ABSTRACT
          Evidence of semantically based orderings of phrasal
coordinations in child speech is explored. Speech samples from two
children are analyzed to show that such sequences occur frequently,
are internally consistent, and are part of children's active
repertoire of referential and expressive acts at an early age. The
samples were obtained from one child between the ages of 18 to 27
months and another between 36 to 41 months. The evidence suggests
that early in child speech, word order in coordination lends itself
to iconization of several types of semantic distinctions. Children
acquire a principle which states that a preferred ordering exists for
semantically distinct constituents of phrasal coordinations. Further,
such an ordering iconically encodes the subjective primacy of one
referent by placing it first in the coordination. The need for
longitudinal data on spontaneous speech accompanied by information on
gestures, focus of attention, and parents' speech is cited. (RW)

Stanford Univ. Dept. of Linguistics

Semantics of Word Order in Co-ordination

David Birdsong
University of Texas

When Ronald Reagan and Alexander Haig walk into a press con-
ference, the nation's highest-ranking public official enters ahead
of his appointee. As a rule, he also assumes a loftier, more cen-
tral or more visible spot on the podium. The symbolism of these
acts is then mirrored linguistically when the men are announced by
their titles: invariably it is, "the President and Secretary of
State," never the other way around (Haig's wishes to the contrary
notwithstanding).

The fixed order of the co-ordinate sequence "President and
Secretary of State" was cited as early as 1961 by Roman Jakobson
to illustrate one of the many ways language as a semiotic system
encodes asymmetrical semantic relationships. Other studies, in-
cluding Cooper and Ross (1975), have examined frozen expressions
such as friend or foe, animal, vegetable, and mineral, Cowboys and
Indians, here and there, etc., where the first terms are said to
incorporate characteristics of the prototypical speaker, or the
"Me." This is held as further evidence of how the constituent or-
der of co-ordinate strings reflects semantic distinctions regular-
ly made by speakers. In this way natural language, with varying
degrees of fixedness of word order, conventionalizes and lexical-
izes co-ordinate sequences for semantic effect.

With these observations as a point of departure, the present
paper seeks in child speech similar evidence of semantically-
motivated orderings of phrasal co-ordinations. It will be argued
that such sequences occur frequently, are internally consistent,
and form part of the child's active repertoire of referential and
expressive acts at a very early age. The paper will proceed via
the following steps: (a) First this study will be situated with-
in the body of pertinent existing research; (b) Next, co-ordina-
tion data from two well-known corpora of spontaneous speech, those
of "Eve" and "Adam" (v. Brown, 1973), will be classified and an-
alyzed; (c) Third, a plausible sketch of the ontogenesis of what
may be called the semiotics of phrasal co-ordinations will be de-
veloped; (d) Finally, ways of testing the provisional conclusions
of the paper will be recommended, along with several areas of re-
lated future research.

Numerous studies embracing a wide range of perspectives have
documented the interaction of linear order with semantic factors.
At the level of narrative structure, for example, it is found that
adults in scene-description tasks tend to proceed from near to
far, from left to right, and from most important to least impor-
tant (MacKay, 1982). At the sentence level, the sequencing of

25

functional relationships of constituents is seen by McNeill (1979) as an example of "semiotic extension," whereby ideas from the sensori-motor domain are given form and take on iconic or symbolic meanings through linguistic signs. McNeill argues that English-speaking children's preferences for such word order sequences as Verb-before-Object (Action-Patient), possessor-before-possessed, and entity-before-location (roughly, figure-before-field) are productive iconic mappings of conceptual relations. More germane to the situation at hand is an ordering predisposition noted in Mac-Whinney (1977, 1980), whereby children initialize elements with which they most closely identify. These elements, called perspectives by MacWhinney, are examined at the sentence-level and are found often to be agents in active voice constructions. Finally, at the level of phrasal co-ordinations, it has been found that color terms are ordered by children in preferential sequences. In a study by Conley and Cooper (in press), subjects aged 6;9 to 7;6 were asked to name the colors of pairs of intertwined shoelaces; their tendency was to fix in immutable order pairs of colors which were highly contrastive in terms of brightness, while color pairs that were similar were more flexibly ordered. Another pattern placed the darker color before the lighter color in conjoined pairs; the strongest orderings that emerged were <u>brown and white</u>, <u>brown and pink</u>, <u>yellow and white</u>, and <u>black and white</u>. Conley and Cooper speculate that these orderings may be explicable in terms of natural salience, the darker colors being more salient in the environment.

The present study is in at least one relevant aspect an extension of the Conley and Cooper research. The quest for ordering principles in language normally involves teasing apart many confounding factors; by examining, as Conley and Cooper did, only sequences of conjoined elements of the same grammatical category, one restricts considerably the number of degrees of freedom. This is not to say, however, that all confounding factors in the present data have been eliminated, nor does it mean that more information in the form of richer contextual notes would not help illuminate the material at hand.

The data displayed in Table 1 represent 116 co-ordinations of an exhaustive total of 187 in the Eve sample (age = 18 months to 27 months; MLU = 1.39 to 4.22). Also listed for comparison are 13 lexicalized co-ordinations produced by Adam in seven separate 2-hour sessions over the period 36 months to 41 months; MLU = 3.32 to 4.49.

The criterion for designating a subcategory (e.g., "you and 3rd person") in Categories B, C, and D is the occurrence of two or more tokens in the corpus. Not included in the Table are co-ordinations of the following types: "entailed" verbal sequences such as <u>try and cook</u>, <u>go and take</u> ("Baby Sarah go an' take a nap"); various sentential sequences such as "You cut it in little pieces ... and

Table 1

Co-ordinations by Eve with Lexicalized Forms by Adam

A	B
LEXICALIZED FORMS	**PERSON DEIXIS**

A (LEXICALIZED FORMS)	B (PERSON DEIXIS)
up and down 7/0	you (mother) and 3rd person 9/0 (proper names, common nouns)
bread and butter 4/0	you-1st person 3/3
A and P (store) 3/0	1st person-3rd person 5/4
shoes and socks black and blue round and around nice and quiet big-little this-that on-off better-not better (cf. better-worse)	3rd person and 3rd person proper common 2/0
EACH 1/0	**C** PARENTS
From the Adam sample:	parent name-other name (all "Fraser") 12/4
rough and ready 6/0	parent-1st person (name or pronoun) 3/2
up and down 2/0	cf. Grannie and Granpa 2/2
Cowboy-Indian 1/1	mother-father 6/9
cat and mouse meat and gravy back and forth	**D** FRASER
EACH 1/0	Fraser-3rd person 29/10
	Fraser-1st person name 2/0
	Fraser and you 0/3

bite it, this way;" and several other co-ordinations such as guitar and banjo, cookies and graham crackers, for which there was only one occurrence and for which there was no apparent semantic patterning. Below each exemplar included in the Table, the numbers to the left of the slash indicate the frequency of occurrence of the sequence in the order given; numbers to the right of the slash are reversed-order frequencies. A hyphen between constituents means that at least one occurrence of that co-ordination was not of the simple form X and Y (e.g., Fraser and Cromer), but rather occurred in a complex sequence such as Fraser come and Cromer come, where the constituents in question ("Fraser" and "Cromer") are ordered within parallel syntactic contexts above the phrasal level. It is to be noted as well that some co-ordinations are included in more than one category; under the "Fraser-3rd person" subcategory, for example, are included tokens also listed under "parent name-other name." Thus of the 132 co-ordinations summed from Table 1, 16 are listed twice, giving the figure of 116 mentioned earlier.

A cursory glance at the examples listed in Category A for Eve reveals no deviation from lexicalized sequences (the same is true, with the exception of a single Indian-Cowboy, for Adam's output). From the available contextual data, it appears that only four of Eve's forms (two up and down, one each nice and quiet, round and around) were immediate imitations of her mother's speech. The data in Category B suggest invariance with respect to second person-third person sequences, a pattern not necessarily observed in adult speech, where pragmatic demands such as topic/focus motivate varied sequences. Category C reveals a strong tendency to place the parent name first, a pattern broken only when the other term is first person or "Fraser." Note that no uniform pattern obtains for Grannie and Granpa nor for mother-father. A strong pattern is observed in Category D, where in most cases "Fraser" precedes other proper names.

Thus, several types of consistency emerge from the Eve data. First, Eve in most cases is internally consistent or frozen in her production of co-ordinations. This consistency is best seen in Categories A and D and in the patterns "you and 3rd person" and "parent name-other name." Secondly, with reference to Category A, Eve's output coincides fairly consistently with Adam's and with adult models. Also, with reference to Category D, Eve's output coincides with what is known about her mother's speech. According to Brown (personal communication), the mother of Eve typically referred to the experimenters, Colin Fraser and Richard Cromer, as "Fraser and Cromer" and not vice versa. Finally, the data are consistent with various accounts of semantic ordering principles in language generally, notably those formalized in Cooper and Ross (1975) and suggested for children's speech in MacWhinney (1980). As mentioned earlier, these accounts posit principles whereby first conjuncts are "closer" to the speaker in semantic

or conceptual space.

These data, meager though they be, are nevertheless suggestive of principled patternings. Assuming that semantic distinctions do exist in the mind of these young speakers--this being an assumption independent of linguistic evidence--these semantic distinctions appear to be routinely reflected in productive linguistic patterns.

How might these semantic routines arise? Sketching their ontogeny requires a certain amount of speculation, which hopefully will soon be replaced with empirical evidence. Nevertheless, casual observations of children's behavior, as well as studies such as Givón (1979), do suggest that at some early stage of development children go beyond the recognition that order is a practical, benefit-accruing notion (e.g., the child who sticks her hand first into the bag of M&M's gets the most immediate gratification and probably more candy), to become sensitive to the symbolic, or iconic, aspects of order in language. For example, younger siblings are often upset when adults inadvertently refer to them by older siblings' names first.

From available evidence, it seems that early on in child speech, word order in co-ordinations lends itself to iconization of several types of semantic distinctions. Both Adám and Eve, for example, invariably captured temporal and causal distinctions in structures such as, "We all go(ed) to the beach and saw ...," "gon' make noise ... and I will hear her," "Jump and down," "I fell down on Paul bed and missed it," where co-ordination-initial elements occurred first in real time. Another example from Adam's co-ordinations encodes the notion of causality and temporality: "I drink and I cough and cough and cough." In the socio-cultural context of family and friends, co-ordinations can be used to signal more favored or proximate referents (v. MacWhinney). According to Brown (personal communication), the experimenter referred to as Fraser was much closer to all members of Eve's family than was Cromer. Fraser was the first experimenter to make Eve's acquaintance; he was always present at taping sessions; and when the taping sessions ended, it was as if a true member of the family had left. Small wonder then that such a semantic asymmetry finds expression in the preponderance of co-ordinations with "Fraser" as first element. This pattern is perhaps relatable to the parent-before-other pattern noted in Category C and to Category B, where "you" refers to the mother, who was present during the taping. In all three cases the ostensibly preferred human referent is mentioned first in the co-ordination.

From these types of evidence one is led to postulate that, at some early stage in linguistic development, children acquire a principle which states that for semantically-distinct constituents of phrasal co-ordinations, a preferred ordering obtains. It further appears that such an ordering iconically encodes what may

loosely be called the subjective primacy of one referent by placing
it first in the co-ordination.

Additional motivation for this hypothesis comes from several
independent sources: (1) The Conley and Cooper experiment, though
conducted with older children, demonstrates that perceptual sali-
ence dictates word order; (2) In the case of Eve, there is evidence
of an adult-speech model, namely the mother; (3) Variants of such
an ordering principle are cited in MacWhinney (1977, 1980) and
Cooper and Ross (1975).

As the child grows older, this powerful ordering principle
might be subject to certain constraints. One may envision, for
example, a politeness constraint, whereby forms such as you and I
may be conventionally and not semantically motivated. Such a
constraint is typically observed in adult speech and does not seem
to apply yet for either Eve or Adam. There may be a discourse con-
straint, whereby the pragmatic demands of a communicative situation
(anaphora, topic/focus, etc.) may dictate order. It would be in-
teresting to see whether such a constraint would apply as a func-
tion of the partner in the speech situation (cf. in particular
Eve's pairings which seem to obey only the preferred ordering prin-
ciple). Needless to say, different data and analysis of context
would be essential in addressing this issue.

From these observations and speculations, it is clear that a
good deal more study in this area is warranted. The first require-
ment for any further work with spontaneous speech is significantly
more data, preferably longitudinal, with full contextual notes re-
cording gestures and the child's focus of attention, along with a
full record of the parents' speech and especially their manipula-
tions of co-ordinations.

Several questions deserve attention if future research is
conducted in this area:

(1) Is routinization of semantic sequences signaled by acous-
tic cues, such as compression of the length of the utterance, or
vowel reduction in the conjunction, yielding a syllabic nasal con-
sonant rather than a full "and"? Preliminary instrumental evidence
suggests that this is the case.

(2) What is the relationship between the lexicalization of
sequences such as bow and arrow, peanut butter and jelly, etc.,
and routinization by the individual child of similar sequences?
To what extent are the child's ordered sequences unanalyzed re-
petitions or analogues of adult lexicalized forms, and to what
extent are they the child's own inventions? Is the semantic order-
ing principle proposed for Categories B, C, D reponsible for or in
any way related to the forms attested in Category A? Does consis-
tency vary with age, that is, are forms more routinized at an ear-
ly age than later, or do they become even more invariant as lin-
guistic sophistication increases? When do phonetic factors come

into play, such as meter and syllable number (<u>kit and caboodle</u>)
and vowel alternations (<u>dribs and drabs</u>)?

(3) Is the child's semiotic system in co-ordination part of
a larger system of deictic reference and communicative egocentrism
(cf. Clark, 1973 and Miller, 1979)? In other words, does ordering
by subjective primacy reinforce the notion of the centrality of
the speaker in speech situations?

(4) Finally, one might consider the possibility that prefer-
ential order in co-ordinations does not iconize hierarchical sem-
antic relationships at all, but rather results from information-
processing demands of speakers and hearers. This possibility
(raised anonymously at the SCLRF presentation) is elaborated in
Bock (1982, p. 39), holding that "automatic deployment of a certain
alternative from among a set of syntactic options may be used as
a means of accommodating transient processing demands while simul-
taneously keeping the syntactic processing burden of working mem-
ory to a minimum." If such were the case, the presumed second
level of meaning, the symbolic, would simply be absent. Further,
it would suggest that children quite early on begin to develop
fairly sophisticated and efficient mechanisms for the processing
of linguistic information.

It is only fitting to close by acknowledging the enormous
debts owed to many of those in attendance at the SCLRF who collect-
ed and analyzed the Adam and Eve data nearly twenty years ago.
Likewise, a great debt is owed to those who have been responsible
for demonstrating the roles of semantics, pragmatics, and context
in the development of child syntax. The preliminary research re-
ported here leads to the tentative conclusion that some of these
same factors are also responsible for certain pre-grammatical
orderings in co-ordinations. It is to be hoped that this phenom-
enon will receive attention in the future.

REFERENCES

Bock, J.K. Toward a cognitive psychology of syntax: Information
processing contributions to sentence formulation. <u>Psychologi-
cal Review</u>, 1982, <u>89</u>, 1-47.

Brown, R. <u>A first language: The early stages</u>. Cambridge, Mass.:
Harvard University Press, 1973.

Clark, H.H. Space, time, semantics, and the child. In T.E. Moore,
(Ed.), <u>Cognitive development and the acquisition of language</u>.
New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Conley, K. and Cooper, W.E. Conjoined ordering of color terms by
children and adults. To appear in <u>Studies in Language</u>.

Cooper, W.E. and Ross, J.R. World order. In R.E. Grossman, L.J. San, and T.J. Vance (Eds.), Papers from the parasession on functionalism. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1975.

Givón, T. On understanding grammar. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Jakobson, R. Implications of language universals for linguistics. In J.H. Greenberg (Ed.), Universals of Language (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1966.

MacKay, D. A general theory of serial order in behavior. Paper given at the University of Texas at Austin, February 24, 1982.

MacWhinney, B. Starting points. Language, 1977, 53, 152-168.

MacWhinney, B. Basic processes in syntactic acquisition. In S. Juczaj (Ed.), Language development: Syntax and semantics. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980.

McNeill, D. The conceptual basis of language. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1979.

Miller, M. The logic of language development in early childhood. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1979.