HAL open science

Leaving Prolepsis

Pablo Kirtchuk

To cite this version:

Pablo Kirtchuk. Leaving Prolepsis. 2010. hal-00557950

HAL Id: hal-00557950

https://hal.science/hal-00557950v1

Preprint submitted on 20 Jan 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Leaving Prolepsis: Pragmatic, Prosodic, Typological, Dynamical and Biological Considerations

Est-ce prolepse ? Considérations pragmatiques, prosodiques, typologiques, dynamiques et biologiques

Pablo Kirtchuk, CNRS-LACITO, INaLCO- Paris
kirtchuk@vjf.cnrs.fr

Prolepsis is considered as *'the presence, in a completive construction, of a word or phrase in the main clause […] which is also co-referent with the subject (or the object) of the following subordinate clause'* (Fraser 2001), or *'a syntactical structure in which the main clause includes a sentence part extra-posed from the subordinate one'* (Dubois 1973), or *'prolepse, c'est-à-dire extraposition…'* (Touratier 1980: 55). Zewi (1997: 4) says: *The sentence type discussed in this paper* [i.e. 'Subodinate nominal sentences involving prolepsis'] *involves extra-position*.

The term *prolepsis* refers also to noun-phrase internal constructions such as possessive ones in which the possessor is grammatically encoded on the ante-posed possessum by an appended suffix which displays agreement - for example, in gender and number - with the possessor. In other words, in the verbal realm oblique complements can be indexed on agents and in the nominal realm possessors can be indexed on possessums. It follows that prolepsis refers to any construction in which an element, whose lexical (or, in some cases, grammatical) specification will be mentioned later, is present on a previous member of the clause or sentence. In other words, prolepsis involves cataphora and that in the uttered chain, whenever there is so-called prolepsis, a lexical or grammatical morpheme in the main clause precedes a lexical or grammatical *co-referent* morpheme in the subordinate clause. From these definitions it appears that in order for the element in the main clause to be considered proleptic, it need not necessarily be a direct object.

Several questions arise: What is the dynamics leading to the emergence of proleptic constructions: are they the output or rather the input of their syntactically non-marked equivalent constructions, in a more straightforward wording: does prolepsis necessarily involve extra-position? What are the correlates of prolepsis at the typological, into-prosodic, pragmatic, cognitive, biological, functional, pragmatic levels? Is there a special affinity between prolepsis and determination, agentivity, animacy, humanness or other parameters?

Let F be the deictic or nominal *focal object* of the main sentence, and let the same referent also be the T or *topical subject* of the following subordinate: can it have been extra-posed? This is improbable. For the focus of a first utterance, namely its new information, to become topic, namely old information of a following sentence, is common. As far as grammar is concerned, the two sentences may merge into one – main and subordinate, then the subordinate become a determinant, and the nominal element may be pro-nominalized at an oblique case:

I. I saw a woman # She was seated on a chair.	J'ai vu une femme. Elle était assise sur une chaise.
II. I saw a woman who was seated on a chair.	J'ai vu une femmme qui était assise sur une chaise.
III. I saw a woman seated on a chair.	J'ai vu une femme assise sur une

chaise.

IV. I saw her seated on a chair. Je l'ai vue assise sur une chaise.

It agrees with the principle of iconicity: first grasped, first expressed. Then, this element is not new anymore: it becomes topical, namely - grammatically speaking – subject. However, nothing opposes object pro-nominalization before stage IV, say at stage II, yielding

IIb. I saw her who was seated on a chair. Je l'ai vue qui était assise sur une chaise.

It follows that there is no syntactic extra-position whatsoever.
On the other hand, for a topic, *i.e.* old information, to become focus, *i.e*. new information, is highly improbable on pragmatic, cognitive or dynamic grounds, even if syntactically it may seem so. Indeed, it would be counter-iconic to suppose that in the previous sentences the speaker postulates the existence of a woman seated on a chair of whose existence he is still unaware, and then mention that he saw her. This would be the case if there were extra-position, as most if not all authors claim. In other words, we would have a clash between syntax on one hand, cognition and pragmatics on the other.
Indeed, prolepsis, according to the authors quoted above, implies extra-position. Now if we redefine prolepsis not in grammatical but in pragmatic terms, this would mean that: topical, *i.e*. old information, has been extracted from a subordinate clause and presented as focal, *i.e*. as new information, in the main clause. As we have just seen, this is highly improbable as a cognitive, pragmatic, and even morpho-syntactic process. ***A very significant fact is that if we look at real examples, we see that so-called prolepsis is typical of dialogue and direct speech, not of narrative or reported speech. It follows that so-called prolepsis is indeed not the transformation of a grammatical construct but, quite the opposite, an essentially pragmatic phenomenon.***

Let's turn to some examples now

1. wa-yarʔ	ʃᵉlo:mo:	ʔɛt	ha-naʕar	ki	ʕo:ɣɛ	mᵉlåʔkå	hu:ʔ
And-see, ipf,3sg.m	S	acc	def-lad	rel	do	work	3sg

'And Solomon saw the lad, that he was a maker of craft' (1 K, 11, 28)

2. wa-yirᵉʔ-u:	ha-miCr-i:m	ʔɛt	hå-ʔiʃʃå	ki:	yåpå	hi:ʔ
and-see, ipf, 3pl	def-Egypt-pl.m	acc	def-woman		beautiful	3sg.f

'And the Egyptians saw the woman, that beautiful she was' (Gn 12, 14)

3. lᵉmaʕan	daʕat	kol	ʕamm-ey	hå-ʔåreC	ʔɛt	yad	ʔᵃdonay	ki:	ħåzåqå	hi:ʔ
for	knowledge	all	people-pl.cns	def-earth	acc	hand	Lord	that	strong	it

'For all the peoples of earth to know the hand of the Lord, that it is mighty' (Jos. 4, 24)

4. ʔattå	yådaʕ-tå	ʔɛt	ʔåb-i:-ka	wᵉ-ʔɛt	ʔᵃnåʃ-ayw	ki:	gibbor-im	hemmå
2sg.m	know,pf-2sg.m	acc	father- 2sg.m.poss	and-acc	men-3pl.sg.p	that	hero-pl.m	3pl.m

'You know your father and his man that they are stroing fighters' (2 Sam. 17, 8)

5. wᵉ-ʔɛt	bᵉqiʕ-ey	ʕir	dåwid	rᵉʔi-tɛm	ki	rabb-u
and-acc	breach-pl.cns	city	D.	see,pf-2pl.m	that	be many,pf-3pl

'You saw the breaches in the city of David, that they are many' (Is 22, 9)

6. ʃi:r ha-ʃi:r-im ʔᵃʃɛr li-ʃlo:mo:
song-def-song-pl rel dat-Solomon
'The song of songs of (litt. which [is] to) Solomon' (Cant. 1, 1)

7. hinne miTTåt-o ʃɛ-li-ʃlo:mo: ʃiʃʃ-i:m gibbor-i:m såbib l-åh
behold bed-3sg.m.poss rel-dat-S. six-pl hero-pl around dat-3sg.f
'Behold, Solomon's bed (litt. his bed which is to Solomon) – sixty heros are around it' (Cant. 3, 7)

8. ʔåmar l-o: ha-qådo:ʃ båruk hu:ʔ lᵉ-mo:ʃɛ
say, pf.3sg.m dat-3sg.m def-saint blessed 3sg dat-Moses
'God said to Moses (litt. 'Said unto him the Saint-Blessed-He to Moses')' (?abot dᵉRabbi Nathan 17, 3)

9. ʔeyn mo:kᵉr-i:m b-åh båt-i:m
Not sell,pt.act-pl.m in-3sg.f house-pl
'You don't sell houses there' (RN 35, 2)

(The following 3 examples are in **Spanish** (Argentine**,** PK, native speaker))
10. Hoy vi una pelirroja
Yesterday, see,pf,1sg idf red-haired,f
'Today I saw a red-haired woman'

10a. Hoy **la** vi **a** **la** pelirroja de la esquina
Today np.sg.m see,pf,1sg acc def,f red-haired,f of the corner
'Today I saw the red-haired woman of around the corner'

11. La titular **le** solicitó **al** **Congreso)**…
Def chairwoman 3sg.m.ind. ask acc.def.m Congress
'The chairwoman asked [ít] the Congress…'

12. rᵉco:n-o: ʃɛl måqom
will-3sg.m.poss of God 'God's will (litt. his will of God)'(RN 17, 4)

13. ʃibħ-ån ʃɛl ħakåm-i:m
praise-3pl.f.poss of wise-pl 'The praise of the Wise, litt. 'Their praise of the wise'' (RN 18, 1)

It appears from those examples that determination, agentivity and animacy, humanness are linked, to varying degrees, to the question under analysis. Higher elements in those gradients are more liable than others to trigger so-called prolepsis.

The hypothesis concerning extra-position is founded upon the existence, in the subordinate, of a lexical (or grammatical) specification of the object present in the main clause. Now what if there is no specification of the so-called extra-posed part in the subordinate clause? From what is it extra-posed then? It is simply not. The presence of such a specification is the second stage in the continuum leading from pragmatics to grammar: on the first pole, the subordinate contains no repercussion of the so-called proleptic element, only intonative-cum-prosodic marking. At the other pole, there is such repercussion with strict and complete morpho-syntactic and/or lexical agreement. In between, there are several degrees of so-called prolepsis. All is affair of degree: register, spontaneity and style. But in no instance is there obligatory transformation or extra-position, in other words there is absolutely no need to postulate in the first place a syntactically built clause whose subject would have been extracted and extra-posed in

order for the main clause to exist, with that subject in an oblique function. An additional fact is the presence of an antecedent to the direct object of the main clause in a preceding sentence. In this case, this direct object is anaphoric and not proleptic to begin with. In other words; it is necessary to take in account not only context but also co-text.

