

**Summer Institute of Linguistics and  
The University of Texas at Arlington  
Publications in Linguistics**

Publication 107

**Editors**

Donald A. Burquest  
University of Texas  
at Arlington

William R. Merrifield  
Summer Institute of  
Linguistics

**Assistant Editors**

Rhonda L. Hartell

Marilyn A. Mayers

**Consulting Editors**

Doris A. Bartholomew  
Pamela M. Bendor-Samuel  
Desmond C. Derbyshire  
Robert A. Dooley  
Jerold A. Edmondson

Austin Hale  
Robert E. Longacre  
Eugene E. Loos  
Kenneth L. Pike  
Viola G. Waterhouse

**Language in Context:  
Essays for  
Robert E. Longacre**

**Shin Ja J. Hwang  
William R. Merrifield**  
*Editors*

**A Publication of  
The Summer Institute of Linguistics  
and  
The University of Texas at Arlington  
1992**

© 1992 by the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc.

Library of Congress Catalog No: 92-80356

ISBN : 0-88312-183-2

ISSN: 1040-0850

All Rights Reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—without the express permission of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, with the exception of brief excerpts in journal articles or reviews.

Cover design by Hazel Shorey

Copies of this and other publications of the Summer Institute of Linguistics may be obtained from

International Academic Bookstore  
7500 W. Camp Wisdom Road  
Dallas, TX 75236



## **Marked and Unmarked Text Strategies within Semiotically Based NATURAL Textlinguistics**

**Wolfgang U. Dressler**  
*Universität Wien*

This contribution intends to present a semiotically based NATURAL model of textual microstructure. The model (Dressler 1989; cf. Merlini 1988; Dressler and Merlini 1987) derives from two sources: (a) a procedural model of textlinguistics (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981; for text production, cf. Beaugrande 1984), (b) the markedness or preference approach of Natural Phonology and Natural Morphology based on a semiotic metatheory as in Dressler 1985. In this framework, MARKED stands for 'more marked than' or 'dispreferred' or 'less natural than', and, correspondingly, UNMARKED for 'less marked than' or 'preferred' or 'more natural than'. Applied to the text level, this means that more vs. less marked options are often available in text production.

My markedness approach is based on Peircean semiotics (Peirce 1965, Buchler 1955, Hookway 1985, Eco 1984) because, first of all, if linguistics deals with language as a system of verbal signs, and if semiotics deals with signs in general, then semiotics is an appropriate metatheory for linguistic theory; secondly, Peircean semiotics seems to be a semiotic model particularly adequate for being used in linguistics (Dressler 1989). A final caveat about the use of markedness: With this I do not mean overall markedness, but a marked option on a specific universal, semiotically based parameter. In this contribution I must limit my brief presentation to universal markedness (neither typological nor language specific preferences, cf. Dressler 1983, 1989) and to the most important text-semiotic parameters. Thus I must neglect both language-specific discourse markedness and text-related language typology as pioneered by Longacre (e.g., 1982).

I will illustrate unmarked vs. marked text strategies with a few selected examples from English, French, German, Italian, and Latin, sometimes accompanied with translations from one language into another in order to show either crosslinguistic stability of text-strategic preferences or conflict between universal preferences and language specific factors.

Textlinguistics is the linguistic discipline which takes TEXT as its basic unit (Heydrich and Petöfi 1986). Text has been defined by Enkvist (1989:370ff, 377f) as a meaningful (i.e., interpretable) sequence of symbols in a natural language, and—in contrast to discourse—a stretch of language which can be studied outside of its situational context. This decontextualization is, of course, easier with written texts than with oral ones (particularly if they are not transcribed). Note that such a definition offers a lower limit to the stretches of language that qualify as text by excluding uninterpretable pieces of text, but does not offer any definite upper limit; e.g., a self-contained chapter or oral utterance—even a collection of papers by the same author or on a common topic—qualifies as a text. Only if the sequence of symbols comes to lose meaningfulness, do we arrive at marginal texts, quasi-texts, or nontexts, such as with telephone books or with a volume consisting of papers bound together by mere chance such as in certain book auctions. Here the seven standards of textuality of Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) allow further differentiation. At any rate, whereas scientific idealization may justify, at least provisionally, studying a text outside of its situational context, it is even more difficult to isolate a piece of text which may qualify as a text, from its cotext, i.e., from the larger text it forms a part of.

