

LANGUAGE IS TOO COMPLEX TO EXPLAIN WITH A SINGLE FORMALISM: the theory of evolution and the Chaos theory, two interacting partners in the study of the evolution of language

Svetlana T. Davidova

Abstract

Evolutionary linguistics explains the existence of language from two competing perspectives. On the one hand it is envisioned as an evolutionary process of variation and selection resulting in the formation of a Language Faculty, by some, and as cultural evolution in the formation of languages by others. The competing alternative view evokes the Chaos theory and the concept of self-organization in either biological context, explaining the formation of a Language Faculty by self-organization of neurons, or in language systems as the formation of sociolects and idiolects.

The present article argues that both evolutionary principles and self-organization interact at every step in an entangled interdependence in the formation and functioning of language and languages, which makes the individual participation of each difficult to pinpoint and estimate, suggesting that the evolution of language is better understood by treating the two formalisms as two interacting partners, not as alternatives.

Keywords: self-organization, Language Faculty, co-evolution, complexity, idiolect, sociolect

Introduction : evolution vs. self-organization, two alternative explanations for the existence of complex design

Self-organization and evolution are evoked as explanation for the existence of complex design . That said, these are two very different processes and operate in two very different ontological areas: the former in inorganic matter the later in life forms.

That said, attempts are made by some in the field of life sciences to explain complex biological properties by evoking self-organization as alternative to Darwinian evolution.

Evolution and self-organization are said to be theoretical alternatives in explaining the complexity of individual life forms and the diversity of species Longa V., and Lorenzo G. (2014) discuss various points of difference and find the two incompatible.

In the explanation of change and diversity they diverge on the following criteria:

- a. pace of changes: gradual (evolution) vs. abrupt (self-organization)
- b. triggers for change : external (evolution) vs. internal (self-organization)
- c. direction of change : isotropic , or non-directional (evolution) vs. directional from disorder to order (self-organization).
- d. products of change: change in degree as small alterations in pre-existing biological entities vs. biological innovations, change in kind
- e. processes involved: competition (evolution) vs. cooperation, coordination (self-organization)
- f. role of participants: passive (evolution) vs. active (self-organization)
- g. levels of organization: genocentric (evolution) vs. Epigenesis and behaviour-centred (self-organization).

To sum up, changes in the biosphere are explained differently by different theories with

different conceptual machinery . They all offer one vision to the exclusion of all alternatives. Importantly, the same “ either or” perspective is assumed by linguists where alternative explanations are offered for the modern shape of the Language Faculty in biolinguistic, and for the shape of languages in usage-based/emergentist contexts.

Importantly, Darwin's theory is formulated for explanation of the diversity of species of life forms and , as such, reflects the fundamental properties of biological beings.

The Chaos theory is designed to explain the diversity of forms in physical matter and, as such, reflects the fundamental properties of lifeless matter.

That said, recently both Darwin's theory and the Chaos theory have been reinvented to explain a broader range of phenomena, e.g. Universal Darwinism as a universal theory explaining cultural and linguistic diversity, and the Chaos theory for explaining complex formations in biology, cognition, linguistics, cultural artifacts.

Most importantly, both Darwinism and the chaos theory are evoked as competing explanations of language as a biological organ, and languages as cultural creations.

That said, language is a highly complex phenomenon composed of multiple components of different ontological types : physical matter , e.g. sound waves, chemical substances and compounds as building blocks of the human organism, biological matter , e.g structures and systems in the human organism which participate in language-related activities, , as well as non-material, e.g. abstract concepts, all of which interact and change as they form a unique complex. This suggests that one-sided perspectives are bound to provide simplistic and incomplete explanations.

In the present paper I will offer an alternative perspective, i.e that both evolutionary principles and self-organization interact in an entangled interdependence in the formation and functioning of language and languages, which makes the individual participation of each difficult to pinpoint and estimate.

1. The original theory of evolution by Charles Darwin

Darwin's theory of evolution of species by natural selection is one of the major scientific achievements of all times. It defines diversification of life forms as alteration in heritable characteristics of successive generations. It is a three-step process and encompasses three interconnected phenomena in the living world : inheritance, variation and differential survival. Darwinian theory has offered a plausible explanation for the presence of complex design in life forms. In Darwin's theory the diversity of species is explained as resulting from series of small successive modifications in the ancestral species, by which they aim at becoming maximally fit to some element of the environment . These small modifications , gradually accumulated in each new generation of descendants, lead to their divergence into new species. The following summary by Schoenemann (1999) outlines the general principles of evolution in a concise and clear form:

1. Evolutionary changes are gradual, evolution is a process in which changes occur in small steps, each one of which is independently beneficial for the survival of the species, undergoing the change.

2. Evolution prefers continuity. Evolutionary changes are incremental, they are improvements upon prior adaptations. In Schoenemann (1999) “ Evolution does not produce novelties from scratch. It works on what already exists” (p. 313)

3. Evolution prefers domain-general mechanisms as they lend themselves to modifications. In Schoenemann (2005) "...the evolutionary process does not favor the evolution of domain-specific modules...the evolutionary process itself is inevitably biased towards modifying mechanisms that are by definition more domain-general" (p.4).
4. Evolutionary changes are usually preceded by behavioural shifts as the biological entity is forced to extend the limits of its behavioural flexibility to cope with the environmental challenges. In Schoenemann (2005) "Behavioural adaptations which require minimal genetic changes will be favoured at each step." (p.4).
5. Evolutionary goals are short-term solutions to local circumstances. Evolution does not have long-term plans. It is a reactionary process as it reacts to present and local circumstances and has no foresight or planning. Evolutionary change does not imply progress in absolute sense. Progress is defined only in terms of survival in the local environment at a given time-period.
6. Evolution is not concerned with the good of the species as a whole, it works on improving the survival of the individual organism.
7. Organisms do not evolve in isolation. Evolutionary changes are an adaptation to some feature of the environment. Thus, evolution is a change triggered from factors external to the organism. It is a change from without. The concept of environment includes not only the physical environment but also other organisms in the ecosystem with which an organism co-evolves.

1.1. Evolution of Darwinism

Modern science has prompted various interpretations of the original Darwinian theory. Classical physics has influenced studies of evolution in portraying it as recombination of stable immutable entities which act as abstract individual entities independently of context. Mendelian heredity bears the name of Mendel who in the 19th century designed a mathematical model for describing heredity. The modern interpretation of Mendel's theory understands the organism in terms of an abstract model as a combination of discrete elements and describes heredity as "inheritance by which stable non-decomposable characters, controlled entirely or overwhelmingly by a single genetic locus, are transmitted over many generations" (in www.medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/mendelian+inheritance).

The Mendelian paradigm combined with molecular biological perspective on heredity furnishes the modern understanding of evolution. Mendelian use of mathematical concepts is coupled with the influence of Turing's theory of computation in modern biology. Concepts and principles of computation are borrowed from Turing where a finite and predetermined set of abstract symbols automatically combine according to a finite number of equally predetermined rules resulting in an infinite number of combinations. In this context evolution is defined as a computation process where a finite number of basic discrete units of DNA molecules combine and form the diversity of life forms. Key concepts are DNA, genotype, phenotype.

1.2. Evolution as a multidimensional process

The evolutionary process is a complex interaction and interdependence of evolutionary inheritance in various contexts. Jablonka, Lamb (2005) distinguish 4 dimensions: inheritance

at the genetic level, epigenetic inheritance, inheritance in developmental routines, inheritance of behaviour.

The term “epigenesis” was coined by Waddington in the 1940s and refers to processes of formation of the new organism, the phenotype, through interaction of the genome with the environment at the molecular level. The building of the new organism starts from the formation of a new genome by copying of the parental genomes. The information about the post-fertilization process of building of various organs and tissues of the new organism is contained in the so called regulatory genes which follow established pathways of turning on and off specific chemical processes at specific time-frames depending on the type of tissue. The epigenetic routines are also referred to as “canalization” of the developmental process to follow established pathways. The activities of the regulatory genes, their time schedules, i.e. patterns of epigenetic development, are preserved by the cell memory and passed on, so the new daughter cells follow the same developmental routines. Thus, epigenetic routines are also inherited.

In addition, experience can trigger alterations in the genome. This idea was first proposed by Mark Baldwin and is known as the Baldwin effect. Baldwin argues that a behaviour, which initially consumes much effort and time to learn, can gradually become easier to master with every new generation to the point when very little or no learning is required and the behaviour essentially becomes instinctive. Baldwinian evolution is an intelligent solution nature has found to successfully respond to unpredictable environmental challenges.

In addition, behaviour routines are copied/inherited by learning. Individual animals learn from experience and social animals learn from conspecifics. Learned behaviours are not inherited by the genome, they are learned anew by each new generation. The process of learning from conspecifics is defined in Darwinian terms as inheritance of knowledge by copying of information from one brain to another. Similar to other types of inheritance the process of copying is subjected to errors which creates variation. Behavioural inheritance follows the general principles of a Darwinian process i.e., as part of the learning process behavioural innovations are selectively perpetuated given survival superiority to alternatives.

In sum, evolution is a highly complex process where a number of sub-evolutions interact to determine the observable diversity of life.

