; later the form remains voiceless in compounds, e.g., *weg-arbeiten* ‘work off’ (172 ff.). The always fascinating problem of the relation of orthography to word forms is discussed, in relation to forms that retain voiceless finals in their “upgraded” form despite combination or inflection.

Wolfgang Ullrich Wurzel’s “Inflectional system and markedness” asserts that in the lexicon are found words with “normal” inflectional behavior, and those with “less normal” behavior, which have specific inflectional information, and that it is the latter category that are marked (197). This is significant in a language like German, where, for example, six possible inflections are

shown for masc. nouns (193). One may also infer the point that when loanwords are imported with donor language inflections intact, it is sociolinguistic factors, not the typical treatment of the inflectional system, that determine forms, and the synchronic picture of the inflectional system may be distorted (see 200, 201; N. 8). W. states, “grammatically ... conditioned change is by nature to reduce markedness, which provides a motivation for language change to take place” (207). In many cases among the Germanic languages this rationale may suggest itself, but the persistency of marked forms (e.g., ‘children’, ‘oxen’, ‘fish’) argues just as strongly against this “motivation”. In addition, outside the Indo-European language family, the situation is not so neatly circumscribed. In Chinese, for example, successive apparently analogical processes of noun formation and suffixation, (*-tou*), (*-zi*), (*-r*), have complicated the picture, created variation phonologically and morphologically, and increased markedness, according to the ordinary criteria.

Carlos Gussenhoven, in “On the origin and development of the Central Franconian tone contrast,” argues that tonal contrasts in the dialect in question occurred as a result of the need to maintain opposition between sg. and pl. forms of words whose vowels had already been lengthened by Open Syllable Lengthening in the pl., when analogical lengthening of vowels in the sg. was spreading in presumably prestige dialects (217, 232). The central claim is that a social motivation, emulation of a feature in a prestige dialect that was advancing from the east, motivated the change, but it led to a problem: adopting the lengthened vowel would obliterate the sg. – pl. distinction. It is supposed that the innovation of the “H-tone” arose as speakers “faked” analogical lengthening (232, 251) by innovating the “H-tone.” This explanation is far-fetched at best. Even if the supposition of prestige association with the speech feature in question is so, conscious imitation of a feature perceived as prestige produces at best stylistic variation in individuals adopting the feature in target situations. This is far from the case of an unconditioned sound

change in the native tongue of the speech community. An opportunity for interactive study is offered at a URL where audio recordings of some of the sample data may be heard.

Thomas Riad, in “The origin of Danish stød,” describes stød [informants tell me that stød is notoriously difficult for learners of Danish to acquire]) and traces it through various dialects. It is shown to be distinctive in a few instances (263). Stød in Danish and Accent 1 (basically, an accent with a falling intonation [271]) in Swedish and Norwegian are have the same lexical distribution, and seem to be related (267). R. notes some parallels with and possible relation to the Eskilstuna-curl system in Swedish (275).

Haike Jacob’s “The revenge of the uneven trochee: Latin main stress, metrical constituency, stress-related phenomena and OT” seeks to offer a better account of these phenomena. We note numerous examples that demonstrate how syncope applied, a crucial aspect of J’s argument; we would like to have seen example words and their contexts that evidence the constraints and rankings discussed.

Richard M. Hogg’s, in questions the reality of High Vowel Deletion in Old English. H. notes in particular such forms as *hēafod*, *hēafdes* (353); WS *hēafdu* (356), where the obvious candidate for deletion, the inflection, remains, but syncope does occur; from *The Vespasian Psalter*, *hēafudu* (353, 364), where neither vowel is lost; and forms in which “the final vowel is sometimes lost,” *hēafudu*, *hēafud*, and *wolcenu*, *wolcen* ‘clouds’ (353), where the inflection is lost but syncope does not occur. H. cites difficulties in both phonological and analogical accounts for such variations, and raises the vital question of just what grammar are we talking about in regard to OE (365). Two principles that may simply be too basic to present themselves in a serious scholarly quest occur to me. Standardization of orthography is relatively recent in English. It is well known that even as late as 1756 Ben Johnson, when compiling his dictionary of English, complained of

inconsistent orthographic representations of words both among writers and in the work of a single individual, even on the same page. Is it to be believed that this problem is a sudden phenomenon of the eighteenth century, and that records from previous centuries represent a faithful consistency with (synchronic) spoken forms? Orthographic representation becomes relevant to the question of the degree to which the overall drift that saw the loss of inflectional and the reduction of vowels in unstressed syllables had spread by the time of the VP and WS records.

A presupposition in many of the papers in this book reflects the theory that the changes in question occurred as products of the language acquisition process among native speakers—this view appears almost as a shibboleth. As for this view, I know of no empirical evidence that supports it, but much that contradicts it. In any case, a fundamental fact merits reassertion: knowing that a change occurred is one thing; understanding the process of the change is another. But knowing its cause is, as my central Michigan kinsmen would say, a whole ‘nother thing.

It has always been true that Indo-European languages are the most studied among the world’s languages, and the present tome extends this tradition, as new trends and concepts are applied to old topics by leading Indo-Europeanists. A work that addresses the same topics—analogy, leveling, and markedness—taken up by specialists in other language families would also be very valuable in contributing to what we can learn about language.

Robert D. Angus
California State University, Fullerton