Moreover, in Beaugrande and Dressler 1981 we have insisted (a) on the procedural aspect of text production and text reception and (b) on the limits of decontextualization of text. The procedural aspect (a) fits well to the Peircean view of semiosis as a dynamic process involving signans, signatum, interpreters and the interpretant they produce (i.e., the communicative or cognitive effect of semiosis as a new sign). Concerning (b), textual semiosis starts with the level of social interaction the text producer is involved in when motivated to construct a concept of the text s/he wants to produce; and this semiosis and its outcome (the interpretant) can never be judged outside of its situational context.

### 1. Iconicity

Within the Peircean sign triad of icons, indices, and (conventional) symbols, icons are the most natural signs, or more precisely: All linguistic signs are, at least minimally, conventional/symbolic (Saussure's *arbitraire du signe*), but they may, simultaneously contain iconic or indexical aspects or

both. In this way, Seiler (1989:5)—who distinguishes the three functional principles iconicity, indicativity and predicativity—is much closer to Peirce than he claims. Now, according to Peirce (1965:276), “The only way of directly communicating an idea is by means of an icon; and every indirect method of communicating an idea must depend for its establishment upon the use of an icon.” Iconic memory and iconic perception are thus the most elementary types of memory and perception, and an iconic bookkeeping device facilitates production (Lang 1987). Thus, the more iconicity a sign contains, the more natural, more preferred, less marked it is. This establishes the universal parameter of iconicity (with its subparameters) where iconicity means similarity between signans and signatum in the mind of the interpreter.

On the text level, the best known aspect of iconicity is the universal preference for the *ordo naturalis* (Enkvist 1981; Levelt 1983). The *ordo naturalis* represents, so to speak, a diagram between cognitive order (i.e., the cognitively perceived order of events) and sentence order. Thus the text strategy of *ordo naturalis* is unmarked and more iconic than the marked *ordo artificialis*, which is more symbolic insofar as it is either motivated by language-specific or stylistic conventions or contains additional predications, in the sense of Seiler 1989 (e.g., symbolic descriptivity). The *ordo naturalis* has been most studied in narrative texts, with contingent temporal succession and agent orientation in the sense of Longacre 1982:460.

But the *ordo naturalis* is also very much preferred in instructive text types (or procedural discourse), where sequential, goal-oriented activities allow a clear distinction between *ordo naturalis* and *ordo artificialis*, similar to contingent temporal succession and agent orientation in narrative text. For example, in the Roman cookbook of Apicius there is nearly only *ordo naturalis*, and both French and German translations retain this *ordo naturalis*, as in (1).

- (1) a. *Apium coques ex aqua nitrata, exprimes et concides minutatim. In mortario teres piper, ligusticum, origanum, cepam, vinum, liquamen et oleum. Coques in pultario, et sic apium commisces. (recipe 104)*
- b. *Faites cuire du céleri à l'eau avec du carbonate de soude, égouttez-le et hachez-le finement. Pilez dans un mortier du poivre, de la livèche, de l'origan, de l'oignon, du vin, du garum et de l'huile. Faites cuire dans un plat à bouille et mélangez-y alors le céleri.*
- c. *Koche eine Sellerieknolle in Wasser mit Natronzusatz, drücke sie aus und schneide sie in kleine Stückchen. DANN verarbeite im Mörser Pfeffer . . . und Öl. In der Kasserolle aufkochen lassen und die gehackte Sellerie darunterstreichen.*

Here the sequential order of phrases in the recipe follows closely the chronological order of steps in the actions the cook has to take. The addition of *dann* 'then' in the German translation is thus unnecessary, because the German reader expects the *ordo naturalis* to prevail.

The *ordo naturalis* not only holds for finite verbs within main clauses but also for embedded participles, as in (2), and embedded secondary clauses, as in (3); and whenever the French and German translations change the type of embedding, the *ordo naturalis* is still preserved.

- (2) a. *Assam a furno simplicem salis plurimo conspersam cum melle inferes. (recipe 268)*  
 b. *La viande est rôtie au four, sans sauce, saupoudrée abondamment de sel et servie avec du miel.*  
 c. *Im Rohr gebratenes Fleisch bestreue reichlich mit Salz und serviere es mit Honig.*
- (3) a. *Pernam, ubi eam . . . elixaveris, detracta cute tessellatim incidis . . . Et cum farina cocta fuerit, eximas furno et ut est inferes. (recipe 290)*  
 b. *Après avoir fait cuire le jambon à l'eau . . . détachez la couenne et faites des incisions en carrés . . . Quand la pâte sera cuite, enlevez du four tel quel et servez.*  
 c. *Wenn du die Keule . . . gekocht hast, dann entferne . . . Ist der Mehliüberzug braun gebacken, dann nimm die Keule aus dem Ofen und serviere sie, so wie sie ist.*

There are very few examples where the *ordo naturalis* appears to be violated, as in (4), where the cooking of the pork brains is of such minor importance that it is embedded into an attributive participle without consideration of chronological order.

- (4) a. *Cucumeres rasos elixabis cum cerebellis elixis. (recipe 83)*  
 b. *Concombres pelés: Faites-les bouillir avec des cervelles cuites à l'eau.*  
 c. *Schmore die geschälten Gurken mit gebrühten Schweinehörnchen.*

Finally, in (5), a nonchronological afterthought is added at the end of a recipe concerning the preparation of rose wine.

- (5) a. *Sane custodito ut rosam . . . optimam mittas. (recipe 4)*  
 b. *Prenez bien soin de mettre des roses de premier choix.*  
 c. *Man beachte, dass man nur die besten . . . Rosenblätter nehme.*



In the rare cases of *ordo artificialis*, like those of (4) and (5), the violation of the diagrammatic preference for the *ordo naturalis* is justified. This marked order is, therefore, translated in the same way.

Another instance of diagrammaticity can be observed in the unmarked word order of functional sentence perspective (Sgall 1987). If on the cognitive level that which is known is the starting point for what is new, and if on the expression level the theme (given, known) precedes the rheme (new, unknown), then we have diagrammaticity again. Let us examine a German translation of Pasolini (1977/1982). In a translation unit where Pasolini speaks about the *koinè italiana*, he continues in the second sentence of (6) with a thematic element, whereas a verb precedes it in the German translation, as if something entirely new were presented, such as in the very first sentence of a paragraph or chapter.

- (6) a. *Questo implica un fatto che del resto è ben noto: IN ITALIA non esiste una vera e propria lingua italiana nazionale.* '... in Italy there is no proper national Italian language.'  
 b. ... *es gibt IN ITALIEN keine wirkliche Nationalsprache.* '... there is in Italy no true national language.'

So far we have dealt with PARADIGMATIC DIAGRAMMATICITY, i.e., with diagrammatic relationships between meaning and form. Now we are going to pass to a syntagmatic type of diagrammaticity, i.e., PARALLELISM. Identity of position of the same or similar elements facilitates both production and perception (Lang 1987), due to its iconicity. Thus parallelism is a preferred option in all types of texts (Weinrich 1972), including poetry, e.g., Paul Eluard's poem *L'amoureuse* (with Samuel Beckett's translation):

- (7) *Elle est debout sur mes paupières...* She is standing on my lids  
*Elle a la forme de mes mains,* She has the colour of my eye  
*Elle a la couleur de mes yeux,* She has the body of my hand  
*Elle s'engloutit dans mon ombre* In my shade she is engulfed  
*Comme une pierre sur le ciel.* As a stone against the sky.

Beckett inverts the order of sentences, which is rather rare in itself. Moreover, he also violates parallelism in the second to last line, without any other apparent reason than the great liberties that he takes in translating. This contradicts Jakobson's claim about the inherent poetic quality of parallelism (see also the critiques in Werth 1976).

Somewhat different is our next example taken from Arthur Rimbaud's *Le Bateau Ivre*, as translated by Beckett.

- (8) a. *PLUS LÉGER qu'un bouchon j'ai dansé sur les flots*  
*Qu'on appelle rouleurs éternels de victimes,*  
*Dix nuits, sans regretter l'oeil niais des falots.*  
*PLUS DOUCE qu'aux enfants la chair des pommes sûres . . .*
- b. *Nine nights like a cork on the billows, I danced*  
*On the breakers, sacrificial, for ever and ever,*  
*And the crass eye of the lanterns was expunged.*  
*MORE FIRMLY BLAND than to children apples' firm pulp . . .*

Here the first French comparative is not translated by a parallel, sentence-initial English comparative, because the expected synthetic comparative *lighter* would not form an easily recognizable parallelism with the second, analytic comparative *more firmly bland*.

## 2. Indexicality

This parameter is based on the character of the indexical signans defined by Peirce (1965:369) as that "which like a pronoun demonstrative or relative, forces the attention to the particular object intended (= indexical signatum) without describing it." Indexicality may point either to an element within the context of situation (exophoric deixis) or to a cotextual element, i.e., within the same text (endophoric deixis) and thus either backwards (anaphora) or forwards (cataphora).

On the parameter of indexicality, anaphoric indexicality is universally preferred over cataphoric indexicality (Lichtenbeck 1988). Because anaphora refers back to what is already known and cataphora to a (potentially) uncertain future, the former establishes the more reliable sign relationship, in the sense of Morris 1938:365. The indexical signata of the anaphoric signantia in (9a), for example, are usually much easier to find in the cotext than those of the cataphoric signantia in (9b).

- (9) a. *see above, the above mentioned, the above*  
 b. *see below, the below mentioned, \*the below*

In many languages there is even a distributional asymmetry in the inventory of endophoric elements (*the above* vs. *\*the below*, normally used *antecedent* vs. very rarely used *postcedent*). Thus anaphoricity, as in (9a), is the unmarked option, cataphoricity the marked option. One representant of this marked option is the marked stylistic strategy of jumping in, which can be illustrated by the first page of a novel by Thomas Mann (Harweg 1968), as seen in (10), where only after a page-long series of cataphoric

pronouns do we finally learn who the indexical signatum is, namely Moses. This remains a marked text strategy even for a reader who recognizes Moses as the hero before he reads his name.

- (10) *SEINE Geburt war unordentlich . . . ER . . . MOSES . . .*  
 'His birth was unorderedly . . . he . . . Moses . . .'

A more delicate illustration of jumping in can be found with Italian interfixes (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1989). Diminutives with (morphopragmatic) interfixes prefer anaphoric position in regard to diminutives (or a *fortiori*, *simplicia*) without interfixes, such as in the dialogue (11) between a lady (a) and her gardener (b).

- (11) a. *Già, e le mie piant-INE, mentre sono via?*  
 'Well, and my little plants, while I'm away?'  
 b. *Innaffieremo anche le sue amate piant-IC-INE.*  
 'We'll water your beloved little plants as well.'

As both spontaneous speech and tests run by Merlini Barbaresi have shown, native speakers of Italian nearly always prefer this order simplex/diminutive–interfixed diminutive over the inverse order.

In the Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera*, however, I found a report about the derailment of the Brenner express train near Bologna which starts with the sentence of (12).

- (12) a. *Così un vecchio ponticello ha 'tradito' il treno*

*Un ponticello costruito dai nostri nonni non ce l'ha fatto più.  
 Erano passato da poco le 23,30 quando il treno è arrivato a scavalcare in piena velocità quel piccolo ponte di appena tre metri . . .*

- b. *Thus a (dear little) old bridge 'betrayed' the train*

*A (dear little) bridge built by our grandparents hasn't made it any more. It was just after 11:30 P.M. when the train came at full speed to pass the bridge of hardly three meters . . .*

Here, the title already starts with two emotive elements which are meant to, cataphorically, arouse tension and interest, i.e., the interfixed diminutive of *ponte* 'bridge' and the metaphoric verb *tradire* 'to betray'. Also the first sentence of the text (again with the interfixed diminutive) continues this

emotive register, whereas the second sentence falls back into the expected sober news report register.

As Peirce has clearly expressed in his above cited characterization of indices, pure indices may not be descriptive. This holds both for pronominal and zero anaphora. Anaphoric lexical recurrence (repetition), however, contains the same amount of descriptivity as the repeated antecedent, albeit without adding any new descriptive element. But if these anaphoric elements are substituted for by a new coreferent that is only a partially synonymous word or word group, then this represents a descriptive paraphrases that adds symbolicity and, possibly, pragmatic value that reveals author perspective. Such pragmatic reloading is evident in the following episode (13) from *Robinson Crusoe*, where Defoe speaks about Friday and other victims of cannibals.

- (13) a. *I perceived . . . two miserable WRETCHES dragged from the boats . . . I perceived one of THEM immediately fell . . . while the other VICTIM was left standing . . . In that very moment this poor WRETCH . . . and HE started away from them . . . and this I saw plainly, HE must necessarily swim over, or the poor WRETCH would be taken there. But when the SAVAGE escaping came thither, he made nothing of it [I omitted 8 instances of he].*

Also the German translation (13b) contains a similar variation among these different anaphoric elements. However, the respective choices are made in different places, i.e., mere indexicality vs. symbolic reloading does not occur at the same places in the original and in the German translation:

- (13) b. *Da bemerkte ich . . . wie man zwei UNGLÜCKLICHE aus den Booten . . . herbeischleppte . . . Den einen DAVON sah ich alsbald . . . niederstürzen . . . während das andere SCHLACHTOPFER wartete . . . In diesem Augenblick zuckte ER zusammen und O rannte . . . Es war klar, daß der arme KERL diese durchschwimmen mußte, wenn ER nicht in die Hände der Verfolger fallen sollte. Wirklich warf sich der FLÜCHTLING . . .*

The German translator has obviously taken Defoe's varying choices as a matter of pure and random stylistic variation in order to avoid tiresome repetitions and has reacted with truly random variation. This translation has thus changed the information flow and shifts in author perspective.

Since, according to Peirce (Hookway 1985:155ff), perception comprises an indexical component, an additional indexical relation is established in the hearer's perception of the speaker and between their utterances.

Therefore, the indexical relations between turns—e.g., within question answer pairs—are stronger than between adjacent sentences uttered by the same speaker. In addition, questions contain cataphoric elements pointing forwards to the answer. This strength of indexical cohesion explains why more anaphoric ellipsis is possible in answer than follow-up sentences of the same speaker (Schimanski 1975).

### 3. Transparency

According to Koj (1979), "Transparency to meaning . . . appears precisely when we completely cease to perceive the material shape of a sign . . . and are conscious only of its semantic sign," i.e., when cognitive or pragmatic or semantic meanings are directly reflected on the surface of the text without further necessity for inferencing or reconstructive processing. Full transparency, of course, can obtain only in an idealized state of affairs where economy of processing is not necessary; normally we can find varying degrees of opacity.

For example, in trains, we can read inscriptions like those of (14).

- (14) a. *Do not lean out*  
 b. *Ne pas se pencher en dehors*  
 c. *Nicht hinauslehnen*  
 d. *'E pericoloso sporgersi* 'It is dangerous to lean out.'

In none of the four versions of (14) is the window mentioned. This noun can be easily inferred, however, because the inscriptions are always written beneath the respective window so that there is little real opacity in the material context of situation. But the Italian version does give a justification—Italian public, postfascist inscriptions often appeal to the intelligence of their intended readers—which at first sight makes the prohibition to lean out somewhat opaque. One may even think of an adventurous person who, when reading this Italian inscription, may feel encouraged to take a risk. In the social context of situation, however, or within the frames of public transport in general and of trains in particular, risks are understood to be avoided. This shows us that the degree of transparency (or opacity) can only be calculated within the context of situation (situationality of Beaugrande and Dressler 1981) or within the cotext of which the respective text chunk forms a part.

Direct speech acts are more transparent than indirect speech acts; i.e., the degree of directness of a speech act is correlated with its illocutionary transparency. Direct speech acts are universally unmarked insofar as they

are easier to understand, earlier learned by children, better preserved in aphasia. Their predicted frequency of use is highly restricted, however, by language- and culture-specific conventions, particularly by norms of politeness, although indirectness does not always increase politeness (Held 1990).

Since we are more interested in cotext than in context, let us return to (iconic and indexical) repetition and to its role on the parameter of transparency. Let us start with sentences from Anthony's oft-repeated funeral speech in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*.

- (15) *For Brutus is an honourable man*  
*And . . .*  
*For sure he . . .*

The illocutionary force of Anthony's sentence may be opaque or ambiguous to his readers at first reading. But with each repetition the new context helps to disambiguate the intended meaning, i.e., repetition renders the meaning more transparent. This is clearly only possible because the hearer is able both to grasp the indexical character of repetition and to assume diagrammaticity of this indexical relationship, i.e., to assume that these repeated sentences always have the same meaning.

Of course, rhetorical/poetic repetition also increases the perlocutionary force, both in literary and in ordinary speech.

As we have seen, all parameters discussed so far can be applied both to the paradigmatic and to the syntagmatic axis of language; paradigmatic iconicity is preferred in the relations between levels of meaning and form, syntagmatic iconicity occurs in repetition, parallelism and lexical/semantic/syntactic recurrence—all elements which simultaneously presuppose syntagmatic indexicality. And transparency has these same two options. The next, and last parameter we are going to present is restricted to the syntagmatic axis (unless we include what is omitted, i.e., is not uttered at all).

#### 4. Figure and ground

This parameter of contrasting a more important, more precise, more dynamic figure (or foreground) with a less important, more pallid, more static ground (or background) has been taken over from gestalt psychology into semiotics (Ertel 1981, Holenstein 1976, Scherer 1984:156ff). This parameter seems to be adequate for capturing hierarchies within the rhythmic structuring of sequential linearization of text—and all texts must have hierarchical structuring. This rhythmic structuring follows—again iconically—from underlying cognitive, pragmatic, and semantic hierarchies. The stronger the contrast

between figure and ground, the better the figure is perceived, i.e., the "percept...obtrudes itself on my gaze" (Peirce 1965:619).

Languages have several means of enhancing the contrast between foreground and background, e.g., of the story/event-line vs. the setting.<sup>1</sup> These include, for example, (a) verbal aspect, i.e., the difference between perfective and imperfective aspect (and its equivalents), (b) embedding into secondary clauses, participles or preposition/noun phrases, (c) (compensatory) particles. Let us reanalyze a translation unit from Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* and its French, Italian, Spanish, and German translations (Wandruszka 1957).

- (16) a. *They walked down the road to the old man's shack and all along the road, in the dark, barefoot men WERE MOVING, carrying the masts of their boats.*  
 b. *Ils descendIRENT... des gens se mouVAIENT... les mâts de leurs bateaux sur leurs épaules.*  
 c. *ScesERO... si muOVEVANO uomini scalci, che portAVANO...*  
 d. *MarchARON... se VELAN hombres descalzos PORTANDO...*  
 e. *Sie GINGEN die Landstraße hinunter bis zu der Hütte des alten Mannes, und die ganze Straße entlang im Dunkeln bewegTEN sich barfüßige Männer, die die Masten ihrer Boote TRUGEN.*

According to the criterion of verbal aspect the English simple form *walked* refers to the foreground, the expanded/progressive form *were moving* to the background. By embedding, the participle *carrying* is still further backgrounded. The Spanish translation comes closest with the equivalent triad *preterito perfecto simple, imperfecto, participio*. The French translation comes close with *passé simple, imparfait*, and a nominalized phrase. The Italian translation as well with *passato remoto, imperfetto*, and an *imperfetto* embedded into a secondary (i.e., relative) clause. Embedding into a relative clause is also chosen in the German translation. Since German has no grammatical equivalent to verbal aspect, however, the translator has flattened the difference between figure and ground by translating both the English simple and progressive form by a German preterit.

My final example (Latin, with English, French, Italian, and German translations) is from Virgil's *Aeneis*, where Aeneas exhorts his companions within the burning city of Troy. It is meant to illustrate (frequent!) parameter conflicts.

<sup>1</sup>As in Longacre 1985, 1987; cf. Grimes' 1982 concept of staging and, in general, Grimes 1975:51ff.

- (17) a. *moriatur et in media arma ruatur*  
 b. *come, let us die, we'll make a rush into the thick of it*  
 c. *Mourons et jetons-nous au milieu des armes*  
 d. *moriamo, e gettiamoci tra le armi*  
 e. (Thassilo von Scheffer) *so stürzen wir denn zum Kampf und zum Tode.*

This Latin exhortation clearly violates the diagrammatic parameter of the *ordo naturalis* in its basically chronological interpretation and thus is a classical example of a *hysteron proteron*. The decision to die is foregrounded, however, by getting sequential priority. In other words, there is a conflict between the parameters of diagrammaticity and of figure and ground. Virgil's stylistic choice is maintained in all but the German translation. In respect to scientific texts, we may compare the textual strategy of ordering material according to "order of importance" (Trimble 1985:60ff).

Waugh (1982) maintains that the pair MARKED-UNMARKED can be considered as a contrast between figure and ground. However, marked and unmarked refers both to the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic axes (even predominantly to the paradigmatic axis), whereas figure and ground do not. Second, figure and ground form a clear binary contrast, whereas preference/markedness/naturalness allow a continuum, although each continuum can be dissolved into bundles of binary opposition pairs.

## 5. Conclusion

I have tried, in this brief presentation, to show that seemingly unimportant properties of a text such as word order, repetition, and use of pronouns have a meaning in texts, that they help to shape the flow of discourse, and that they are, thus, also relevant to an analysis of relative markedness. By inserting these phenomena into a semiotically based preference model, I have distinguished parametrized marked vs. unmarked text strategies. Since semiotic relations are much richer and more complex on the text level than in phonology and morphology, the predictive power of a semiotic parameter is in itself more limited on the textual level, although it may be involved much more frequently in the explanation of linguistic phenomena and of their cross-linguistic distributions.

## References

- Beaugrande, Robert de. 1984. Text production. Norwood: Ablex.



- and Wolfgang U. Dressler. 1981. Einführung in die Textlinguistik. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Buchler, Justus, ed. 1955. Philosophical writings of Charles S. Peirce. New York: Dover.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1983. Notes on textual typology. In Sándor Rot (ed.), *Languages in function*, 77–83. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- . 1985. *Morphonology*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Press.
- . 1989. Semiotische Parameter einer textlinguistischen Natürlichkeitstheorie. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- and Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1987. *Elements of morphopragmatics*. Duisburg: Linguistic Agency of the University of Duisberg A 194.
- and ———. 1989. Interfissi e non-interfissi antesuffissali nell'italiano, spagnolo e inglese. Atti 20° congresso Società di Linguistica Italiana, 243–52. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Eco, Umberto. 1984. *Semiotics and the philosophy of language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Enkvist, Nils. 1981. Experiential iconicism in text strategy. *Text* 1:71–111.
- . 1989. From text to interpretability: A contribution to the discussion of basic terms in textlinguistics. In Wolfgang Heydrich, Fritz Neubauer, János Petöfi, and Emel Sözer (eds.), *Connexity and coherence*, 369–82. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ertel, Sigbert. 1981. Wahrnehmung und Gesellschaft. Prägnanztendenzen in Wahrnehmung und Gesellschaft. *Prägnanztendenzen in Wahrnehmung und Bewusstsein. Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 3:107–41.
- Grimes, Joseph. 1975. *The thread of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1982. Reference spaces in text. In Sture Allén (ed.), *Text processing*, 381–414. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.
- Harweg, Roland. 1968. *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*. Munich: Fink.
- Held, Gudrun. 1990. Beziehungsarbeit und Konversationsanalyse am Beispiel eines Bittgesprächs. *Folia Linguistica* 23:405–37.
- Heydrich, Wolfgang and János Petöfi, eds. 1986. *Aspekte der Konnexität und Kohärenz von Texten*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Holenstein, Elmar. 1976. *Linguistik, Semiotik, Hermeneutik: Plädoyers für eine strukturelle Phänomenologie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hookway, Christopher. 1985. *Peirce*. London: Routledge.
- Koj, Leon. 1979. The principle of transparency and semantic antinomies. In Jerzy Pelc (ed.), *Semiotics in Poland*, 376–406. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Lang, Ewald. 1987. Parallelismus als universelles Prinzip sekundärer Strukturbildung. *Linguistische Studien A* 161:1–54.

- Levelt, Willem. 1983. The speaker's organization of discourse. In Shirô Hattori and Kazuko Inoue (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th International Congress of Linguists*, 29 August–4 September, 1982, Tokyo, 278–90.
- Lichtenbeck, F. 1988. The pragmatic nature of nominal anaphora in To'aba'ita. *Studies in Language* 12:299–344.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1982. Discourse typology in relation to language typology. In Sture Allén (ed.), *Text processing*, 457–86. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.
- . 1985. Discourse peak as a zone of turbulence. In Jessica R. Wirth (ed.), *Beyond the sentence: Discourse and sentential form*, 83–98. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- . 1987. The semantics of the story-line in east and west Africa. *Journal of Semantics* 5:51–56.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 1988. *Markedness in English discourse*. Parma: Zara.
- Morris, Charles. 1938. *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pasolini, Pier Paolo. 1977. *Empirismo eretico. Saggi*. Milan: Garzanti. (Translated into German as *Ketzererfahrungen* by R. Klein, Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1982.)
- Peirce, Charles S. 1965. *Collected papers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Petőfi, János S. 1986. Report: European research in semiotic textology. *Folia Linguistica* 10:545–71.
- Sgall, Petr. 1987. The position of Czech linguistics in theme-focus research. In Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold (eds.), *Language topics: Essays in honour of Michael Halliday* 1, 47–55. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Scherer, Bernd. 1984. *Prolegomena zu einer einheitlichen Zeichentheorie*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Schimanski, Annerose. 1975. Zu Fragen der Verkürzung im dialogischen Text: Satzkontextbedingte Reductionen. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 12:293–97.
- Seiler, Hansjacob. 1989. A dimensional view on numeral systems. *Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts* 79.
- Trimble, Louis. 1985. *English for science and technology: A discourse approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wandruszka, Mario. 1957. Strukturen moderner Prosa. *Der Deutschunterricht* 7(3):89–104.
- Waugh, Linda. 1976. Roman Jakobson's science of language. Lisse: de Ridder.
- Weinrich, Harald. 1972. Thesen zur Textsortenlinguistik. In Elisabeth Gülich and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Textsorten: Differenzierungskriterien aus linguistischer Sicht*, 161–69. Frankfurt: Athenum.
- Werth, Paul. 1976. Roman Jakobson's verbal analysis of poetry. *Journal of Linguistics* 12:21–75.