“...there are several types of heritable variation ...transmitted in different ways, and selection operates simultaneously on different traits and at different levels of biological organization.” (Jablonka, Lamb, 2005, p. 276). “Something like evolution can occur in each dimension. But...we are not made up of four neat and separate dimensions, we are a messy complex. And it is the complex that evolves” (Lamb, Jablonka, 2005, p. 231).

1.3. Universal neo-Darwinism

D. Hull proposes a generalized theory of evolutionary change where the theory of evolution by natural selection is used as a template for understanding similar processes in other phenomena. The basic principles of Darwinism are incorporated in an overarching general theory of evolution, which defines evolutionary changes in abstract terms and aims to understand processes of change in any context. Hull's generalized theory of evolution, in analogy to biological evolution, understands evolution in general as two different processes, of replication and selection, performed by two different entities with two different roles in the

evolutionary process : replicators, which are copied, and interactors, which interact with the environment and are subjected to selection. He maintains the separation between replicator and interactor but points out that , like in biology, the roles of replicators and interactors can be assumed by different entities at different levels of structural complexity. For example, genes, chromosomes and species can be both replicators and interactors.

2. Darwinism as explanation for modern language

The evolutionary theory is evoked in two contexts: in biolinguistic context for the phylogenesis of the Language Faculty and in the usage-based approaches for the glossogenesis of languages.

2.1. Phylogenesis of a Language Faculty

Pinker and Bloom (1990) were the first to suggest darwinian explanation for human linguistic abilities via gradual incremental alterations in the genetic makeup of an organism as adaptations to environmental changes in the form of a language instinct/language organ/Language capacity, a cognitive structure containing Universal Grammar and located in Broca' s region of the brain.

To remind, the functioning of the language algorithm is premised on the pre-existing lexicon from where words are selected and combined by an operation Merge. Under the latest version of minimalism it is hypothesized to produce grammars with the properties defined by the Principles and Parameters /Government and Binding approach. These are as follows: *It produces hierarchically organized structures. *All operations are cyclical. *All operations are local. *Control operates on deficient clauses which contain elements in need of proper case assignment . *Rules are structure-dependent. * Movement is always local, upwards, structure-preserving and under C-command configuration. * Case and agreement apply at Xo and XP, but not at X' level. *Pronouns and reflexives are in complementary distribution and are subjected to binding principles. *Grammatical structures must be semantically interpretable. * The output of each cycle of linguistic computations are fed into two interfaces, the Logical form and the Phonological form, which produce meaningful and pronounceable pieces of usable language. The Minimalist views on the Language faculty are outlined in detail in Chomsky 2005, Hornstein 2018 and elsewhere.

Initially the existence of a Language capacity in the human brain was explained in terms of genetic evolution and the discovery that a single gene, FOXP2 was directly responsible for complex linguistic functions. Lately other genes, e.g. ROBO1, ROBO2 and CNTNAP2 were determined to be implicated in language-relevant functions, in recognition of the pervasive pleiotropy of the organism. (D.Dediu, V.Levinson, 2018).

A multistage hypothesis (Jackendoff 2002; Culicover, Jackendoff 2005; Jackenfoff, Wittenberg 2014) envisages phylogenesis of language as a gradual multistage process where cognitive changes in the homo lineage are reflected in language systems of gradually increasing grammatical complexity and culminating in modern multileveled structure of language.

To note, attempts of evolutionary explanation of the Language faculty by linguists reveal misunderstanding of fundamental evolutionary principles. For example, as a general

characteristic of the evolutionary process, a genetic mutation survives the selection process if it produces phenotypes capable of surviving and reproducing at rates higher than the competition. That is, a Language Capacity for complex language, in order to be competitive, must prove not just its utility but its reproductive superiority compared to alternatives. That said, there is no evidence for connection between language skills and fertility.

“...the claim that greater rationality and linguistic ability lead to greater offspring production is largely a modern prejudice” (Lewontin, 1998, p. 22).

Importantly, the generative stipulation that the rules of grammar determined by the Language Faculty are arbitrary, i.e. unmotivated by language use, one of the most foundational assumptions of the innatist argument, contradicts claims for its selective advantages and reproductive superiority.

Similarly, the vision of Language Capacity as uniform, i.e. each individual brain has an identical copy of it, contradicts a fundamental principle of evolution, a process of selection based on variation, which injects additional confusion in the generative argument.

In addition, the assumption of pre-existence of a lexicon, i.e. a cultural invention, as a pre-condition for the bio-program to be turned on has no known parallels in life sciences and is, I suspect, a biological impossibility.

Importantly, the generative/biolinguistic approach and its conceptualization of the Language faculty as a biological tissue in terms of artificial systems reveals misunderstanding of life forms, the human mind and evolution by assuming that somehow a biological entity can violate the laws of life forms and still remain a biological entity. In this sense the conceptualization of linguistic ability as computation makes sense only as a metaphor, on the basis of similarity. Nevertheless, metaphors are the province of art, not science. It is true that analogy can and often does add some value using available knowledge to understand the unknown on the basis of similarity. That said, in this case it is not similarity, it is equivalence which allows for a literal, not metaphorical, substitution of a biological entity with a man-made mechanical device. Replacing one ontological category with another literally as a theoretical foundation for scholarly research does not lead to credible conclusions.

In sum, the generative/biolinguistic conception of the Language Faculty is in contradiction with evolutionary principles limits the possibility for delivering reliable insights and understanding of the evolution of language.

2.2. Darwinism as glossogenesis of modern languages

Hull's theory is applied for explaining changes in various spheres: life forms, cultural practices (from technology, farming, fashion, to institutions, language). Dawkins (1976) proposes that cultural evolution can be understood with Darwinian principles of variation and selection. He introduces the concept of 'meme' as unit of cultural evolution analogue to the gene in biology.

In linguistics there is a long tradition in defining language diversity in biological terms as diversification of languages from a common ancestor. It begins with Darwin himself who has written about the analogy of languages to species. (Darwin, 1871, referenced by M. Studderd-Kennedy, 1990). This tendency is continued by 19th century European linguists and later, with the discovery of the genome and reinterpretation of Darwin's theory of evolution in terms of genetic evolution as Mendelian genetics, the tradition of defining language in biological

terms has been reinterpreted by finding analogies with genes in the domain of language. Scholars who see parallels between languages and biological beings look for similarities between biological evolution and changes in language systems and assume that the principles of Darwinian evolution by variation and natural selection can be borrowed to explain historical changes in the language systems over time, a process termed glossogenesis.

In the usage-based approaches principles and methods of modern genetics are borrowed into linguistics in effort to understand change in language systems as linguistic forms are likened to genes and language systems to genomes. In this way genetics is applied for determining the phylogeny of languages as branches of language families.

Moreover, some find relatedness between evolution in human populations and languages. This led to the hypothesis of the African Eve, which argues that all humans are descendants of a small population which lived in Africa some 150,000-200,000 years ago (ya) and all modern languages have branched out of the so called protoworld, or “mother tongue”, the language of this ancestral population, whose traces, seen as linguistic genes, are said to be preserved in modern languages, was proposed by Merritt Ruhlen (1996) and Ruhlen (1992). The theory has been criticized and is not accepted by most linguists.

The theory of grammaticalization understands glossogenesis/ language change as change in the individual linguistic entity. Each individual linguistic entity has its own evolutionary path, although most follow a general pattern: lexical (content) word > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix. (Heine and Kuteva 2007)

As an alternative to the gene-centred perspective on lifeforms and languages, the population perspective on organisms by E. Mayr (2001 What evolution is) A population perspective defines languages in terms of population of idiolects: if different language varieties are mutually intelligible then they belong to the same language. In analogy to species' reproductive isolation which is the cause of speciation, communicative isolation leads to loss of intelligibility which marks the difference between language varieties and different languages. So, in this context a language is defined in terms of the linguistic interactions of a community. Croft's model of language evolution (2000) adopts the population perspective on evolution in the study of linguistic phenomena. Here language is the set of linguemes, abstract linguistic entities, e.g., a phoneme, a word in its conventional phonemic structure, syntactic features, etc. are formed by conventions and reside in minds. They are replicators, the linguistic equivalent of the gene. Utterances, the linguistic equivalent of biological bodies are the interactors which, by their interactions make possible the replication of linguemes. Thus, the replication of linguemes happens via the use of linguistic utterances/interactors.

In Croft glossogenesis follows the general principles of evolution:

a. variation: variation in various levels of language use is pervasive: 1. there is diversity of idiolects, 2. among sociolects, as sociolinguistic diversity, motivated by various social factors: age, gender, class, 3. variation within idiolects: in phonetics, lexicon and grammar as the same person is found to use different linguistic devices at different occasions in expressing the same idea.

b. competition: in language two or more vocabulary items are used as alternatives to encode the same concept (synonyms), or various syntactic structures are alternatively used to describe

the same event . For example: “ He decided to leave : it was getting late.” vs. “ He decided to leave because it was getting late.”

c. inheritance : some linguistic forms are persistently used over generations , which makes possible the understanding between generations.

2.3. Language change is not evolution.

Although many scholars, starting from Darwin, have pointed at similarities between the processes of change in biological and linguistic contexts , prompting the transplant of conceptual machinery from biology into linguistics, there are also significant differences. For example :

* The mechanisms of inheritance in linguistic and biological contexts differ significantly. In phylogenesis acquired characteristics are not transmitted to the next generation, while in glossogenesis such transmission is the norm, since linguistic innovations of predecessors are perpetuated by the new generation. Thus, biological evolution is Darwinian-Mendelian, glossogenesis is Lamarckian.

* In phylogenesis the genomes of the parents are inherited in their entirety at the single point of conception , while linguistic items are learned piece-meal at different points of the learning process.

* Linguistic entities are transmitted (inherited) via language use , that is, mediated by communicative interaction as conscious behaviour, while genes are inherited directly, by instinctive urge to produce offsprings.

* In genetic transmission the offspring has no active role in the production of the new genotype, while in the formation of the idiolect the learner is active participant by making choices in reflection of one's individuality.

* In life forms an organism inherits characteristics of two parents, while in the formation of the idiolect multiple community members , e.g. parents, extended family, neighbours, teachers etc. make linguistic contributions. Moreover, in biological organisms the offspring inherits the totality of the parents' genomes, while in the idiolect the contribution of the parents' idiolects is one of many.

* In life forms genetic variation is produced by recombination of the pool of parental genes, while in the formation of the idiolect the learner can introduce his/her own innovations , although these are restricted by what would be considered acceptable by the community. The formation of the idiolect, then, is a creative process and a reflection of one's individuality as a creative entity.

* In phylogenesis copying errors are rare and the genome is highly conservative, while languages display a much higher intra-lingual diversity of idiolects and sociolects which amplifies the potential choices for selection.

* The selection factors in phylogenesis and glossogenesis are very different. Although biological factors play a role in both processes, in glossogenesis the social and cultural environment is of primary importance.

* The number of species of flora and fauna is in the millions, while diversity of languages is highly constrained at about 7000.

In short, evoking darwinian principles in explaining diversity and change in languages, although providing some valuable contributions in extending our knowledge of the world languages and their past histories, is not able on its own to provide a full picture as it ignores the role of biological evolution of the human Language capacity, in whatever form it will be determined to exist in the human body.

3. The complexity paradigm

Given that the theory of evolution is well known as is application of evolutionary principles in linguistics, hence, the evolution of language, a major topic of research, further comments on that are, I think, unnecessary. On the other hand, the complexity paradigm is fairly recent and much less known to linguistic circles which demands some detail of exposition. It was initially meant to explain the appearance of complex organization in physical matter.

A system is complex if it is composed of multiple component parts each semi - independent, but connected by membership in an integrated whole. Complex systems are emergent, and thus, are historical entities and as such are unique. This is because emergent wholes are hierarchical systems, where each new level of complexity is organized differently(Corning,1998, 2002,)

A complex system is situated at the cusp between order and chaos, that is, it is neither completely predetermined and predictable, nor completely chaotic and unpredictable. Under certain conditions order can be replaced by chaos and vice versa, a chaotic system can self-organize, that is, form structure. This means that order is flexible and alterable. This means that order and disorder/chaos naturally co-exist and create one another. This brings possibility of change, which is inherent in nature (Heylighen, 2008). In this context change is explained with series of spontaneous unmotivated events of emergence of novelties . The theory defines complexity in terms of simple interactions among multiple individual entities which produce results different from the actions of these as individual entities in isolation and by which complex internal organization is produced . In short, the whole is different from the sum of its parts and collective complexity spontaneously emerges from individual simplicity where simplicity is defined as lack of internal organization, that is, something is simple if it is indivisible and homogeneous .

As a general term “ emergence” means an unprecedented and sudden event of appearance of groundbreaking novelties in nature. Emergence concerns the elements of complex systems, some of which spontaneously interact , giving rise to well organized new entities.

“ ...rule-like reality can emerge from apparently unregulated behaviour. “(Ellis, N. 1998, p.643)

It stands for the appearance of “radical novelty”, that is, new patterns, structures , etc. not predictable from antecedent conditions and impossible to anticipate . It also implies a clear difference of before and after state, a qualitative change Emergent phenomena are the result of self-organization.

“ Emergence is what self-organizing processes produce.” (Corning 2002)

Although emergence implies a change in kind in a short time, it is actually a three-stage process : synergy, self-organization, emergence. Synergistic/cooperative behaviours , initially occasional, are repeated / imitated , which in turn, leads to the establishment of more permanent organization among the elements participating in the interactions, which, in the end

leads to the emergence/appearance of novel stable integrated wholes.

Thus, a newly formed complex novelty is produced by a succession of events where cooperative behaviours of ever increasing strength build upon one another.

Self-organization is a key concept in the complexity theory. Self-organization is a general property of complex systems, where in a singular event global organization in form of patterns emerges from interactions at a lower, local level, or "...well defined patterns emerge spontaneously giving rise to order in a system from previous chaos." (Longa, V. , 2001, p.4) In sum, a self-organizing system is one capable of self-control.

Order is defined as a state of a system which is describable by fewer rules, established by the coordinated behaviour of interacting entities which, initially acting chaotically as independent individuals, under certain conditions coordinate their behaviours in a pattern and become members of a unity.

The following characteristics are defining features of self-organization.

1. Absence of external cause. The process of internal organization and structure-creation is prompted by internal pressures, quite unlike the process of adaptation in biological evolution , where external forces from the environment are the cause of change .

2. Critical mass. The emergence of structure takes place when the number of participating elements reaches a critical mass and as a result "...a quantitative change triggers a sudden qualitative change: the emergence of order. " (Longa, 2001, p.12).

3. Absence of internal centralized control , instead control is "distributed" as all participant units have some influence over the final outcome, the shape of the new pattern as their interactions at a local level result in the emergence of unifying global patterns, i.e. "... The local alignment has expanded into a global order." (Heylighen, F. 1999)

Magnetism , herds of sheep, flocks of birds, ecosystems, stock markets, etc. , all display ability to spontaneously organize into self-regulating systems .

4. Non-linearity. Unlike linear systems, where the effect is proportionate to the cause, in non-linear systems this relation is unpredictable. This means that small changes could have enormous effect and vice versa. This follows from the so called " feed-back " : each component is connected to each one of the rest; so, a change in one component causes changes in all of the rest which, in turn, comes back full circle to affect the first component, the initiator of the change. The feed-back can be positive or negative at different places in the system, which makes the final outcome unpredictable.

6. A self-organizing system is a closed, or isolated from the surrounding environment and, although the system constantly interacts with its environment, its internal organization is clearly distinct . Thus, self-organization happens when a number of individual entities are isolated from the broad environment, find themselves in close contact with one another and engage in interactions among themselves. As a result of their interactions they change from individual entities to components or members which form a unity.

" ... Organizational closure turns a collection of interacting elements into an individual, coherent whole" (Heylighen, F. 1999 p.11)

That said, although relatively isolated from outside influences, a self-organizing system is opened to influx of energy from outside which, crucially, is the source of disorder, or chaos, and the trigger for self-organization , or order, i.e. the emergence of a new whole with new properties.

The internal organization of this whole gives rise to new properties, non-reducible to the sum

of the properties of the participating components. There are no universal patterns of self-organization and no predetermined blueprint : the process is by definition a spontaneous, unpredictable and creative one, while following simple, general and universal principles of interaction.

To recap , the main characteristics of a complex system can be summarized as follows:

1. It is composed of various semi-independent parts which exist and interact in coordinated way as components of a unified whole. The interactions among the components produce additional value over and above the value of the independent actions of the same entities as individuals.
2. The components of a complex system change as a result of interactions which results in internal restructuring of the complex as a whole.
3. Internal changes inside the system may not result in a change in the overall functioning of the system which remains stable as a whole. Nevertheless, when a breaking point is reached a swift change in the internal structure of the system takes place.
4. As internal changes are not detectable from outside, the future states of the system are difficult to anticipate with certainty, only with various degrees of probability : the trajectory of future patterns is likely to be a continuation of a trajectory formed in the past. Prediction in this context is only an estimation of possibility, not certainty.

Lately the complexity paradigm was reinterpreted for understanding changes in the biosphere, by Gould , Lewontin (1979) and others.

3.1. Locating life at the edge of chaos

In modern science the theory of evolution by natural selection, initially designed by Darwin is recognized as the best explanation for the diversity of life forms.

In recent years the chaos theory is proposed as an alternative hypothesis to Darwin's theory, most notably by S. Kauffman (1995 and elsewhere)

In this context the universal laws of self-organization suggests that the emergence of life is inevitable and should be ubiquitous throughout the universe in some universal form, predetermined by God-like principles, given that self-organizing life in its universal form would exist irrespective of the environmental conditions on a specific planet, in rejection of Darwinian principles of adaptation to an environment. This suggests the direct implication that astronauts would find life forms on Mars, the moon and everywhere else, similar to these on earth, i.e. in demonstration of a universal “ body plan” with some minor variations explicable with different combinations of “ parameter tuning ”.

As per Kauffman life is “ natural outgrowth of the world in which we live”.(Kauffman, S. 1995, p.26)

And most importantly, Kauffman suggests that life has emerged at once in its fully modern form.

“ Life emerged, I suggest, not simple but complex and whole, and has remained complex and whole ever since” (Kauffman, *ibid.* p. 25-26)

My take on the argument that life on earth can be explained in the context of the Chaos theory is as follows: if life is the inevitable result of the spontaneous formation of order for free, it would be fairly easy to demonstrate that in lab experiments. I know of no such demonstrations so far. Moreover, if all species, simple and complex, emerged simultaneously, this implies that human species are not 250,000 years old, but human speciation is as old as life on earth, i.e. 4

billion years old. In addition, it must be anticipated that extraterrestrial intelligent life, very similar to ours is a given. The fact that visits to near by planets have not found it possibly suggests that human astronauts are unable to detect it. In any case, how an empirical proof of the hypothesis would look like?

Others, Camazine (2001), see also T. Seeley, 2001) argue that self-organization is preferred in the diversification of life forms as in some aspects of the evolutionary process change is easier to achieve by self-organization. For example, in social species selection favours products of self-organization in physiology and behaviours, as opposed to genetically pre-specified patterns of development for the following reasons:

a. blueprints are complex, self-organization is simple.

The formation of genetically based complex behaviours (blueprints) usually involves genetic changes of great specificity and precision which are difficult to implement by development. In contrast, the genetic instructions for coordinating group behaviours are simple and usually more general. Nature prefers simplicity.

b. blueprints are costly, self-organization is cheap.

The formation of blueprints demands more energy costs due to its specificity. Self-organizing systems are more economical to develop.

c. central control is difficult to establish by genetically determined avenues for information transmission and coordination. In large animal groups the formation of a genetic recipe must include instructions for the individual animals to work together in a coordinated way and each individual genotype must be specified for a specific role in collective activities (e.g. construction in beavers or nest building in birds) considerable cognitive complexity in individual members is required. In addition, the establishment of central control in the form of a leader is hampered by the fact that animals usually communicate at a local level and, for example, in a group of several million ants the authority of a leader is not possible to establish due to lack of innate patterns of information transmission for which even more genetic complexity is needed. Coordination of individual behaviours at a local level is much easier to establish.

d. Blueprints are stable and inflexible, self-organization is adaptable.

This presents a problem in social species as the individual behaviour must constantly adapt to the behaviours of group members.

4. Self-organization and evolution, theoretical rivals in explaining complexity of biological form

As mentioned above, in modern science the internal complexity and diversity in life forms on earth is explained with two alternative theoretical platforms, evolution and self-organization. Darwin's theory of evolution in its modern interpretation defines life as a tree where species branch out from a common ancestor following a lengthy process of accumulation and differential inheritance of minor differences in the genotype causing diversity in the phenotype. At the centre of evolutionary processes is the genome, the repository of instructions for the formation of the organism. It is the dominant theory in biological sciences.

The theory of complexity is usually credited with explaining the provenance of complex entities in the non-organic world. The former is a process which affects independently

functioning individuals, the later, individuals acting in coordination as members of a unity. In biosphere evolutionary changes are adaptations to some feature of the environment, while this is not the case on physical matter. Moreover, the standard version of the evolutionary theory explains changes in biological bodies as top-down, or from genome to phenotype. In self-organization changes are from bottom up, thus, locally emerging patterns become globalized. In addition, complex entities of physical matter are independent of the environment, thus, adaptation is not a factor, although crucial for life forms. In addition, evolution of species is expected to be gradual and incremental over long time periods, while self-organization usually implies a swift qualitative change producing complex novelties in a short time.

So the two theories are different because they formalize different types of reality, thus, epistemological differences reflect ontological differences.

4.1.Punctuated equilibrium, alternative to evolution

Although the theory of evolution is currently dominant in modern science, alternative hypotheses have questioned some major tenets of the theory and proposing alternatives. The hypothesis of punctuated equilibrium by Gould and Eldridge has emerged as a counterargument to Darwinian gradualism as explanation for diversity in life forms. (Gould and Aldridge, 1972, p. 91)

The hypothesis of punctuated equilibrium argues that abrupt shifts in the form of macro-mutations alternate with periods of relative stability which explains the gaps in the archeological record. "...major structural transitions can occur rapidly, without a smooth series of intermediate stages. (Gould, as quoted in *Why we talk*, p. 99). Genetic events of such significant magnitude are assumed to occur in a single individual in spatially and as a result, reproductively isolated, usually small populations, thereby resulting in genetic unbalance or disorder in the population. Reproductive isolation provides the optimal conditions for the mutation to spread fast, making the mutant's offsprings dominant and marking the return to genetic equilibrium, hence the hypothesis of punctuated equilibrium. In this way the species diversity is explained with self-organization in the genome.

Numerous empirical examples support the hypothesis, some of the most quoted of which is the Cambrian explosion: after a long period of stasis an explosion morphological variation and complexity took place about 550 million years ago (mya), which gave rise to the genetic diversity found in life forms today.

A similar idea of evolution as series of dramatic transformations is articulated by Maynard Smith and Szathmary (1995) who distinguish 5 major transitions in evolution.

4.2. Laws of mathematics and a universal body plan

The complexity paradigm has originally been designed as an alternative to Newtonian physics in the study of physical matter. Efforts have been made to apply it directly in understanding change in biological systems under a reductionist approach.

For D'Arcy Thompson "true science", i.e. namely, physics and chemistry, lay in its relation to mathematics" (D'Arcy Thompson, 1992, p. 1). A zoologist by training, he attempts to explain

the properties of living organisms by universal laws of matter and argues that universal principles of physics and geometry shape directly the morphology of life forms and applies "... mathematical methods and mathematical terminology do define and describe the forms of organisms." (ibid. p. 269).

In this way D'Arcy Thompson aims to explain the skeletal morphology of vertebrates and the changes it undergoes, during lifetime with the influence of physical forces on the shape and physical dimensions of the skeleton. In this context physical forces interact with the properties of the organism, which creates different outcomes in different species. For example, depending on the animal's mass, velocity of locomotion, size, bodies are influenced differently by gravity, surface tension, and other physical forces, producing different outcomes in morphology of insects, birds, mammals, etc. "...there is an essential difference in kind between the phenomena of form in the larger and in the smaller organisms." (ibid. p. 36).

In rejection of the evolutionary explanation for species' diversity as adaptation to local environments, he argues that diversity of skeletal proportions found in species comes down to a limited range of slight alterations, or divergences in various directions, in an otherwise universal "body plan", determined by the principles of geometry. So, the details of the skeletal morphology of a species and the changes it undergoes during development from infancy to adulthood are understood here as slight deviations from a theoretical prototype, calculated to perfection by the principles of geometry.

"...our own study of organic form...is but a portion of that wider Science of form which deals with form assumed by matter under all aspects and conditions, and, in this wider sense, with forms which are theoretically imaginable" (ibid. p. 269).

In this way the diversity in organisms' morphology can be explained by universal principles of geometry which underly both non-living and living nature.

That said, the stipulation of "imaginable" universal body plan offers explanation for vertebrate species only, leaving the rest of biological species inexplicable.

Similarly, change in the configuration of the "body plan" is understood in terms of minor alterations or "parameter tuning", (Edelman, Denton 2007, referencing Camazine et al. 2001)

Significantly, the argument for self-organizing biological matter as demonstration of nature's creativity understands self-organization as a core principle underlying organic and non-organic matter.

" We find the parsimony and beauty in the idea that the basic forms of inorganic and organic realm of nature may finally be shown to result from the same principle of self-organization immensely attractive and unifying." (Edelman, Denton 2007, p. 598).

The argument for self-organization as a determining factor in the formation of life forms as creation of novelties in self-organizing biological matter implies universality of life as a phenomenon throughout the universe, and the hierarchy of complexity within it. In short, that life takes the same form everywhere in the universe, from DNA molecules to humans, perhaps within minor deviations from the universal "body plan".

Moreover, the postulation of a universal "body plan" would answer an age-old question, are we, humans, alone in the universe?, projecting human-like societies and cultures to be ubiquitous in the universe.

In this sense one gets the impression that, while Darwin offered humanity a huge leap forward in the scientific understanding of biological form, the complexity paradigm reinvented the idea

of universal order, traditionally attributed to a deity, substituted in modern context with the god of mathematics.

On the other hand, I suspect it is natural to look for commonalities in self-organizing systems in both non-organic and organic matter given that both are dependent on outside influx of energy, physical energy, e.g. heat in inorganic context, and food in life forms.

5. Self-organization and evolution, two contributing factors in the diversity of life forms

“...spontaneous order...has been as potent as natural selection in the creation of the living world. We are the children of twin sources of order, not a singular source.” (Kauffman, 1995, p. 38).

The Chaos theory defines the living organism in terms of autocatalytic sets of molecules organized in a cell, not in terms of genetic storage of instructions and their realization in phenotypes, as in modern Darwinism. Life is envisioned here to have emerged from non-life as soon as the necessary concentration of the necessary chemical components is found in a closed space, making possible their interaction, resulting in self-replicating cells.

Kauffman and like-minded scholars recognize that diversity of life on earth cannot be explained only in terms of successions of speciations and extinctions, i.e. in the alternation of order and chaos in life forms. He recognizes that self-organization is a component of the evolutionary process, as self-organization creates the conditions for selection.

“...self-organization is a prerequisite for evolvability...there is an inevitable relationship among spontaneous order, robustness, redundancy, gradualism...” (Kauffman, 1995, p.104).

If I understand him properly, Kauffman suggests that the origins of life are in the spontaneous self-organization and self-replication /autocatalysis at molecular level where during the replication procedure small alterations in the internal order of self-replicating molecules, can occasionally occur, not sufficient to trigger dissolution of order into chaos, i.e. “without veering into randomness” (Kauffman, *ibid.* p. 44). The imperfections in self-replicating process, produce variation, which triggers selection process, thereby providing the conditions for a Darwinian evolution to work. Thus, life is formed at the edge of chaos.

In this context, natural selection “finds its role as the molder and shaper of the spontaneous order for free.” (Kauffman, *ibid.* p.49).

So, source of variation produced by errors in self-replication of molecules, i.e. bio-chemical elements, suggested by Kauffman, is highly similar to variation produced by genetic replication in Darwinism.

And, again, if I understand him correctly, he suggests that the evolutionary process as adaptive response to the environment is pre-conditioned and initiated by creations of universal order, i.e. evolution is not entirely a matter of chance or “tinkered together contraptions” (Kauffman, 1995, p. 104).

Similarly, in V. Longa (2001) self-organization is seen as a contributing factor, as a source of variation on which selection operates in both biological and cultural evolution.

“Selection is a filter that rejects the utter failures...To sum up, selection does not originate complexity; instead, it operates on it...As Kauffman puts it, “that which is self-organized and robust is what we are likely to see preeminently utilized by selection” (V. Longa, 2001, p.7)

Similarly, Batten, Salthie, Boschetti (2008) argue that the relationship between self-organization and natural selection is one of mutual cooperation unfolding in three-stage

process :

1. self-organization produces internally complex organisms upon which selection acts: thus, self-organization provides the starting point for the evolutionary process.
2. at the next stage the outputs of selection provide input for the next round of self-organization , thus natural selection acts as a constraint on self-organization.
3. complex organisms produced by self-organization compose the environment to which organisms adapt and which is the context for natural selection to operate.

In short, these are two complementary processes.

In addition, Oudeyer P.(2011) finds that self-organization interacts with evolutionary processes in creating diversity of life forms in that :

- a. life starts with the formation of a cell by self-organization, that is, impulsive internal structuring
- b. self-organization further produces complex biological entities which become choices for selection.

“ Self-organization provides a catalogue of complex forms distributed over a landscape of valleys in which and between which natural selection moves and makes its choices...”

- c. emergent complex biological entities delimit the available options for the next selection cycle.

B. Johnson and S.K.Lam (2010) argue that self-organization plays a “ subservient role in the evolution of biological complexity” (ibid, p.881)given that the conditions for self-organization to work must be created, maintained and regulated by the organism, which makes it conditioned on the internal environment of the organism. The role of selection is found to be crucial as, although selection does not create complexity, it “ discovers complexity”(Johnson, Lam 2010) , i.e. identify products of self-organization with adaptive potential, and creates the right conditions for self-organization processes to take place. Further, adaptation works on their improvement.

That is, self- organization and selection feed off one another in entangled interdependence.

In fact, self-organization implies adaptation (Heylighen, 1999)

5.1. Self-organization and complexity in life forms, reductionism and beyond

Scientific study of reality has begun in Ancient Greece and ever since the goal of science has been to uncover the eternal, immutable order , which reflects the ultimate rationality of a creator, underlying the superficial diversity of reality, i.e. the ideal of ultimate rationality . In other words, the goal of science has been to explain everything by reducing reality to a small number of general laws and principles, connected by logic.

Reductionism is a philosophical position based on the idea that there is a connection between natural phenomena, reflected in the theories which study them. It states that a phenomenon can be redefined in terms of another, more basic or simpler one. In this context any system can be understood by breaking it down into component parts and studying the components in isolation. The totality of the complex is assumed to be the sum of its component parts.

Reductionist science is aiming at **total decomposition** of scientific objects into minimal units, or primitives . It aims at exhaustive decomposition into the simplest building blocks into which everything in the universe is decomposable.

Reductionism in epistemology means that science attempts to reduce the scientific body of knowledge of one discipline to another. For example, the properties and functions of life forms can be explained by reducing them to chemical compositions and ultimately, to atoms and particles.

Reductionism in methodology tries to define an entity in terms of smaller and simpler entities. Reductionist scientific theories attempt to explain a complex phenomenon as the sum of its component parts. In this way reduce all entities to pre-existing primitives, be it an individual concept or conceptual systems (theories). Thus, complexity is reduced exhaustively to simplicity. Reductionism states that the only ontological reality is that of atoms and everything else is describable as their combinations. These foundational assumptions have been guiding principles for the most part of the history of science : science has aimed at uncovering the timeless simplicity of the immutable universe. During the Renaissance this world view was reflected in Newton's conceptualization of the universe as a machine, dominated by universal and eternal laws of motion. Reductionism in scientific theories fits well with the mechanistic view of nature brought about by Newtonian physics which has been regarded as the golden standard in science for the last few centuries.

And although over the centuries this method has been productive for accumulating knowledge of certain parts of reality, for example, the behaviour of large bodies of non-living matter, its dominance has been detrimental for understanding others, for example, minuscule bodies of matter, particles, as well as living organisms, not to mention their participation in larger units of organization, groups, families, and societies. In modern science Occam's advise for simplicity of explanation is taken to an extreme by modern minimalism, which aims at reduction of complex entities into simple ones by decomposing them into the most simple possible primitives. As an illustration, not only chemical substances, but organisms and even brains are reduced to atoms and even more elementary particles. The misuse of this scientific approach has resulted in misrepresentations of natural phenomena , in some cases, to the point of caricatures.

Kauffman in earlier publications identifies the complexity paradigm as reductionist.

“ We seek reductionist explanations. Economic and social phenomena are to be explained in terms of human behaviour. In turn, that behaviour is to be explained in terms of biological processes, which, in turn are to be explained by chemical processes, and they, in turn by physical ones. “ (Kauffman, 1995, p.11)

The reductionist approach has been criticized for being inadequate in contexts beyond physics. P.W. Anderson, (1972) a professor of theoretical physics and Nobel Laureate writes “...The ability to reduce everything to simple fundamental laws does not imply the ability to start from those laws and reconstruct the universe. In fact the more the elementary particle physics tells us about the nature of the fundamental laws, the less relevance they seem to have to the very real problems of the rest of science, much less to those of society. “ (P.W. Anderson, 1972, p. 393-396). He further argues that new levels of complexity arise at different levels of organization making a complex entity not reducible to the collection of properties at the lowest level of complexity. “... the whole becomes not only more but very different from the sum of its parts” (ibid. p. 395) He criticizes attempts to reduce complex behaviour and especially human behaviour to laws of physics and chemistry , namely, “... to try to reduce everything about the human organism to “only “ chemistry, from common cold and all mental

disease to the religious instinct. “ (ibid. p. 396).

In more recent statements Kauffman focusses on philosophical implications of the chaos paradigm and advocates against the reductionist/physicalist mentality in modern society which places value on pure rationality while disregarding the importance of values, ethics, spirituality and meaning. (Kauffman, 2006, Beyond Reductionism...edge.org).

“ With reductionism comes the conviction that court proceedings to try a man for murder is “ really” nothing but a movement of atoms, electrons and other particles in space, quantum and classical events, and ultimately to be explained, with, say, the string theory” (S. Kauffman, 2006, ibid.)

Similarly, as per Prigogine and Stengers (1993, p. 72-73) “ Nature as an evolving, interactive multiplicity thus resisted its reduction to a timeless and universal scheme.”

In sum, by the admission of prominent scholars, the reductionist approach has significant epistemic limitations.

5.2 Reductionism has cultural roots.

A slight deviation from the main topic I find interesting to mention. Various scholars and philosophers have argued that the domination of reductionist views in modern society is biased by cultural prejudices and formalisms in science are biased opinions with which we approach nature. They are cultural products and as such they reflect cultural values and biases which are reflected on thought, and by extension, scientific reasoning.

This is the view of Michel Foucault, a respected philosopher, who, as paraphrased and referenced in Gould and Vrba, (1982) wrote : “ ...when you know why people classify in a certain way, you understand how they think...” (ibid, p. 4). Thus, the way we label nature reflects our values as participants of a culture.

R. Nisbett and all.'s ' s findings (2001) confirm this statement . Moreover, logical reasoning is not universal either, it is culturally dependent. The widely held belief that basic processes of human cognition, e.g. categorization, learning, inductive and deductive inference and causal reasoning are innate , i.e. predetermined by human biology and as such, independent of culture, personal experience and/or training, and as such, universal (the same in all humans) prevalent in the western philosophical tradition has been challenged. A comparative study of the Ancient Greek and Chinese cultures reveals that : 1. cognition is not universal, it is culturally sensitive; human cognition is determined to a significant extent by culture (thus, experience and learning). 2. Scientific thought reflects earlier stages of human cognition, , namely, mythic culture, and its conceptual models of the universe.

“ The social – psychological aspects of Ancient Greek and Chinese life had correspondences in the systems of thought of the cultures. Their metaphysical beliefs were reflections of their social existences... These result in very great differences between Greece and China in their approaches to scientific, mathematic, and philosophical questions. “ (Nisbett et al..2001, p.293)

The Chinese counterpart of the Greek sense of personal agency was a sense of reciprocal sense of “social obligation or collective agency” (Nisbett et al., p.292). “ The cognitive differences between the ancient Greek and Chinese can be loosely grouped under the heading of holistic

versus analytic thought. “ (Nisbett et all. , 2001, p. 293). It appears that the ancient Greek and Chinese cultures have developed focus on different aspects of reality. Greeks see reality as a collection of individual objects, while Chinese, as members of a larger unity.

“ A fundamental difference between the Chinese and the Greeks was that the Chinese held the view that the world is a collection of overlapping and interpenetrating stuffs, or substances... This contrasts with the traditional Platonic philosophical picture of objects which are understood as individuals or particulars “ (Nisbett et all. .2001, p. 293).

And further, “ One of the most remarkable characteristics of ancient Greeks ... a sense of personal agency ... The Chinese counterpart of the Greek sense of personal agency was a reciprocal sense of social obligation or collective agency. (Nisbett et all. 2001, p. 292)

These cultural differences in world view have resulted in cognitive differences.

“ We define holistic thought as involving an orientation to the context or field as a whole, including attention to relationships between a focal object and the field, and a preference for explaining and predicting events on the basis of such relationships. Holistic approaches rely on experience-based knowledge rather than on abstract logic and are dialectical, meaning that there is an emphasis on change, recognition of contradiction and of the need for multiple perspectives... We define analytic thought as involving detachment of the object from its context, the tendency to focus on attributes of the object to assign it to categories, and a preference for using rules about the categories... Inferences rest in part on the practice of decontextualizing structure from content, the use of formal logic, and avoidance of contradiction” (Nisbett et all. 2001, p.293)

The holistic nature of Chinese culture is reflected in their scientific methods, which focus on dialectics, constant change and mutual adjustment.

The Greek preference for analytic thought has given rise to formal logic. In addition, Chinese acquire knowledge through experience, they “ seek understanding through direct perception” (ibid., p.294). Greeks prefer abstract analysis. They build abstract models to understand natural phenomena. “ ...they were prepared to reject the evidence of the senses when it conflicted with reason” (ibid.,p.294)

So, the way scientific theories conceptualize the world is arbitrary, it is based on cultural conventions, and differences in the focus of study and the conceptual tools used for it reflect cultural biases.

Interestingly, philosophical convictions and scientific arguments reflect biases of their proponents, whose minds are shaped by the limitations of their respective fields of inquiry. As per Kauffman (2006) “ The physicists who hold out for firm reductionism are...high energy particle physicists...”

In sum, there is no, and cannot be, pure reason.

5. 3. Biology against reductionism

Complex design in physical matter is explained by the Chaos theory as perpetual alternation of order and disorder. Complex design in life forms is explained with perpetual alternation of speciation and extinction, i.e. with the interaction of self-organization and evolution, adopting a reductionist approach and reducing living forms to inorganic matter.

That said, significant differences between the two ontological types question the epistemic value of the reductionist approach. In physics universal laws of matter which apply without

exception are used, in biology comparative methods are used, generalizations have only statistical value and exceptions are the norm.

Mayr points out that changes in non-living matter and organisms are two qualitatively different processes. Transformations in matter are predictable and are illustrations of internal processes in internally homogeneous entities.

“ Each mountain is unique, so is the weather system, and each planet and star. However... such uniqueness in the inanimate world is limited...the basic building blocks of such systems (elementary particles, atoms, molecules and crystals) consist of identical components. “ (E. Mayr, 1988).

Organisms are different. Their unique characteristics are at the molecular level, in the unique DNA and RNA. The uniqueness of the genome is the result of historical processes which took many millennia. They are open systems in which interaction with the environment is the essential property, not found in inorganic matter. The emerging properties of living matter are causally related to the fact that living organisms must adapt to changing environments in order to stay alive. Organisms are a different kind of matter and self-organization processes have different outcomes: the interacting entities, namely, biological bodies, become altered as a result of their interactions with one another within the group, in their interaction with the physical environment, or between groups.

On the other hand, the atom of iron remains unchanged irrespective of its participation in compounds.

In this sense E. Mayr (2001) proposes that unification of science (by finding common principles, methodology and terminology encompassing the study of both living organisms and non-living matter) cannot be achieved by reducing biology to physics. He argues that a unified science requires an extension of the concept of science which must include biology. Thus, he argues for a new synthesis, based on the concepts and methods of life sciences.

R. Lewontin (2002) argues convincingly against the suitability of reductionist approach to the study of living organisms.

“ The problem for biology is that the model of physics, held up as the paradigm of science, is not applicable because the analogues of mass, velocity and distance do not exist for organisms “ (Lewontin, 2002, p. 93)

He defends a holistic approach stating that “ there are no universal rules for cutting up organisms (ibid. p. 87) and also, that there are “.. quite different ways of cutting up an organism depending on what we are trying to explain” (p. 82). Further he explains that the methods of reducing natural forms to idealized types and studying them in isolation (vacuum) used by the so called “hard sciences “ are inadequate for studying organisms as they have irregular shapes and , unlike physical substances, do not exist passively in isolation, but interact with the external world, affect it and are affected by it.

Johnson and Lam (2010) explain that in inorganic context “a self-organizing mechanism in isolation is an intrinsic property, a purely spontaneous process, that is , a product of given circumstances” (p. 882). Self-organization processes in biological context are highly constrained and regulated as the conditions they require must be continuously sustained, thus, the process is not spontaneous. And, crucially, “ selection has to fine-tune and control many parameters to get work out of a self-organization process” (ibid. p. 882)

Thus, the organisms and inorganic matter are qualitatively different parts of nature and so are

the processes intrinsic to them. Self-organization does occur in biological forms, but only in the context of evolution.

5.3.1. Universal law of change at the edge of chaos?

“ These patterns of speciations and extinctions, avalanching across ecosystems and time, are somehow self-organized, somehow collective emergent phenomena, somehow natural expression of the law of complexity we seek... from ecosystems to economic systems undergoing technological evolution ..from single cells to economies ...evolve to a natural state between order and chaos.(S. Kauffman, 1995, p. 10).

Kauffman argues for a universal law of change as he detects similarities in the patterns of change in the physical, biological and cultural systems, i.e. evolution in all ontological contexts progresses at the edge of order and chaos. For example, technological evolution proceeds in terms of successive stages of creative exuberance of multiple technological innovations, which are selectively adopted under market demands for efficiency and affordability.

To sum up with the artfully articulated conclusion of Kauffman, “ Tissues and terracotta may indeed evolve in similar ways. General laws may govern the evolution of complex entities, whether they are works of nature or works of man.” (Kauffman, *ibid.* p. 113).

Does this imply bridging the divide of mind and matter?

F. Heylighen (2013) argues that the results of spontaneous interactions in the physical systems are indistinguishable in their final results from goal-oriented action directed by a conscious mind. Actions, both intended by the mind, or automatic, as in physical matter, are indistinguishable as long as they produce irreversible results. This is the common denominator of matter and mind.

“...the complex systems approach transcends the mind-matter duality: causal (material) and intentional (mental) models are essentially equivalent, even though one may be more easily applicable in certain contexts than the other (*ibid.*, p.3)

This implies ontological unification of physical and biological matter, and crucially, of mind and matter under a reductionist principles, i.e. reducing mind to matter.

Here I can only raise the question and leave the discussion for scholars with relevant expertise.

6. Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS)

Complex Adaptive Systems are initially defined as physical systems, dynamic in nature, formed by the coordinated interactions of subsystems, each individually organized and functioning as integrated and interconnected components of a larger system . A CAS is formed and functions under the complexity principles by the contributions of individual participants with their interactions at a local level following simple rules. It is adaptive if it is able to maintain its internal organization while at the same time adapting to changes imposed from outside (Heylighen, F.1999).

The CAS perspective was originally designed for understanding complex integrated phenomena in inorganic matter and later was adopted as a universal law of change in all ontological contexts while applying the theoretical machinery designed for studying physical matter, i.e. an example of theoretical reductionism.

In biological context CAS are complex integrated associations of internally organized biological entities which adapt to one another, forming ecosystems and change in concert in adapting to a common physical environment. For example, predator and prey coevolve as part of a niche, as do flora and fauna. Behaviour, morphology, metabolism of a biological body coevolve as a CAS. In fact the boundaries between individual evolving entity and the environment is blurred (Kaufmann, 1993, Lewontin, R. 2002).

Mutual adaptation among systems and organs within the biological body is encapsulated in the term “exaptation”, a process by which a biological entity, either with a purely supportive function, i.e. a spandrel, or with established function, i.e. preadaptation, undergoes modification of its internal organization as adaptation for a new function, while, often maintaining the original one as well. Exaptation is nature's answer to the demands of sudden change in the environment, often initiating a process of speciation. A classic example of exaptation in the bird feathers, initially an adaptation for insulation, e.g. Archaeopteryx had feathers although it could barely fly. More examples can be found in S.J. Gould and E. Vrba, 1982, p.7)

So, exaptation is actually a version of adaptation. Clearly, initially the new function is made possible with machinery not specified for it and the best possible scenario is when the old and the new functions are as similar as possible as demands for modification would be minimal and the period of transition shorter.

Importantly, sudden alterations usually concern simple organisms, e.g. bacteria, while complex organisms with numerous interwoven components do not reorganize in a single event.

Certainly big mutations are usually deleterious. The primate brain cannot be expected to have become human in a single event.

In short, as per Kauffman (1995) CAS illustrate “evolution of coevolution” at the edge of order and chaos.

Significantly, coordination in evolutionary processes in various contexts and timeframes is argued by some proponents of the darwinian approach who view biological evolution, especially in complex organisms, to be a complex process involving coordinated processes of mutual adaptation in the genome, the phenotype, developmental patterns and behaviour (Jablonka, Lamb, 2006).

The CAS paradigm demonstrates the value of theoretical integration in understanding complex phenomena. In this sense the view of language as a CAS where multiple systems, biological, cultural, cognitive, etc. each explicable by different formalisms, interact and integrate in the formation of language. The evolution of language as a complex phenomenon is defined in terms of CAS as “complex interplay of influences of different kinds (each described, imperfectly by their unique formalisms)” (Heylighen, 1999, p. 70).

In biological systems the coordinated changes in the components of CAS can be defined as “co-evolution”. Encyclopedia Britannica defines co-evolution as a process of “reciprocal evolutionary change” which occurs in entities (species, groups of species) as a result of their interaction and interdependence. The same process of mutual adjustment based on co-dependence is proven to be at work between organs and systems within an organism as well as between biological/cognitive entities and behaviours. In both cases the co-evolving entities form part of each other's environment as a case of mutual adaptation. A typical example is an eco-system where multiple species co-exist and co-evolve with one another and the physical

environment. In the context of the Chaos theory every participant in an eco-system exists at the edge of order and chaos and, consequently, the eco-system as a whole is permanently placed at the edge of order and chaos.

6.1. Irrelevance of the debate on gradualism vs. catastrophism

In the theory of evolution in all its interpretations the evolutionary process is defined by two fundamental and distinguishing characteristics: it is series of successive small genetic innovations each judged by their functionality .

Its theoretical alternative in understanding and explaining the causes of diversity of life forms is the Gouldian view which explains the diversity of species as alternation between sudden bursts of biological creativity and mass extinctions, i.e. the hypothesis of Punctuated Equilibria (Gould, Eldridge, 1972).

The empirical support for either are limited to certain species and certain periods. For example, there is clear evidence for the gradual evolution from dinosaurs to avian species with an intermediate species of archaeopteryx. On the other hand, the gradualist argument is been questioned on the basis that the fossil records show some gaps in the intermediate stages of evolution of various species, resulting in questioning the continuity argument and interpreted by some as a demonstration of discontinuity. A plausible explanation for such gaps is that each of the two sources of biological innovation works in different circumstances , e.g. gradual, slow adaptive changes occur in large populations, while relatively rapid, abrupt jumps with peaks in activity, which disturb the usual stability, happen in small, isolated populations.

Joseph and Janda (2003) offer a different interpretation as they argue that the debate on gradualism vs. saltationism is irrelevant as each of these alternatives explain the same facts from different viewpoints involving different time-scales, i.e. geological (where time is measured in millennia) and biological (which measures changes in a few generations). The argument is that on a geological scale gradual changes, which are normally small and cumulative , are undetectable and thus, are registered as stasis. Changes are registered only when the difference of before and after is significant enough to be detectable, which explains the apparent gaps in the material remains they have left behind in the paleontological record. Small events of little significance which bring quantitative alterations , each building on the next, sooner or later result in qualitative transformations. In short, quantity transitions into quality. Thus, evolutionary Rubicons happen in small steps, masqueraded as big leaps. In the end, the sources of variation, e.g. imperfect copying, as envisioned by the theory of evolution, or sudden jumps in creativity, as in the theory of complexity, are irrelevant . The causes of variation (genetic accidents) or spontaneous interactions (resulting in self-organization of some kind) are also unimportant. All that matters for the biological form is to survive in the current environment.

The same applies to social contexts, e.g. scientific and technological advances are made some times by accident, e.g., and some times by the direction and financing of a government. From a different perspective, selection is a component of the evolutionary process where improvement is produced by selectively multiplying variants produced by copying errors. Positive feedback loop is a component of self-organization process where improvement is produced by selectively perpetuating patterns by amplified repetition. Thus, feedback loop and

selection have very similar functions i.e reducing randomness by selective perpetuation. Thus, despite the fundamental differences in these two processes, outlined in earlier segments, there are also commonalities: some improvement is created by selective repetition of some among available options.

From a different angle, evolution is usually defined as a blind process, i.e. without any intended direction, while self-organization is viewed as goal-oriented towards equilibrium. Yet in evolution only the formation of variation is blind, while selection has a clearly defined goal, the survival of the species.

In this sense the difference between evolution and self-organization is not easy to discern.

7. Complexity paradigm in linguistics

The complexity paradigm is used in linguistics in two contexts. On the one hand, in bio-cognitive context it is applied for understanding the formation of a Language Faculty in the individual mind in terms of self-organization and establishment of stable neuronal connections for processing language. On the other, for understanding the formation of individual language systems from communicative interactions among language speakers as community members.

7.1. Physicalist perspective, minimalism and the Language Faculty

The generative paradigm and especially its most recent version, the Minimalist approach to language has as its goal to define in maximally simple and general principles the shape of language by defining the language capacity in terms of universal principles of matter. Importantly, the Minimalist vision of the Language Faculty is in unison with Kauffman's view's of Laws of life, as he suggests that a scientific formalisms of complex systems must focus on the fundamental properties of complex living systems, while leaving the details to development to fill in (Kauffman, 1995, p. 10-11), a position reflected in the Principles and Parameters approach (Chomsky, Lasnik 1993 and elsewhere).

Some of the properties of the Language Faculty are permanently configured and are termed as universal principles, others are in the form of underspecified binary options, parameters. Both develop with the limited influence of experience as the internal organization of the Language Faculty is said to be largely endogenous. The core computational operation Merge operates in cycles and builds increasingly more complex hierarchies ad infinitum. In this way the crucial component of the Language Faculty is understood as instantiation of maximally generalized universal principles of structure formation, reminiscent of the universal principles of pattern formation outlined in the sciences of complexity.

The most recent proposal by Chomsky (2005) outlines three components in the formation of the Language Capacity: 1. genetically predetermined language-exclusive bio-computations linguistic computations , 2. general cognitive capacities applied for language-relevant functions , e.g. , speech production, theory of mind, memory, etc. and 3. general principles and conditions of efficient structure-formation underlying all physical nature.

This informs his rejection of Darwinian explanation for the Language Capacity and shapes his argument for the influence of physical forces which, in his mind, explains the perfection of this hypothetical grammar- computing devise. Chomsky (2005) has referred to the influence of physical forces in the architecture of the brain as ' the third factor'. So, the appearance of

the Language Faculty here is explicable by principles of physics, not biology and as such, is immune from evolutionary explanation.

By this line of reasoning this component of the Language Faculty does not have biological dimensions and as a consequence, cannot be explained in Darwinian terms. The vision that laws of physical nature influence the shape of language is consistent with the guidelines of the reductionist approach in classical science.

Importantly, the application of complexity principles in the context of language reveals an inherent contradiction with the computational approach as complex systems and algorithms are based on very different mechanisms. Computation works like LEGO, i.e. primitives are assembled into a structure following rules and the product is exhaustively decomposable into primitives. The language algorithm produces a sentence with one meaning as a sum total of the literal meanings of the component linguistic forms and their position in the hierarchy, i.e. $2+2=4$.

Moreover, evolutionary processes will inevitably be implicated in the existence of any biological entity, with or without some form of participation of self-organization, and, as per S. Kauffman (2006) evolution in biosphere is not algorithmic. Thus, the framing of a Language Faculty, a biological property in terms of algorithms is contradictory.

If language is viewed from a complexity perspective a sentence is an integrated whole with holistic properties, irreducible to the sum of its components, e.g. rhetorical questions, interpretation of negative sentences as affirmative in irony, holistic expressions “when pigs fly” etc. i.e. $2+2=5$. In this context the added value comes from the contribution of context, implying a communicative function. Significantly, if one talks of creativity in language, it cannot be framed as computation.

The contradictions do not end here as the Language Faculty is argued to display similarities with any other biological organ in the human organism, while at the same time displaying properties highly unusual for a biological form as a biological novelty, i.e. with no continuity, e.g. unlimited recursion, perfection, properties foreign even to machines (Chomsky 2000, 2005, 2006, Hauser et al. 2002 and elsewhere), in effect undermining the innatist argument by attributing cartoonish properties to a biological entity.

None of these postulations are proven or provable given that it is well known that the human brain shares many similarities with the ape brain. Various areas in the human brain have been found to be homologous both in form and in function in modern apes and even in species more distantly related to us. For example, Broca's area has a homologue in the ape's area F51. So, Broca's area is not a biological innovation. Moreover, although the human brain displays some differences from the ape brain, these do not constitute any evidence of complete architectural transformation, which one might expect to result from the spontaneous emergence of a completely new kind of structure. P. Liebermann, discusses in detail the overwhelming evidence for continuity in the brain architecture and functions of the human brain. He argues that although language is a novel and unique behaviour, it is made possible by the human brain as a slightly modified reptilian brain (Liebermann, 2001).

In addition, Gary Marcus (2008) argues that not only the human mind is a kluge, that is, far from perfect, though good enough and useful cognitive organ, but the Language Capacity is a kluge as all natural languages are highly imperfect, full with redundancies and imperfections. Moreover, he argues that humans are unable to learn artificial languages intentionally designed to avoid the imperfections of natural languages.

In sum, the theoretical models of the Language Faculty, proposed by the mainstream generative/biolinguistic approach are borrowed from physics and attribute properties of physical matter to hypothetical biological formations. Chomsky famously stated (2002 and elsewhere) that the abstract models reveal the truth while observable phenomena are a distortion of the truth. He even has encouraged life sciences to replace biological forms with idealizations in search of reliable understanding.

That said, although abstractions are a legitimate and highly useful tool in any line of inquiry, they must reflect the most distinct properties of the object at hand. In life sciences are prototypes or the best examples as representative of species or populations, routinely used in lab experiments, vaccine testing, etc. If linguistics is defined as natural science and the Language Faculty as a biological property, these deviations from the established practices are inexplicable.

7.2. Language Faculty emergent by learning

Self-organization is evoked as explanation for developmental patterns not pre-specified by genes but emergent during epigenesis (Waddington 1953; Dor D. Jablonka, E. 2000). Emergent developmental routines are termed “canalization”. The formation of neuronal connections in the infant brain and their stabilization as neuronal pathways supporting behaviours is also explained with self-organization by connectionist models , where some emergent neuronal patterns are selectively solidified thanks to positive feedback, others disappear due to negative feedback (N. Ellis, Emergentism, connectionism and language learning, in Language learning, 1998).

For others language processing is accomplished by coordination of a multitude of general cognitive capacities used in various activities not specific to linguistic behaviour (M. Donald 1993, Studard-Kennedy, Knight, Hurford, 1998) which participate and interact in the process of language use.

Similarly, Corning (1999) talks about Language Capacity as a synergistic effect.

At the level of sociolect language as a communication system inherently presupposes cooperative behaviours between at least two communicators. At the same time at the level of the individual, as represented in the human organism , language presupposes cooperation among various cognitive capacities and , in addition, cooperation between cognitive and physiological capacities and activities. The emergence of language in the individual presupposes synergistic activities at multiple levels:

a. synergy among organs and systems in the individual organism:

*synergy among the articulatory organs for the purpose of speech production

*synergy among cognitive capacities :

capacity for reference (to represent a class of objects through signs (as special case symbolic thought, symbolic representation)

capacity to form categories

capacity for mind-reading, or theory of mind

capacity for self-monitoring, or metacognition,

consciousness (awareness that one's person and mind differ from others)

intentionality (stimulus-free initiation)

capacity to learn , extended memory

imagination, planning (or displacement: capacity to refer to distant referents, distant from here and now)

capacity for socialization (need for the company of conspecifics)

* cognitive and behavioural synergies among the members of a group:

synergy in behaviours resulting in common cultural practices symbolic and practical

synergy in conceptualization resulting in the so called “ common ground' , a standardized views of reality reflected in myths, folklore, etc. which makes possible the formation of a vocabulary.

In short, language processing requires the coordination not only of organs and systems of the individual organism, but coordination of multiple organisms.

That said, the transplant of theoretical tools originally designed for understanding physical matter for understanding the individual and social aspects of language has its own limitations. Atoms and molecules, the interacting agents in physical matter, are identical and eternal and their interactions are determined by universal principles of matter. On the other hand, the formation of the idiolect by self-organization in neurons is protracted time and highly influenced by variations in genetic, epigenetic, developmental, experiential, etc. factors, all influencing the formation of idiolects in different ways. Today language learning is guided by schooling which reduces randomness and introduces central control.

Thus, the process of pattern formation in chemical elements, atoms and molecules is fundamentally different from language learning.

Thus, while fish schooling, wall building by ants, the synchronized flashing in fireflies (S. Camazine et al. 2003) are credibly explained with the principles of self-organization, the formation of a language processor in the human brain is not one of them.

7.3. Languages and the Complexity paradigm

From complexity perspective the language system is understood as a complex unified whole built from multiple subcomponents or subsystems which interact . The interactions among the components result in formations different from the ones produced by the actions of the individual entities in isolation. The complexity of the system increases with each higher level as each level adds new types of interactions and each subsequent level contains the complexity of lower levels and builds on them.

N. Ellis,(2011) and also Ellis, Larsen-Freeman (2009) (position paper)outline the main characteristics of language from the complexity perspective :

- a. Complex systems in general lack central control, thus, they are emergent systems, where global patterns emerge from local interactions without predetermined outcome. Such is the case of bird flocks and supermarket lines. Language in this context is viewed as a novelty and grammar is understood as unpredictable patterns emergent spontaneously from the communicative interactions among speakers .
 - b. Complex systems are by nature diverse. In the case of language, there is no one prototypical speaker or a prototypical community. The individual speaker has a unique version of the language system , or an idiolect). Each idiolect is a unique result of the individual's experience with the world and other idiolects.
 - c. Complex systems are dynamic, they are in constant flux as they are in perpetual search for
-

equilibrium . Both the idiolects and sociolects (the language system of the community) dynamic systems, constantly reorganizing , thus, language change in idiolects and in d. Patterns in complex systems arise and become perpetuated through positive feedback, that is, each time a pattern is repeated encourages further repetition, or alternatively die out due to negative feedback. Language as an abstract system is understood as emergent through experience from the interaction and interdependence of a variety of factors , for example, language processing and language learning , the human experience with the world through the senses, human cognition and its species-specific ways of interpreting this experience, human interaction with conspecifics, culture, human history, all of which interact in complex ways.

e. In complex systems small local changes can have dramatic global effects, called phase transitions. This is known in the complexity theory as “ butterfly effect”. It is used to explain sudden emergence of novelties in both biology and in culture. For example, it is argued that abrupt changes in small sections of the genome in the homo lineage have produced the homo sapient species with qualitatively different characteristics . In language learning children experience sudden dramatic increase in vocabulary, also known as “ lexical spurs” , leading to the emergence of grammar.

f. In a complex system the interactions are localized, each individual entity has access and interacts with a limited number of neighbouring entities. In the case of language each speaker communicates with a social circle of friends and relatives who compose a network and influence each other's idiolects . This maintains variation among idiolects and affects language change.

The language system as abstraction is represented by the commonalities in idiolects also called “ common core”. Self - organization processes at two different levels are at play: one at the level of the individual organism, its mind and individual experiences , which gives rise to the idiolect, and the other, at the level of multiple individual minds, which gives rise to the sociolect. The idiolect emerges form interaction of the brain's learning capacities and the local sociolect. The sociolect emerges as standardization of local communicative patterns

Similarly, Keller (1994) presents the ' invisible hand' hypothesis where a sociolect emerges spontaneously as unintended byproduct of the rational and intentional interactions of individual speakers to communicate with conspecifics in an attempt to solve interpersonal problems at a local level. Thus, language as patterns in the brain and in social behaviour, is the result of human actions but not the intended result.

That said, although under the Chaos theory the sociolect is formed by random interactions of idiolects, in languages with writing systems the norms of writing are prescriptive, assuming the role of centralized control, thus, in contradiction of the fundamental principle of self-organization. Thus, self-organization alone cannot explain the all aspects of language formation.

7. 3.1. Languages as unique emergent systems

Chater and Christiansen (2008) explain language diversity as different languages being, to paraphrase, different local solutions to a combination of constraints imposed by cognitive pressures and cultural and historical idiosyncrasies. As the local cultural and historical factors vary across communities, languages find diverse ways to achieve the right balance mediating

these pressures differently at different time periods.

Similarly, V. Evans and S. Levinson (2009) identify language diversity is a universal of human language and explain observable recurrent patterns of organization in languages as “stable engineering solutions satisfying multiple design constraints, reflecting both cultural-historical factors and the constraints of human cognition(Abstract)

In this context linguistic categories are language -particular generalizations resulting from convergent patterns of language use based on universal semantic categories. M. Haspelmath (2007) argues that grammatical categories are language-particular , e.g. in languages as similar in structure as German and Russian, show clear differences in the category of dative case, languages define Adjective differently. Even categories like “ word” and “ sentence” appear to be language-particular.

Importantly, not only grammatical systems but also semantics is language-particular as “ ...the same fact or event is not only expressed differently, but also structured semantically in a different way , in different languages” (Zaefferer, D. 1991,p. 46).

The formation of language systems by self-organization is illustrated by computer simulations where artificial agents through coordinated interactions converge onto a unified symbolic system. (Dale Barr, 2004; L. Steels, 1995)

Similar experiments simulate the emergence of discrete speech sounds where the through the actions of artificial agents mimicking human individuals it is demonstrated that discrete reusable units of speech, phonemes and syllables, emerge as crystallized point along a sound continuum under the pressures of ease of articulation and auditory distinctiveness (Oudeyer, P. (2006), also Bart de Boer,1998). For a compact review see B. de Boer 2005.

Jill Morford (2002, p.338) has documented the formation of language systems in gestural domain as homesigns by individuals with abnormal ontogenetic experience, deprived from normal access to spoken language , who invent their own gestures to communicate and extrapolates that a similar process of self-organization could have taken place in the first stages of language origins.

In addition, