



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

An International Open-Access Peer Reviewed Referred Journal

Impact Factor: 6.064

E-ISSN : 2249 – 4642

P-ISSN: 2454 - 4671

ASPECTS OF MARKEDNESS IN ENGLISH AND STANDARD ARABIC

Zaynab Mahmood H. Al-Kawwaz

Department of English, Al-Ma'moon University College, Iraq

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i02.017>

Paper Received:

10th March, 2022

Paper Accepted:

30th April, 2022

Paper Received After Correction:

05th May, 2022

Paper Published:

09th May, 2022



How to cite the article: Al-Kawwaz Z.M.H.(2022), Aspects of Markedness in English and Standard Arabic, *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, April-June 2022 Vol. 12, Issue 2; 277-292 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i02.017>

ABSTRACT

One of the most important theories in structural linguistics is markedness theory. Scholars and linguists have always been drawn to it because of its academic value. This study will look at three different types of markedness in English and Standard Arabic, from both a formal and semantic standpoint: formal markedness, distributional markedness, and semantic markedness. These three categories of markedness are discussed in depth in both English and Standard Arabic, from their definitions to their qualities.

A brief reference to Markedness Theory is also introduced with an attempt to shed light on the relationship of the three types of markedness. The ultimate aims of this paper is to investigate whether markedness exists in Arabic and to give an insight of markedness phenomenon not only from linguistic form or structure, but from its semantic distinctions and pragmatic use. The study also aims to shed light on the increasing applications of Markedness Theory in different fields of language study.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاتسام-النظريه- التوزيعيه -الشكلية

جوانب محددة للاتسام في اللغة الانكليزية واللغة العربية

نظرية الاتسام هي واحدة من أهم النظريات في علم اللغة التركيبي وان أهميتها الأكاديمية قد اجتذبت الكثير من العلماء والمفكرين.

هذه الدراسة تحاول استكشاف جوانب محددة من موضوع الاتسام في اللغة الانكليزية واللغة العربية من منظور الشكلية والدالية , تحديداً : الاتسام الشكلي , الاتسام التوزيعي , والاتسام الدلالي. وقد تناولت الدراسة هذه الانواع الثلاثة بالتفصيل في كلتا اللغتين. كما وتطرقت الدراسة الى شرح مختصر لنظرية الاتسام المشار اليها اعلاه.

أن الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو البحث والتقصي للتأكد من وجود موضوع الاتسام في اللغة العربية اساساً وكذلك لأجل المساهمة في اسناد ودعم هذه الظاهرة (ظاهرة الاتسام) في اللغة الانكليزية ليس من حيث الشكل فقط وانما من حيث المعنى والدلالة ايضاً مما يسهم في تطبيقات نظرية الاتسام والاستفادة منها في مجالات وحقول علم اللغة المتعددة.

توصلت الدراسة الى ان ظاهرة الاتسام موجودة في اللغة العربية وقد تم تناولها والتطرق لها بشكل معمق من قبل النحويين العرب قديماً وحالياً.

INTRODUCTION

Markedness is a fundamental notion in the study of linguistics in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and it can be traced back to structuralist phonological theory's early stages.

However, during the course of the twentieth century, it has taken on numerous various meanings and applications that its contemporary usage is still hotly disputed and vaguely defined. Basically, markedness refers to the phoneme as a collection of distinguishing

characteristics (distinctive features) that can be positively or negatively stated ("marked") for a given value.

DEFINITION OF MARKEDNESS

By the inclusion of additional morphological material, markedness may be described as a separate form or construction from another with which it stands in a paradigmatic connection (the unmarked one). For example, the lexical terms *waitress* and *incorrect* are marked in relation to *waiter* and *correct*; plural *books* are marked in relation to singular *book*; and a passive construction like *Linda was rewarded by the boss* is marked in relation to the corresponding active form *The boss rewarded Linda*.

The marked form is seen by Trask (1993:167) as "*less central or less natural than a countering one on different basics, such as less occurrence, more constrained distribution, more obvious morphological marking, greater semantic specificity or greater rarity in languages generally*".