The dynamics of language involves diachrony but also, among others, ontogeny, phylogeny, creolistics and register variation; and not only grammar but also pragmatics. Not only do so-called proleptic utterances exist in all diachronic layers and synchronic registers of languages spoken today which harken several millennia back, but - and this is capital - such utterances are all the more present inasmuch as the emotive, communicative, oral and context-dependent factors gain in importance at the expense of rational, conceptual, written and context-free parameters. Moreover one can see, on both internal and external evidence, taking in account pragmatic, intonative, morpho-syntactic, typological and psychological factors, that more often than not, so-called proleptic utterances do not result from the extra-position of elements from sentences previously constructed. Indeed I reject the term *extra-position* inasmuch as it implies the precedence of syntax over pragmatics and over language's real nature, which is multidimensional and cognitive and not merely grammatical. Language is not dynamic only as a phenomenon, even its actual manifestations *function* dynamically and each one of them reflects the properties of language as a whole. In this sense, language is a fractal. Even such terms as '*grammar* or *structure* of information' are misleading inasmuch as they imply a structure, a construction, while the *raison d'être* of so-called proleptic utterances is reflecting a natural iconic pragmatic order relatively independent of the constraints imposed by the structure of the language in which those utterances are produced.

So-called proleptic constructions are narrowly akin to utterances with focalization or topicalization, which are spontaneous and as such require a minimal encoding and decoding effort, while grammatically well-formed sentences must conform to grammatical rules, especially of word-order and agreement. So-called proleptic constructions do include the presence of a co-referent element both in the main and in the subordinate clause, most often with some kind of agreement. This means that so-called proleptic constructions do include a morpho-syntactic component, while utterances with focalization or topicalization not necessarily do. There is however a strong affinity between the dynamic parameters characteristic of utterances with focalization or topicalization and of so-called proleptic ones, an affinity too consistent to be imputed to coincidence alone. As they are founded on pragmatic and communicative factors, so-called proleptic utterances precede their syntactically well-formed, *i.e*. grammatical vis-à-vis, of which they are the second stage in the gradual displacement from the pragmatic to the syntactic mood.

Let us look at some examples of sentences with topicalization by so-called *left-dislocation* or *detachment:*

14. hå-ʔåræc ʔᵃʃer ʔattå ʃoke:b ʃålej-hå lᵉkå ʔɛ-tᵉnenn-åh
art-*land* rel. 2sg.m. *lay*, part.sg.m. *on*-np.f. à-2sg.m. 1sg.-*give,*impf.-np.f.
'The land upon which you lay – it is to you that I shall give it' (Gn 28, 13)

15. yᵉhu:då ˈattå j-odu:-kå ˈa*ħ* -ej-kå
Judah 2sg.m. np.pl.ipf.-*thank*, qal-2sg.m. *brother*-pl.-2sg.m.
'Judah, you – your brothers will thank you' (Gn 49, 8)

16. ʔåno:ki: ʔåno:ki: hu ' mo:ħɛ pᵉʃaʕ-ey-kå lᵉ-maʕᵃn-i:
1sg 1sg np.sg.m. delete,pcp crime-pl-cns-2sg.poss to-sake-1sg
'As for myself, it is I, the one who deletes your crimes for my sake' (Is 43, 25)

17. ʕɛrwa-t ' iʃʃå wᵉ-bitt-åh loʔ tᵉ-gallɛ
nudity-cns woman and-daughter-np.sg.f.poss no ipf.np.2m.sg-discover
'The nudity of a woman and her daughter, you shall not discover' (Lev 18, 17)

18. ha-ʔelle te-rᵉd-i me-hem
def-dem,pl 2sg.-let go-f of-np.pl
'Those guys, let go of them' (Oz a-t 49)

19. ha-yald-a haki yapa b-a-gan yeʃ la-h ʕeyn-a-yim haki yap-ot b-a-gan
def-child-f spl beautif. in-def-garden there is to-np.f eye-du spl beaut.-pl in-def-garden
'The most beautiful girl in the kindergarten, she has the most beautiful eyes in the kindergarten' (Geffen)

20. ʔᵃbal ʔa hᵃba ʃe-tedaʕ lᵉ-ka ʃejnfeld Sarik
but love rel-2-know,fut to-2sg.m Schönfeld need

liprot ʔot-ah li-gruʃ-im, lo laħᵃʃob kol-kak gadol (Shalev, 307)
cut acc-np.f to-cent-pm no to-think so big
'But love, you may as well know, Scheinfeld, you have to split it into small pieces, don't think so big'

21. lɛ-ʔᵉkol ʔᵃni ʔakal-ti ʕᵃsab-im wᵉ-mayim ʔᵃni ʃati-ti me-ha-nahar
eat I eat-1sg herb-pl and-water I drink,pf-1sg de-def-river
'As for eating I ate weeds, and water I drank from the river' (Shalev 29)

22. ha-limude-y qodeʃ ʔᵃni biklal loʔ mᵉʕunyan wᵉ-baħur-ot loʔ roʔ-im po
def-studies-pl.cns sacred I at all no interested and-girl-pl.f no see-pcp, m.pl here
'The holy studies I'm not interested (sic), and girls you don't see here' (Oz)

23. bᵉ-ʕerek ʃiʃʃ-im ' aħuz mi-ma ʃe-katab-ta ʔᵃni day maskim
en-value six-pl percent of-what rel-write,pf-2sg.m I enough agree,pr
'About sixty perecent of what you say I agree (sic)' (Oz)

24. kol ʕayin ʔᵃʃɛr ta-bit ʕaley-nu bᵉ-mabat ʃel sinʔa nᵉ-naqer
All eye rel np.f-look at-1pl in-look of hatred 1pl-extract,fut
'Any eye looking at us with hatred, we shall extract' (Press)

Arabic (classical, Wright, III, § 120**)**
25. zajd-u-n ʒiʔ-a ʔila-jh-i bi-kita:b-i-n
Zayd-nom.-déf. *arrive,* pass.,pf.-3sg.m. *towaeds*-3sg.m.-gen. loc.-*letter*-gen.-def.
'Zayd, a lettrer was brought tio him' (Wright 1859)

French
23. Chaque client ↗], on fait quelque chose de particulier ↘]].
24. Li quens Rollant ↘ ↗ ↗], il est mult irascut ↘]].
25. Il est garagiste. Moi ↗], les garagistes ↗], je me méfie ↘ ↘]].

26. Mon voisin ↗], il est toujours malade ↘]. (Sujet thématisé, Di Cristo p. 211)
27. Mon voisin ? Il est toujours malade !]]. (Question, Di Cristo p. 211)

The first stage in this scheme is represented by utterances where a detached element is not grammatically linked to a following clause. It is not with extra-position that we're dealing but with re-position; not with the stabilized order characteristic of grammar but with the emergence of order out of the entropy characteristic of pragmatics; in other words with proto-grammatical utterances, in which iconic, archaic and strongly biologically motivated mechanisms such as focus of a first utterance becoming topic of a second one – which is the reason of the affinity between so-called prolepsis and definiteness, both of which are essentially pragmatic phenomena - and not with the counter-intuitive symbolic and highly complex mechanisms by which the syntactic subject of a sentence would become the subject of another one which governs the first. Thus, if an element is presented as the focus of a clause, it is due to its status of pragmatically focal information, whose semantic nature, if it is not clear from the context, may be revealed in the following clause. Moreover, it may have been revealed before. This is the case of the example given in the symposium program 'I saw him in the battle range about, and watch'd him how he singled Clifford forth'. This sentences are immediately preceded by 'I cannot joy, until I be resolved / Where our right valiant father is become'. Only then comes 'I saw him in the battle' and so on. The character in the accusative's identity is crystal-clear: it's the speaker's father. This example is instructive as it shows how important it is to take in account the context and the co-text of any given example in language, because there is no message that is not, to some extent, context-depending including in its very grammar. These sentences, from Richard's answer to his brother Edward's words concerning their father Henry VI also reveal the extent to which so-called prolepsis is characteristic of dialogic, oral, spontaneous, emotive register:
Agreement and Concord reflect the formal repercussion of one or more properties of the kernel on other members of the clause or sentence. The fact that in so-called prolepsis the same data are encoded twice is of grammatical nature, but it is also of pragmatic origin inasmuch as it facilitates comprehension, memorization and reaction. In any case, this agreement does not imply that a syntactic construction preexisting to the proleptic one from which the oblique element would have been extracted or extra-posed.
All this refutes Milner (1980) according to which prolepsis is to be analyzed in the framework of transformational grammar. There is no need, indeed no justification for such a view: language is not a self-contained system but an open and to some extent context-dependent system; its first aim is communication; and in language, like in any other biological device, function precedes structure. Touratier (1980) is wrong when he claims that the accusative characteristic of many a so-called proleptic element marks it as direct object. No, it marks it as *focus* (Kirtchuk 1989, 2007). Let us bear in mind Lamarck's words (1806) *les usages font les formes,* and in a more contemporary wording, *la fonction créé l'organe.* This is the conclusion of evolutionary biology, and language is, in my contention, a biological phenomenon, a product of evolution.

My contention is part and parcel of the puzzle of language hence of Man. I had called it *LUIT: Language – a Unified and Integrative Theory*, henceforth *Principia Linguistica* (PL, forthcoming), according to which in the dichotomies ***deixis*** - *conceptualization,* ***parole*** *vs. langue,* ***discourse*** *vs. grammar,* ***non-segmental phonemes*** *vs. segmental phonemes,* ***diachrony*** *vs. synchrony,* ***iconic*** *vs. symbolic mechanisms,* ***pragmatics*** *vs.*

morphosyntax, ***communication*** *vs. categorisation,* it is the first element that primes, precedes and is more central than the second, at the opposite of the claims of classic linguistic from de Saussure to this day. It is therefore not as a subject per se but inasmuch as it contributes to elucidate the puzzle of language that I will treat the matter under study.

Just as oral language is not a transformed, marked, deficient or deviant version of written language and just as noun-sentences (*i.e.* sentences whose predicate is a nominal or a deictic element) are *not* transformed, marked, deficient or deviant save for linguists whose mother-tongue is Indo-European - indeed it is the need for a copula which is an innovation in the relatively few languages of the world which display it - likewise so called proleptic utterances are not transformed or deviant except if one departs from grammar as the starting point and the basic mode of linguistic communication. Now this is wrong: the first communicative mood in ontogeny, philogeny, diachrony, creolistics and stylistics is pragmatic, not grammatical, and this mood is by no means forsaken when the grammatical mode enters the scene; grammar is the ever-changing systematization and ritualization of communication (Hopper) as well as an automated, high-speed device for processing information (Givón) and as such it is an output, a by-product of linguistic communication, not its input. Let me quote Ochs (1979: 52) '*Becoming more competent in one's language involves increasing one's knowledge of the potential range of structures (PK mechanisms) available for use and increasing one's ability to use them... communicative strategies characteristic of any one stage are not replaced. Rather, they are retained, to be relied upon under certain communicative conditions. The retention of emerging communicative strategies goes on not only during language acquisition but also throughout adult life*'.

Now since the organizers have had the excellent idea of allotting enough time for each talk and not just the customary 20 minutes in which you can hardly develop things in depth, let alone have a real debate, I deem it useful to expose here some of the insights arrived to in the framework of PL which are linked to the topic at stake. Indeed, I see language as a puzzle, in which all pieces are connected and get meaning out of this inter-connexion. The bulk of data supporting the theory will not be exposed here; suffice it to say that they are the result of an already long interest in specific languages and in language in general. It is the first time I expose this part of my theory at length, as a token of gratitude for having been invited to share it with you. I hope it is considered as a relevant contribution to the meeting, and would be grateful if we could discuss these insights together.

Just as there is a *pragmatics* consisting in the use of constituted language (which is the traditional meaning of the term), there is a pragmatics before the emergence of language, which ends up creating the language faculty itself.

Pragmatics is therefore the α and ω of language emergence, function and structure.

Grammar is constantly systematizing language out of interaction in pragmatic use.

Grammar is therefore a mechanism of organization, in other words of reduction of the entropy which is characteristic of pragmatics.

The central concept of pragmatics is context. Context is what pragmatics is about.

Now since evolution is basically the adaptation of the organism to a changing context, since, in other words, evolution is conditioned and triggered by context, it follows that

pragmatics is of biological nature, and so is language, pragmatics work.
Grammatical rules are therefore pragmatic since they consist in the application of allo-forms depending on linguistic context, namely co-text, cf. morpho-syntactic agreement as well as multiple encoding in general (Kirtchuk 1993 ;2007).
It follows that just as anaphor is but intra-discursive deixis, grammar as a whole is but intra-discursive pragmatics.
Syntax is neither autonomous nor universal.
Grammar as a whole is neither autonomous nor universal.
Pragmatics is, to a point, both autonomous *and* universal.
Language is not reducible to grammar.
Any linguistic utterance can be deprived of grammar but not of pragmatics.
The difference between living tongues and so-called dead ones is not the presence or absence of grammar but of pragmatics: the first former it, the latter do not.
Language is pragmatocentric not grammatocentric the way our astronomical system is heliocentric not geocentric.
No linguistic utterance is deprived of context.
Grammatical rules are pragmatic inasmuch as they consist in the application of linguistically context-dependent linguistic allo-forms.
Hence, grammar itself is nothing but intra-discursive pragmatics.
It is pragmatic functions that determine syntactic functions, not the opposite.
Pragmatic functions may or may not freeze into syntactic functions. Syntactic functions, however, do not freeze into pragmatic functions.
Therefore the δοξα according to which *focalization, topicalization, prolepsis* and *detachment* in general are 'dislocations' is false (Kirtchuk 2005).
The emergence of language is an auto-poietic process anchored in communicative interaction, eminently pragmatic (Maturana 1973; Kirtchuk 2007; Mazaudon & Michailovsky 2007).
Language emerges, functions and changes in context and in function of the interaction with context, which consists of other beings endowed with language, *i.e*. humans, as well as of all the other constituents of the *milieu:* this is epigeny. In this too, language is a biological reality, since it evolves as the result of interaction with its context.
No real linguistic utterance is deprived of context, even if this context is not mentioned in the analysis of the said utterance.
In the process leading to the emergence of the language faculty in phylogeny and to its activation in ontogeny (Kirtchuk 1994; 2007): (1) communication in deictic context emerges before communication out of deictic context; (2) deictic elements emerge before conceptual elements; (3) melodic and rhythmic (*i.e*. intonational and prosodic) schemes, so-called supra-segmental phonemes, as well as the organs necessary to produce them, emerge before the clusters systemically distinct of articulatory proprieties, *i.e*. segmental phonemes, as well as the organs necessary to produce them; (4) iconic mechanisms emerge before symbolic ones; (5) semantically concrete elements emerge before semantically abstract ones (Li & Hombert 2002); (6) communicative functions (*topic-comment*) emerge before syntactic ones (*subject-predicate*); (7) simple parts of discourse emerge before complex parts of discourse (e.g. *noun* before *verb* in the languages which possess this opposition, cf. Bopp 1816, Jespersen 1924, Cohen 1984, Barner & Bale 2002, Parish & al. 2006).

Elements which have emerged first in phylogeny are (1) seldom borrowed (Thomasson and Everett 2002 confirm it though their aim was to infirm it); (2) present in all languages, stages and registers thereof, including Creoles, child language and spontaneous register of adult speech.
The elements that emerged first in phylogeny (1) emerge first in ontogeny, epigeny and diachrony, (2) are language's hard core in synchrony.
All linguistic utterances are both (1) uttered by somebody, and (2) meant for somebody (cf. Benveniste 1966, I: 242: 'any utterance supposes a speaker and a hearer, and implies that the former wishes to influence the latter in some way', my translation, PK).
Speaking is an action insofar as it involves activity by the speaker, but also insofar as it acts upon the hearer.
Linguistic utterances are therefore actions, more specifically interactions.
A language is said to be extinct if it (1) isn't the vehicle of interactions in real communication; (2) isn't the mother tongue of a given population; (3) doesn't experience diachronic change resulting from linguistic interactions with and in context. A language is therefore supposed to be extinct if it hasn't got pragmatics, ontogeny, diachrony or epigeny. The fact for a language to possess – or not – a grammar is of no significance in this respect. This is why Latin, despite its elaborate grammar, is an extinct language, though it lives through its offspring, so to say.
A language is said to be living if it is (1) a vehicle for interaction in real communication; (2) a mother tongue of a given population; (3) subject to diachronic change. A language is therefore living if it has pragmatics, ontogeny, epigeny and diachrony. The fact for such a language to possess a grammar or not is of no significance. This is why Creoles, despite their loose grammar, are living languages, while Esperanto is not.
No linguistic utterance is deprived of intonation-cum-prosody.
If a linguistic utterance can be disambiguated by context and/or by intonation-cum-prosody, it is not ambiguous to begin with.
The hard core of language is not symbolic but iconic, not conceptual but deictic, not segmental but sub-segmental.
The hard core of language is founded on the biological nature of the species it defines.
Though endowed with language, Man is a biological being.
There is no contradiction between Man being endowed with language and it being a biological being.
There is no language without languaging people.
Language is both a (1) complex and (2) dynamic phenomenon. It must therefore be investigated as such. Any partial analysis, which would take the local for global, is bound to yield partial, nay completely false results.
Language is characterized by a certain number of properties, which distinguish it from any other system abusively called 'language'. Those properties include, among others, deicticity, fixity, dynamism, iconicity, multiple encoding, taboo and interactivity.
The concept 'natural language' is a pleonasm.
No system called 'language' other than language itself can be considered as a language except in a metaphorical sense. Such systems include among others animal-'languages', sign-'languages', computer-'languages' and artificial-'languages'.
Language is not an act - and certainly not an entity - but an activity (Humboldt…).
We human beings live in and through language (Maturana 1978).

We human beings are languaging beings even when we are not involved in linguistic activity and even when our language faculty is impaired to whatever degree.
Homo sapiens sapiens is what it is through language and thanks to language.
Homo sapiens sapiens is not a rational and/or symbolic species, but a species whose individuals are animals capable of reasoning and symbolizing.
It is language that makes us human. All other human specific properties derive from it.
Language emergence is an autopoietic process which cannot have taken place but in a species engaged in close social relationships spanning all aspects of life and all periods of year, practising extensive and consistent collaboration and cooperation rather than competition and war though not restraining from them (Maturana 1973 and henceforth).
Language as continuous, conscious and collaborative interaction is *love* (Maturana 1978); or – if this term be ruled out by rationalist, dualist, Western mentality - a permanent encounter (Buber 1923: *Alles wirkliche Leben ist Begegnung),* or still, in terms rather morally than emotionally inspired - as the permanent ability and need to share with other languaging beings, i.e. *selfless behaviour* (Lieberman's 1991). For the psychological aspects, cf. Mitchell (1988).

The advantage of PL, based on observation of linguistic data and reflection thereupon is manifold: it (1) enriches the linguistic scene with data that until now were at best treated as merely 'expressive' (Bally [1932] 1965) or at worst deliberately left out of it; (2) establishes clear links between linguistic facts that until now seemed unrelated to each other; (3) does so by an inversion of perspectives between *cause* and *effect*; *central* and *marginal*, *prior* and *late*, and in this sense it is a Copernican revolution in linguistics; (4) allows to explore the development of language not only from present day backwards, but also from its evolutionary beginning onwards, *towards* present time: to dig the tunnel in both directions, so to speak, which is bound to yield faster and better results; finally it (5) links language to other phenomena characteristic of the form of life known as *Homo sapiens sapiens*. Taken individually the phenomena dealt with may seem 'expressive', the term that for a long time allowed to account for them without integrating them into analysis. Yet their omnipresence at all realms and at all levels of language, any language at any stage, leads to see them not as accidents but as manifestations of the nature of language and its speakers. Of language not grammar for it is the former not the latter that is the object of linguistics. Grammar is only the emerged part of the iceberg called language. All linguistic theories are false which postulate (I) three equal grammatical persons, and/or (II) deictics as pro-nouns, and/or (III) multiple encoding as restricted to grammar, and/or (IV) syntactic structures as commanding communicative ones, and/or (V) non-segmentals as additional phonemes, and/or (VI) verb as such in language as such, and/or (VII) language as restricted to grammar.

The relationship between structural linguistics and PL is akin to the one between classic and modern physics (as for generative linguistics, it evokes Ptolemaic astronomy). If we (a) look at language as it is through its particular manifestations including among others infant speech, spontaneous adult speech and creoles; (b) pay the communicatively and pragmatically salient elements of language as much attention as the one devoted to the conceptually important ones; (c) consider diachrony not as historicity but as dynamism; (d) conceive human beings not as rational animals but as animals capable of reason, as Jonathan Swift had it; (e) grasp all the information linguistic data and speaking people offer us and ask all the questions they keep replying to, we are bound to conclude

that language is part and parcel of (human) evolution.

Bibliography

Bally Ch. [1932] 1965. *Le langage et la vie*, Paris-Genève, Droz.

Barner D. & A. Bale. 2002. 'No nouns, no verbs: psycholinguistic arguments in favor of lexical under-specification'. Lingua 112: 771-791.

Benveniste, E. 1965. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Gallimard, Paris.

Benveniste, E. 1966, 'Strucuture des relations de personne dans le verbe', *Problèmes de linguistique générale* I, Paris, NRF - Gallimard, pp. 227-236.

Bergsträßer, G. [1929] 1962. *Hebräische Grammatik*. Hildesheim

Blanche-Benveniste, C. 2000. *Thématisation et Dislocation,* Conférence prononcée a l'Université de Tel Aviv.

Bohas, G. 2000. *Matrices, racines, etymons*. Editions du Zèbre, Lausanne.

Bohas G. et R. Serhan 2003. 'Conséquences de la décomposition du phonème en traits', *Phonologie, champs et perspectives*. J.P. Angoujard et S. Wauquier-Gravelines (eds.): 131-155.. Lyon.

Bolinger, D. 1964. 'Intonation as a Universal', *Proceedings of the 5th Congress of Phonetics*, *Cambridge 1962*: 833-848.

Bolinger, D. 1985. 'The Inherent Iconicity of Intonation'*, Iconicity in Syntax:* 73-96. John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Buber, M. 1923. *Ich und Du*. Leipzig: Insel.

Bühler, K. (1934) 1982. *Sprachtheorie.* Stuttgart.

Bybee, J. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form* Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins..

Clauberg, J. [1717] 1970. 'Ars Etymologica Teutonum'*, ap.* Leibniz *Collectanea Etymologica* cum praefatione J.G. Eccardi 195-196. Hildesheim – New York

Cohen, D.1984, *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique*, Paris, Société de Linguistique de Paris.

Darwin, Ch. [1859] 1964. *On the origin of species*. Facsimile Ed. Cambridge,Mass. Harvard University Press.

Darwin, Ch. 1872. *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. London: John Murray.

Dyonisos Thrax. [1st century BC] 1989. *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, texte traduit et annoté par J. Lallot. Paris: CNRS Editions.

Frei, H. 1929. *La grammaire des fautes.* Paris, Honoré Champion.

Fonagy I. 1983, *La Vive Voix. Essais de Psychophonétique,* Paris, Payot.

Fonagy, I. *1993.* Φυσει or Θεσει ? *Faits de Langues 4: Motivation et Iconicité* 29-46.

Fonagy, I. 2007. *Dynamique et changement*. Louvain : Peeters.

Givón, T. 1979. (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics*: Discourse and Syntax. New York, Academic Press.

Givón, T. 2002. *Bio-Linguistics : The Santa Barbara lectures*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hewes, G. W. 1973. Primate Communication and the Gestural Origin of Language. *Current Anthropology* 14:5-24.

Hirst and Di Crsito*, 1998. Intonation Systems: a Survey of Twenty languages* Cambridge

Jespersen O. 1924, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London, Allen & Unwin.
Kirtchuk. P. 1993. *Pronoms, deixis, accords, classification: Morpohogenèse et Fonctionnement.* Lille: ANRT.
Kirtchuk, P. 1994. 'Deixis, anaphore, «pronoms»: morphogenèse et fonctionnement'. *Les Classes de mots.* L. Basset & M. Perennec (eds.): 169-205. Lyon: PUL.
Kirtchuk, P. 1994. 'De la pragmatique à l'énonciation, de l'énonciation à la morpho-syntaxe, du discours à la grammaire: morphogenèse, grammaticalisation et fonctionnement dans le langage. Approche typologique et théorique, dans une perspective linguistique générale'. Unpublished lecture for the *Habilitation à diriger des recherches,* Université Lyon 2.
Kirtchuk, P. 1992. '/'et/ ou ne pas /''et/: l'Actant Y en Hébreu et au-delà'. *Actances* 7 137-173.
Kirtchuk P. 1993, *Deixis, anaphore, accords, classification: morphogenèse et fonctionnement,* Lille, ANRT.
Kirtchuk P. 2004b, 'Hebrew as a test-case for the bi-phonematism of the Semitic root', *Proceedings of the 32th North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics*, San Diego 2004 (CD-ROM).
Kirtchuk, P. 1994/ 'Deixis, anaphore, « pronoms » : morphogenèse et fonctionnement'. *Les Classes de mots.* L. Basset et M. Pérennec (eds., Lyon) 169-205.
Kirtchuk, P. 2003. 'Deixis vs. conceptualization, discourse vs. grammar, *parole* vs. *langue*: the Copernican revolution in linguistics', in *Proceedings of the 17th International Congress of Linguists*, Prague (CD-ROM).
Kirtchuk, P. 2004a, 'Some Iconic Correlations in Language and their Impact on the *Parole-Langue* Dichotomy', in *Outside-In — Inside-Out: Iconicity in Language and Literature 4***.** Maeder**,** C.**;** O. Fischer and W. J. Herlofsky (eds.), Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 267-286.
Kirtchuk, 'Definiteness' – Pablo Kirtchuk 'Definiteness' *Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (New York 2005).
Kirtchuk, P. 2005, "Thématisation? Dislocation? Réfutation de l'approche reçue", in *Etudes de Linguistique Typologique* (G. Lazard & C. Moyse-Faurie eds.), Villeneuve d'Ascq, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, pp. 109-122.
Kirtchuk, P. 2007. 'LUIT: Language - a Unified and Integrative Theory'. *Combat pour les langues du monde – Fighting for the World's Languages : Hommage à Claude Hagège*, M.-M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest (dir.) pp. 271-282.. Paris, L'Harmattan.
Kirtchuk, P. 2009. 'Language: A Typological, Functional, Cognitive, Biological and Evolutionary Approach'. *Proceedings of the International Workshop in memory of H. J. Polotsky, Israel National Academy of Sciences*. Jerusalem 2001.
Kirtchuk, P. 2011. 'De *G* comme *Géo-* ou *Grammato*-centrique à *H* comme *Hélio-* ou *Humano*-centrique : L'interlocution, source pérenne du langage'. Actes du Colloque *L'Interlocution : nouvelles perspectives*. Amiens, 2011.
Kirtchuk, P. Forthcoming. *Principia Linguistica.*
König, E. 1881-1897. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*. Leipzig.
Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago University Press.
Langacker, R. W. 1983. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Langacker, R. W. 1991. *Concept, Image and Symbol. The cognitive basis of Grammar* Berlin-New York, Mouton.

Leibniz, G. W. [1667-1717] 1995. *L'Armonia delle Lingue* a cura di S. Gensini, prefazione di Tullio de Mauro. Roma-Bari: Biblioteca Universale Laterza.

Lieberman, Ph. 1991. *Uniquely Human*. Harvard University Press.

Maturana, H. & F. Varela. [1973]. 2006[6]. *De máquinas y seres vivos: Autopoiesis: la organización de lo vivo.* Santiago de Chile, Editorial Universitaria.

Maturana, H. R. 1978. 'Biology of Language : The Epistemology of Reality'. *Psychology and Biology of Language and Thought : Essays in Honor of E. Lennenberg* (Miller, G. A. & E. Lennenberg, eds.), New York : Academic, 27-63.

Maturana H. & F. Varela, 1980, *Autopoiesis and Cognition*, Boston, Reidel.

Maturana H. [1988] 2006. 'Ontología del conversar', in: *Desde la biología a la psicología.* J. Luzaro Garcia (ed.), Santiago de Chile, Editorial Universitaria., 84-95 [Terapia Psicologica año VIII, n° 10]

Maturana H. [1989] 2006. 'Lenguaje y realidad: el origen de lo humano'. Maturana H. 2006: 96-102 [Archivos de Biología Médica Experimental n° 22 77-81].

Maturana H. 2006. *Desde la biología a la psicología.* J. Luzaro García (ed.), Santiago de Chile, Editorial Universitaria.

Maturana H. 1985. *El árbol del conocimiento. Las bases biológicas del entendimiento humano*, Santiago de Chile, Editorial Universitaria.

Meschonnic, H. 1995. *Politique du Rhytme. Politique du Sujet*. Lagrasse: Verdier.

Meschonnic, H. 1982. *Critique du Rhytme. Anthropologie historique du langage*. Lagrasse: Verdier.

Ochs, E. 1979. 'Planned and unplanned discourse', in Givón (ed.), 51-80.

Owen, J. 1990. *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Plato, *Cratylus* [5th century B.C.] 1998, translated, with introduction and notes, by C.D.C. Reeve. Indianapolis.

Posner, R. 1986. 'Iconicity in Syntax', *Essays on the Nature of Culture, Festschrift for Thomas A. Sebeok*, Tübingen: 119-140.

Rousseau, J.-J. [1762] 1966. *Emile*. Paris: Folio.

Sapir, E. 1921. *Language*. Harvest Books, New York.

Saussure F. de. [1916] 1995, *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (Ch. Bally, A. Sechehaye et A. Riedlinger éds.), Edition préparée par Tullio de Mauro, Paris, Payot.

Séchehaye, A. 1917. 'Les problèmes de la langue à la lumière d'une théorie nouvelle'. Revue de Philosophie 84: 1-30.

Séchehaye, A. 1930. 'Les mirages linguistiques'. Journal de Psychologie 27: 337-366.

Séchehaye, A. 1933. 'La pensée et la langue ou comment concevoir le rapport organique de l'individuel et du social dans le langage'. Journal de Psychologie 30: 57-81, rééd. in Pariente J.C. (éd). 1969. Essais sur le langage, 69-96. Paris, Minuit.

Silverstein M. 1976, 'Hierarchy of features and ergativity', in RMW Dixon (ed.) *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages* (AIAS Linguistic Series 22), Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, pp. 112-171.

Simone, R. (ed.). 1994. *Iconicity in Language.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simone, R. 1994. 'Iconic Aspects of Syntax'. *Iconicity in language.* 1994: 153-170.

Thomason, S. & D. Everett. 2002. 'Pronoun Borrowing'. Berkeley Linguistic Society 27.
Trask R. L. 1979. "On the Origins of Ergativity", in *Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations* (F. Plank ed.), New York, Academic Press, pp. 385-404.
Vico, Giambattista. [1744] 1977. *La Scienza Nuova* Reprint Milano.
Whitney W. D. 1884. *Language and the study of language: twelve lectures on the principles of linguistic science*. London.
Wright W. [1859] 1985. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zipf, G. K. 1935. *The Psycho-Biology of Language.* Boston.
Zewi, T. 1996. 'Subodinate nominal sentences involving prolepsis in Biblical Hebrew' Journal of Semitic Studies 41, n°1, pp. 1-20. Oxford University Press, Oxford,