Indexicality. Diachronic perspectives
Henning Andersen, UCLA

Key words: Indexicality, allophony, allomorphy, agreement, word-order types

Terminology. The terms *index, indexing, indexation, indexicality* have come to be widely used in various theoretical contexts as near-synonyms of *deictic, deixis* or *marker, marking, flagging*, and the like. Here they are used in the traditional (Peircean) sense (Nöth 1990). By virtue of its syntactic specification(s) – its conditioning – any linguistic sign is an *index of* ('indicates, draws attention to, points to') the environment in which it occurs. Since both exponents (*signifiants*) and their contents (*signifiés*) may be subject to syntactic specifications, both exponents and contents may indicate (elements of) their environments.

The principal aim of this presentation is to consider the question whether the relationship between indexes and other sign types is the same at different structural levels, as claimed by Andersen (2020). In inflection, for instance, the indexicality of allomorphs is clearly a subsidiary function of exponents whose primary function is to represent lexical or grammatical content; index values, so to say, get a free ride on (in Peircean terms) symbolic signs. In sentence syntax, the indexicality of agreement is quite different; it is evidently a primary function. It would be worthwhile having an understanding of indexicality in the larger perspective of the semiotic economy of language.

The use of indexes in discourse deixis may be a good point of departure (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Consider the simple pronominal anaphors that repeat a few grammatical features, gender or number, of the primary referring phrase (e.g., *Jack and Jill ... **they** ....; Jack ... **his** ....; Jill, **who** ....*). The omission of descriptive, lexical features in anaphors is a reduction in iconicity. It is precisely this reduction that draws attention to the primary referring phrase, that is, makes anaphors function as indexes. A similar reduction in iconicity is seen in pronouns that point to the omitted descriptive material (e.g., A: *I'll have a coke, please*. B: *I'll have **the same***. C: *I'll have **one** too*.).

Such a trading relation between indexicality and iconicity can be observed in both synchrony and diachrony at several levels of linguistic structure, but with significant differences that reflect the diversity of exponents.

The presentation illustrates this with examples from several of the following areas: Morphosyntax (Mel'čuk 2006; Andersen 2020); case marking (Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant 2018), agreement (Corbett 2006; Croft 2013; Haspelmath 2013); word-order types: pragmatic (Bogusławski 1977; Erteschik-Schir 2015; Klavans 1995; Zimmerling 2017), grammaticalized (Heltoft 1992, 2019; Heltoft & Nielsen Forthcoming), templatic (Chafe; Melnar 2004; Drapeau 2017; Fortescue, Mithun &Evans 2017).

The semiotic framework chosen for this investigation opens up for essential aspects of grammar that are mostly overlooked, sometimes labeled redundancies (Dahl 2004), or viewed as brute complexities just waiting to be measured (Arkadiev & Gardani 2020; Dahl 2020). The observed relations between indexicality and iconicity reveal processes in the transmission of grammar that contribute to a more detailed understanding of linguistic change.

References

Andersen, H. 2020. Synchrony, diachrony, and indexicality. In Drinka, Bridget (ed.), *Historical linguistics 2017*, 164–182. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Arkadiev, P. & Gardani, F. 2020. *The complexity of morphology*. Oxford: UP.

Bakker, Dik & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.). 2013. *Languages across boundaries. Studies in the memory of Anna Siewierska*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bogusławski, A. 1977. *Problems of the thematic-rhematic structure of sentences*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Chafe, Wallace. 2017. Caddo. In Fortescue et al., 583–602).

Corbett, G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: UP.

Croft, William. 2013, *Agreement as anaphora, agreement as coreference*. In Bakker & Haspelmath, 95–118).

Dahl, Ö. 2004. *The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dahl, Ö. 2020. Morphological complexity and the minimum description length approach. In McGregor et al., 331–344.

Drapeau, Lynn. 2017. Innu (Algonquian). In Fortescue et al., 560–582.

Erteschik-Schir, N. 2015. *Information structure. The syntax–discourse interface*. Oxford: UP.

Fortescue Michael & Mithun, Marianne & Evans, Nicholas (eds.). 2017. *The Oxford handbook of polysynthesis*. Oxford: UP.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2013. Argument indexing: a conceptuasl framework for the syntactic status of bound person forms. In Bakker & Haspelmath, 197–226.

Heltoft, L. 1992. The topology of verb second and SVO languages. A study in the sign function of word order. In Herslund, M. (ed.), *Word order. Two studies on central issues in the syntax of Danish and French*, 13–64. (Copenhagen Studies in Language 15). Copenhagen: Handelshøjskolens Forlag.

Heltoft, L. 2019. Word order as grammaticalized semiotic systems. In Heltoft, L. & Igartua, I. & Joseph, B. D. & Kragh, K. J. & Schøsler, L. (eds.), *Perspectives on language structure and language change*, 151–180. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Klavans, Judith. 1995. *On clitics and cliticization – the interaction of morphology, phonology, and syntax*. New York: Garland.

Melnar, Lynette. 2014. *Caddo verb morphology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Mel'čuk, I. 2006. *Aspects of the theory of morphology*, ed. by D. Beck. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nöth, W. 1990. *Handbook of semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Witzlack-Makarevich, A. & Seržant, I. 2018. Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation. In McGregor, W. B. & Witzlack-Makarevich, A. & Seržant, I. (eds.), 1–40. *Diachrony of differential argument marking*. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Zimmerling, A. V. 2017. Word order typology, communicative-syntactic interface and information structure in the world's languages (Project report). Moscow: State University of Education.

, for it is relatively simple to highlight the coexistence of symbolic, indexical, and iconic sign types in morphological words and the sets of basic and derived allomorphs that reflect regular mutations, irregular patterns of alternation, or suppletion (Author 2010; Mel'čuk 2006). All these kinds of alternation differ from the absence of alternation in one and the same way: In the case of 'invariant' morphemes, each token is a complete replica of the morpheme it represents; but in allomorphy, one or more derived allomorphs are incomplete replicas – in radical suppletion, non-replicas – of the basic allomorph. The index value of each derived allomorph is inseparable from this reduced iconicity. In diachrony, such index values typically arise at the cost of iconicity, or, perhaps more accurately, they arise by reanalysis attendant on a reduction of iconicity.