N.S.Trubetzkoy, a notable linguist from Prague School, used the word "markedness" in his work *The Principles of Phonology* (1969). This word was originally limited to phonetics: one phoneme in a pair of opposing phonemes is described as marked, whereas the other lacks such characteristic.

Theoretical markedness assumes that some linguistic items in languages all over the world are more basic, natural, and frequently common (unmarked) than others that are considered as marked. Prague Schoolers like Nikolai Sergeyeovich Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson characterized markedness in distinct phonemic contrasts. Thus, markedness was initially explored in phonology, and it was afterwards applied to phonetics, grammars, semantics, pragmatics and psychological linguistics (Battistella, 1996: 51). Markedness, on the other hand, evolves into a theory as a result of the continuing academic research afforded by experts and professionals and to whom wide and deep applications of markedness is attributed. As a result, the study of markedness involves both the structural form of language and its implicit meaning.

THEORY OF MARKEDNESS

Markedness was first established in Prague school phonology and then expanded to cover morphology and syntax as well. According to Archangeli,(1992) one phoneme of a pair is distinguished as marked and the other is unmarked for some distinctive feature whose presence or absence decides which is which. Phonetically speaking, /b/ is marked but /p/ is not (ibid: 391-393). A similar case is indicated in English morphology where the

regular form of past tense is marked (by the suffixation of -ed) while the form of the present tense is unmarked (compare "jumped" against "jump"). A morphologically unmarked form has a wider range of occurrences and a more uncertain meaning than one that is morphologically marked (Jacobson, 1932; Battistella, 1996).

Another controversial issue may arise in the sense that while the past tense form in English (in simple phrases or the main clause of complex sentences) plainly refers to the past, the so-called present tense form is more temporally neutral: it is non-past in the sense that it does not indicate the time as past, but it also does not designate it as present. There's also a more abstract notion of markedness that exists regardless of whether or not an overt feature or affix is present or absent. On a lexical level, the terms "person" and "man" are instances of this sort of markedness. While the term "man" refers only to males of the species, the term "person" refers to both males and females. "Man" is the marked term, and "person" is the unmarked term, which may be neutral or negative depending on context (compare "be careful. It is not a person; he is a man."). The notion of markedness, in this more general or abstract meaning, was universally recognized by linguists of

many schools, and it was used at all levels of linguistic analysis.

TYPES OF MARKEDNESS

The term markedness can be divided into three types: formal markedness, distribution markedness and semantic markedness (Battistella, 1996; Chandler, 2005; Eckman, 1985).

Formal Markedness

The lack or presence of certain formal elements markings can be used to describe the phonological form of markedness. The former phonemes in the phoneme pairings t/d, p/b, and k/g are unmarked for voice, whereas the latter are marked for voice. "Voice" refers to "a particular formal trait or mark." In the case of p/b, p is distinguished by the presence of aspiration, whereas b is distinguished by the absence of aspiration (Archangeli, 1992: 391-393). As can be seen from the examples above, when two phonemes are differentiated by the presence or absence of a single distinguishing characteristic, one is said to be marked of the feature and the other is said to be unmarked of the feature.

According to Clark & Clark (1977: 95), such pairs are referred to as privative opposition, which refers to the one distinguishing quality that distinguishes A from B, and if A possesses it, B does not.

Formal markedness may easily be identified in English morphology, notably in the lexicon of a given term. It is unlike the case in phonology, where formal markedness is determined by whether different characteristics exist or not, formal markedness in vocabulary is mostly determined through derivation and inflection. Derivation is a common process of English word-formation that involves adding a prefix or suffix to existing words to create new ones.

The assumption that in opposition terms like *actor / actress*, *waiter / waitress*, *happy / unhappy*, *friendly / unfriendly*, the latter is the antonym of the former and is officially denoted by either the prefix *un* or the suffix *ess* is largely accepted. The former, on the other hand, is technically and formally unmarked. The prefix and suffix in this case have the reverse or negative connotation (Eckman, 1977:315-330). Prefixes and suffixes can sometimes serve as "formal markings" without necessarily expressing negative or opposing meaning. By adding the suffixes *-ness* and *-able* to the original words, the part of speech of the original words changes, as in *dark / darkness*, *sad / sadness*, *love / lovable*, not the meaning of the original words turning to the opposite ones. Besides derivation, inflection is another way of reflecting formal markedness. It mainly refers to the

creation of new words through the change of number, gender and case of noun, and the change of tense of verbs. For example:

doctor/doctor's, mother/mother's
boy/boys, country/countries

see/seeing/saw/seen,
look/looking/looked/looked

The unaffixed form of nouns, such as *doctor* and *nation*, is normally unmarked, but the attached form, such as *doctor's* and *countries*, is marked. The English verb is marked for past tense, such as *saw* and *looked*, but not for present tense, such as *see* and *look*.

As previously stated, formal markedness defines linguistic structure using the language's exterior structural features. To put it another way, formal markedness only shows an opposing relationship through formal or structural linguistic constructions. Not all oppositional connections in English lexicon are portrayed by formal or structural opposition, such as *good / bad*, *true / false*, *pretty / ugly*, and *big / small* (Eckman, 1985: 3-21). Each pair has two words that have no formal or structural similarities yet reflect completely contrasting meanings. When two words sound alike, they don't always indicate the same thing, such as *partial / impartial*. Even if two words have identical meanings

but different connotations, one does not have to be marked in contrast to the other, as in *careful / careless, joyful / joyless, thankful / thankless, meaningful / meaningless*.

As a result, formal markedness primarily captures markedness inside formal or structural frameworks, which has clear limits and falls short of describing the full phenomenon of markedness in language use. Many linguists, including Lycan (2001) and Segal (2000), have discovered that in a marked-unmarked pair, the marked one and the unmarked one do not have the same scale or level, and the marked one's utility is limited compared to the unmarked one. In phonetics, marked phonemes like *d* and *b* are distributionally constrained (see the incorrect forms of *Sdrong* and *sbort*), whereas *t* and *p* in a same phonetic context (as in *strong* and *sport*) are correct on the other hand. *Sky* is also correct, while *sgy* is unusual. As a result, in a phonetic context, the unmarked one has a larger usage scale than the marked one. This rule also applies to semantics.

Distributional Markedness

In semantics, unmarked terms have a broader meaning than marked ones. Consider the relation between the opposites, "old" and "young", in this question "how old are you?" where it does

not imply "you are old." But, you need to state your age only. In this context, "old" does not mean the opposite of "young", and "how old are you" exclusively means "what is your age" (Battistella, 1992:51). A further example could be in "How far is the station?" where the term *far* does not imply that the station is far away; it might be very near. However, "how far" is usually used to inquire about the distance to the station, whether it is distant or close. The following is an example of a similar situation, compare "How big is the mooncake?" where the term "big" only refers to the size of the mooncake, which is not always supposed to be large. "How large is the mooncake?" is appropriate even if the mooncake is little. Therefore, the connotations of *old*, *far*, and *big* are generalized and neutralized to "age," "distance," and "size" correspondingly, implying that they do not stand immediately opposed to *young*, *close*, and *tiny*.

Thus, the unmarked *old*, *far*, and *big* have a neutral meaning and may be used more generally, but the marked *young*, *near*, and *tiny* have a limited meaning and can only be used in specific situations. There are additional examples of some unmarked and marked objects being neutralized.

(1) Ahmed is *stronger* than me.

(2) Ahmed is *weaker* than me.

In example (1), *strong* is an unmarked adjective and it can either express the meaning of “having great power, especially, of body” or the generalized meaning of “the degree of being strong”. In this example, *strong* is neutral and (1) does not mean “John and I are both strong”. Maybe “we are weak” instead, but “John is a little stronger than me”. But, it is not the case with example (2) which assumes that “John and I are both weak”. Other examples may be:

(3) How high is the mountain?

(4) How low is the mountain?

in which example (3) expresses the neutral or general meaning of “what is the height of the mountain?”. It is unmarked. Even if the mountain is one centimeter. *High* is also applicable for such situations. On the other hand, example (4) states the mountain is *low*. There should be a convincing reason behind the unmarkedness of *high*, *old*, *far*, *big*, and *strong* used in the above contexts in oppose to the markedness of *low*, *young*, *near*, *small*, and *weak*? More attempts are made to explore the causes.

Boucher and Osgood coined the term "Pollyanna Hypothesis" to describe the propensity to use positive terms (e.g., pretty) more frequently than equally

common negative ones (e.g., ugly) (1969). To explain this phenomenon, they used the Pollyanna Hypothesis. According to the Pollyanna Hypothesis, individuals like to focus on the good aspects of life, and they prefer to perceive positive words as unmarked while negative phrases are marked (ibid:1-8).

Furthermore, Rozin et al. (2010: 336-548) believe that the linguistic positivity bias (LPB) reflects the reality that most individuals have more good than negative occurrences to talk about in their lives. According to Suitner and Maass (2008: 1078), there is a "general positive bias when discussing human beings." As a result, rather of stating "*the thing is not so little*," it is preferable to say "*the object is not so enormous*." *Large* is generalized and neutralized, becoming the unmarked one. Because other languages may easily supply counterexamples, their explanations appear to be *less strong*. In Japanese, for example, *thin* is the unmarked one with a generic connotation.

Semantic Markedness

Markedness also pertains to semantics, where componential analysis aspects may be expressed in terms of marking (Waugh, 1982). As a result, the *horse* is unmarked for sex, while the *stallion* and *mare* are. Semantic marking is the name for such form of marking. The

semantic markedness of a word indicates that it is more particular than an unmarked one (ibid: 299-318). *Actress*, for example, is more semantically particular than *actor*. *Waitress* is a more semantic term than *waiter*. *Actress* and *Waitress* are only used to refer to females, but *actor* and *waiter* can apply to both males and females. *Actors* and *waiters* are unmarked, whereas *actress* and *waitress* are *marked*. *Actor* and *waiter* are referred to as superordinate since *actor* includes both female and male actors, and *waiter* includes both female and male waiters. However, we may observe another instance in the following examples:

(1) Is that person an *actor* or an *actress*?

(2) Is that person a *waiter* or a *waitress*?

It's simple to show that the actor and the waiter are not the same people as the actress and the waitress. They have the same connotation, referring to male and female actors, male and female waiters, and so on. The following examples can help to understand it better:

(3) Is that actor an actor or an actress?

(4) Is that waiter a waiter or a waitress?

Both examples given above are correct grammatically and semantically. However, the first and second *actor* in the first example, and the first and second *waiter* mentioned in the second example deserve a special attention. The second "actor" and "waiter" are marked, because they refer to male actors and waiters, respectively, as opposed to actress (female actor) and waitress (female waiter). They have the same semantic value (Lyons, 1968: 467). The first actor and waiter, on the other hand, are superior to the second actor and waiter since they comprise a male actor and a man waiter. The first actor and waiter are also the actress and waitress's superiors. As a result, we can see that actor and waiter (see first actor and waiter in the instances above) can be superordinate of actress and waitress, as well as coordinates and hyponyms of actor and waiter (see second actor and waiter in the above examples). Actor and waiter are more generic than actress and waitress, as can be observed. However, not all words are unmarked to the same extent.

Some opposition pairs, such as the cow/bull pair, would be difficult to distinguish, as the cow is unmarked and the bull is marked. Therefore, the phrase "those cows over there" is permissible. Of course, there might exist some bulls within them. "That cow is a bull," on the other hand, is irrational. "That dog is a bitch,"

however, is rational. It is possible to state that *dog* has a greater semantic distribution than *cow*. Another example lies in the possible referring to a female or male dog, but not a female or male cow. Cow is supposed to stand for the females of the species, whereas, a male cow is self-contradictory (Anderson, 1964; Lyons, 1995). Furthermore, when it comes to unmarkedness, *man* is considerably weaker than *cow*. Man is the opposite of woman, and man can apply to both males and females. As an example, consider the following:

Men are born with equal rights

Women are included here since the term "man" is used to refer to all individuals, i.e., human beings. Man, on the other hand, is not superior to women (Mey, 2001). "That man is a women," is odd and incorrect. Males do not include women in "those men are swimming."

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG THE THREE TYPES OF MARKEDNESS

There are certain similarities between these three forms of markedness, which represent language structure from distinct perspectives. Pairs with formal markedness frequently have distributional markedness as well. For example, the oppositions of host/hostess and healthy/unhealthy, indicate obviously the

existence of both formal and distributional markedness. Of course, there are exceptions to the rule. Sometimes, oppositions may have distributional markedness but not formal markedness, as in high/low and wide/narrow. Furthermore, certain terms are not formally marked but are marked distributionally. Count and prince, for example, are unmarked in comparison to countess and princess, but they are not appropriate in most situations. In general, terms with formal markedness (happy/unhappy, heir/heirress) often have semantic markedness as well. However, certain terms (partial/impartial) are formally marked but semantically unmarked. Words that are semantically marked (dog/bitch, cow/bull) are not always formally marked. Both semantic and distributional markedness are closely related, in the sense that all terms that are semantically marked are also distributionally marked. The following are the two points where semantic markedness and distributional markedness differ: Semantic markedness is concerned with the distinctions between words and may discriminate between different marked levels, whereas distributional markedness is concerned with the context in which the words are used.

MARKEDNESS IN ARABIC

Since the first century after Hijrah, there are significant similarities between the basic ideas articulated by the various schools of grammar that developed in America and Europe and those studied by the great Arab academics in Basra, Kufa, and Baghdad schools. The conceptual notion of markedness is one of the elements that the traditional Arab grammarians debated.

The primary mention of the concept of markedness in the classical Arabic grammar occurs when the Arab grammarians discuss the basic relation between the three parts of speech: (noun) الاسم, (verb) الفعل and (letter) الحرف.

Al-Anbari (513- 577 A.H / 1988) discusses 120 controversial issues in his well-known book "The Fair Judgment of Some Controversial Issues". The first topic addressed in this book is the initial part of speech, namely, the noun (الاسم). The Kufa School's scholars believe that the name "الاسم" springs from "الوسم". They defend their position by arguing that because the term "الوسم" in Arabic refers to the assignment of marks, the term "الاسم" is used because it is marked with the name of the item it refers to. If you say Zaid or Amr, for example, this will identify the people you call by those names and serve as a distinguishing mark. The Basra

School's academics don't consider such derivation. They believe that the name "الاسم" comes from "السمو", i.e., it has a higher rank than both الحرف and الفعل. They support their belief by asserting that the three parts of speech in Arabic have three distinct rankings.

The book's author admits that the Basra academics are more justified in this matter. On the basis of the morphology of each derivation, he presents various evidence. It is possible to conclude that the first usage of markedness in Arabic comes in the most essential and fundamental categorization in Arabic, that of parts of speech. As a result, the markedness hierarchy will be as follows:

Noun > verb > particle

That is, the noun is the least marked portion of speech in Arabic, whereas the particle is the most. The contrast between primaries and ramifications on the one hand, and regular and irregular structures on the other, is closely related with the idea of markedness in Arabic. Structures that belong to the primaries and are regular in analogy and usage are regarded unmarked, whereas structures that belong to the ramifications and are irregular in analogy and use are regarded marked.

Almost all levels of language use the notion of categorizing distinct

categories in Arabic into primaries and ramifications. The notion originated in phonology when two pioneer Arab scholars, Al-Farahidi (108-175 A.H.) and Seebawaih (d. 180 A.H.), attempted to attribute specific qualities to each phoneme in Arabic in a method somehow like the Trubetzkoj and Jakobson's procedure. They thought that assigning a zero case ending to each phoneme [علامه] and preceding it with the glottal

stop /ʔ/ followed by the vowel /i/ (همزه مكسوره) was the best approach to identify its properties. They assign certain qualities to each phoneme based on this method. The fundamental categorization to primaries and ramifications was complemented by the attribution of specific attributes to each phoneme; the following table illustrates how they assign various basic qualities to the phoneme /n/ and how they categorize these features:

The Primaries (الأصول)	The Ramifications (الفروع)
1. The phoneme /n/ is alveolar الأصل في النون أن تتطرق في اللثة	1. It might be bilabial as in (ينبج) or labio-dental as in (ينفع)
2. The phoneme /n/ is nasal الأصل في النون أن تكون أنفية	2. It might be (مفخمة / dark) and dental as in (ينظر)
3. The phoneme /n/ is voiced الأصل في النون أن تكون مجهورة	3. It might be dark and alveolar as in (ينقل)
4. The phoneme /n/ is clear الأصل في النون أن تكون مرققة	

Table 1: The Primary and Ramification Features of the Phoneme /n/ in Arabic

Based on Al-Farahidi and Seebawaih's View

Accordingly, the characteristics stated in the primaries column are the unmarked features of the phoneme column, whereas the marked features of /n/ are those listed in the ramifications column. Ibn Jinni discusses the reasoning behind such technique, assuming that the Arabs pronounce the phonemes according to their intuitions and tastes. Hence, a competent native speaker of Arabic identifies features, such as those listed

under the primaries classification, as more basic and less marked.

In terms of morphological markedness, Ibn Jinni believes that the primaries categorization consists of three major morphological forms: the trilateral form (الثلاثي), the quadrilateral form (الرباعي), and the quinqueliteral form (الخماسي). In relation to the following considerations, he thinks that the trilateral

form is more fundamental than the other forms:

- It is the most frequent form.
- It consists only three sounds (ف + ع + ل).
- It doesn't accept any suffixes.
- It is easy to pronounce.

He goes over each of these points in great depth. First, he contrasts the trilateral and biliteral forms (الثنائي), stating that, despite the actual fact that the biliteral form is more common than the trilateral form, due to the large number of biliteral words in Arabic, such as:

(من ، في ، عن ، هل ، قد ، بل ، كم ،
من ، إذ ، صه ، مه)

the trilateral form comes primarily because it is still easier and more natural to pronounce. Ibn Jinni also presents a full description of the compromise between the

three sounds of the trilateral form. He comes to the conclusion that while the trilateral form is more moderate than the biliteral form, it is also more moderate than the quadrilateral and quinqueliteral forms as well. According to this reasoning, the markedness hierarchy may be put as:

Trilateral form > Quadrilateral form
> Quinqueliteral form > Biliteral form.

Almost all significant Arabic grammar works, such as An-Nahwi (d. 316 A.H./ 1973), Al-Anbari (513-577 A.H./ 1988), Az-Zamakhshari (d.538 A.H./ 1993), Al-Hamathani (600-672/ 1985), Ibn Jinni (322-392 A.H.) and Al-Jazwali, explicitly explain the grammatical categories of primaries and ramifications. Al-Jazwali, for example, introduces a broad classification of the main components of Arabic speech into primaries and ramifications. Such classification may be contained in the table below:

	Primaries (unmarked)	Ramifications (marked)
الاسم	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Singular Masculine Indefinite (نكرة) Of Arabic origin Affix-free. Inflected (معرباً) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plural, dual Feminine Definite (معرفة) Borrowed Affixed. Uninflected (مبنياً)
الفعل	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has a trilateral form (ثلاثي) Bare (مجرد) (is not attached to any affixation) as in (ضرب/كُتِبَ/قُتِلَ) Uninflected (مبنياً) Active voice Assigned to a latent singular subject 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does not have a trilateral form; (رباعي / خماسي etc.) Affixed as in (استخرج) Inflected (معرباً) Passive voice Assigned to an overt dual or plural subject
الصفة	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Singular 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> plural, dual

2. Masculine 3. Inflected	2. Feminine 3. Uninflected
------------------------------	-------------------------------

Table 2: The Assigned Markedness of Major Parts of Speech in Arabic. Based on Ibn Jinni

The Arabic primaries and ramifications classification is not restricted to the major parts of speech. It covers the whole grammatical categories. Hassan (1988) has gathered many examples from

different Arabic grammar books, namely, Ibn As-Saraj (d. 316 A.H/ 1973); Al-Anbari (513- 577 A.H). Some of the gathered examples by Hassan might be contained in the following table:

Primaries (unmarked)	Ramifications (marked)
1. The singular	The plural/ dual
2. The overt (المظهر)	The latent (المضمّر)
3. Post-verbal bound pronouns (كتبه/ ضربهم/ أعطانا)	Post-nominal bound pronouns (زيد أخوك)
4. The noun	The verb
5. The verbs are uninflected (مبنيّة) as in (ضرب/أضرب)	The verbs are inflected (معربة) as in (يدرس / يقوم)
6. The nouns are inflected as in (طالب / طالباً / طالبٌ)	Uninflected members of the class (مَنْ / كَمْ / كيف)
7. 1 st person free pronouns (أنا / نحن)	2 nd and 3 rd person free pronouns (هما / هم -أنت أنتما)
8. The nominative case (حالة الرفع)	The accusative and genitive case (حالاتا النصب والجر)
9. The governor precedes the governee in rank as in (كتب محمدُ الدرس)	The governee precedes the governor in rank (محمدُ كتب الدرس)
10. Hierarchical order (الترتيب حسب الرتبة)	Fronting and Postponement as in (في الجامعة متحف)

Table 3: Some Examples of Marked/Unmarked Distinction

in Arabic Grammar. Based on Hassan (1988)

The above table shows clearly the wide range of markedness coverage throughout the Arabic Grammatical categories. Furthermore, many traditional Arab grammarians agree on the possible identification of almost all the primary structures in terms of some basic primaries which might be called as "the origin of the originals", (اصل الاصول). For example, Hassan (1988) cites some of these basic primaries, specifically,

- Inflection is used primarily to serve a particular semantic function.
- The subjective is primarily definite and the Predicate is primarily indefinite.
- Adjectives agree with the substantives they modify in case endings.
- Definite substantives are primarily not modified.

One remaining issue of markedness is the concept of markedness reversal in both English and Arabic languages. As proved by Henning Anderson (1972: 45) and Shapiro (1983:97), that this kind of treatment is found in Arabic, but under different constraints. Shapiro believes that under specific circumstances, the markedness values of phonological and semantic elements may be affected and/or reversed. For example, lexical markedness reversal could be highly triggered by different factors, like cultural relevance, prototypicality, and frequency of occurrence; as it is found in the opposition of masculine/feminine. Although it is universally acknowledged that the masculine characteristic is unmarked, this relationship is reversed in a number of English opposing words, like the case with the word "nurse," which may apply to nurses of either sex. This is the main reason that we have the compound name "man nurse."

The classical Arab grammarians assume that markedness reversal or literary (to retract in admitting the primaries/ العدول (عن الأصل), is either regular (عدول مطرد) or irregular (عدول غير مطرد). Hassan (1988) states different reasons behind some cases of markedness reversal in Arabic. One important reason is to avoid ambiguity. For instance, the Subject in Arabic should be fronted and the Predicate postponed. In

some sentences this primary structure is reversed to have clear pronominal binding as in:

1. -في أكفانه لف الميت
2. -تميمي أنا
3. -في بيته يؤتى الحكم

The rule of Subject fronting is also reversed when the Subject is indefinite and the Predicate is an adverbial or prepositional phrase as in:

4. -و عندهم قاصرات الطرف عين
-قال تعالى:
5. وَفِي الْأَرْضِ آيَاتٌ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ (الذاريات/ 51 آية 20)
6. وَفِي السَّمَاءِ رِزْقُكُمْ وَمَا تُوعَدُونَ (الذاريات/ 51 آية 22)

Another reason behind markedness reversal in Arabic lies in Preferences of particular primaries. Sometimes two contradictory primary structures might compete in the same position of the sentence. For instance, the Subject fronting rule and the fronting of some interrogative words (كيف, كم, أين etc.). In such cases the interrogative word wins because interrogative words are uninflected (كلمات) (جامدة) and hence, they are more primitive than the inflected words to which Subject belongs as in (كيف عمرو؟).

CONCLUSIONS

The researcher discovered a lot of evidence in the literature to achieve the aim of this study, namely, the disputed presence of markedness in Standard Arabic. Many classical Arab grammarians have proved that there are certain patterns in Arabic which are more fundamental, more natural, and more obvious than others. They classify Arabic grammar into two main categories of grammatical structures, which the researcher has named primaries and ramifications depending on this generalization. They've found a clear connection between the two sorts of structures. Among many others, Al-Anbari (513-577 A.H/ 1988) and Al-Ansari (708-761 A.H/1979) assume the following characteristics:

- The primaries and the ramifications are not identical.
- The ramifications often have a lower rank.
- The ramifications always represent the weaker parts of speech.
- The ramifications may share some features of the primaries.
- The ramifications are never stronger than the primaries.
- The ramifications follow the same specifications of the primaries and

they only contradict them in some exceptional cases.

Arriving at the above findings, the researcher can confirm the clear existence of markedness in Standard Arabic with the *primaries* as marked forms and *ramifications* as unmarked ones.

On the other hand, it has been concluded that the big efforts of scholars and experts on markedness in different aspects contribute a lot to the development of Markedness Theory and its applications in different linguistic fields. Markedness Theory provides a brand new perspective to the study of language structure making it possible to conceive specific linguistic phenomena. However, there are still problems and limitations for Markedness Theory. Continuous efforts should be made to enrich Markedness Theory and enlarge and deepen its application to other scientific fields.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson N. H. (1964). Likeableness Ratings of 555 Personality-traits Adjectives. University of California at Los Angeles. Unpublished manuscript.
2. Archangeli D. B. (1992). "Markedness in phonology" in International encyclopedia of linguistics. Vol. 2. Edited by W. J. Frawley, 391-393. Oxford: oxford Uni. Press.
3. Battistella E. (1996). The Logic of Markedness. NY: Oxford University Press.
4. Boucher J. & Osgood, C. E. (1969) "The Pollyanna Hypothesis". Journal of Verbal Learning and Behaviour. 8: 1-8.

5. Chandler D. (2005). Entry on Markedness. In John Protevi (ed.) (2005) *Edinburgh Dictionary of Continantal Philisophy*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
6. Chomsky N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
7. _____(1979). *Language and Responsibility*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
8. _____(1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordercht: Foris.
9. _____(1988). *Language and Problem of Knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
10. Clark H. H. & Clark E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Hovanovich..
11. Eckman F. (1977). "Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis", in *Language Learning* 27: 315-330.
12. ----- (1985). "The Markedness differential hypothesis: theory and applications" in B. Whealhy, A. Hastings, F. Eckman et al. (1984). "Current approaches to second language acquisition". *Proceedings of the 1984 University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee Linguistics Symposium Indiana University Linguistics Club Bloomington Milwaukee*: 3-21.
13. Fries C. (1945). *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
14. Gibb H. A. R. (1962). *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
15. Lado R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.
16. Lycan W. G. (2001). *Real conditionals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
17. Lyons J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Lyons J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Mey J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
20. Rozin P., Berman L., Royzman E. (2010). "Biases in use of positive and negative words across twenty languages". *Cognition & Emotion*. 24: 336-548.
21. Segal G. M. A. (2000). *A slim book about narrow content*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
22. Shapiro M. (1983) *The Sense of Grammar: Language as Semiotic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
23. Suitner C. & Maass A. (2008). "The Role of Valence in the Perception of Agency and Communion". *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 38: 1073-1082.
24. Trask R. L. (1993). *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge Inc.
25. Trubetzkoy N. S. (1969). *Principles of phonology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
26. Turner K. (1999). *The semantics/pragmatics interface from different points of view*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
27. Waugh Linda (1982). "Marked and Unmarked: A Choice between Unequals in Semiotic Structure". *Semiotica*; 38: 299-318.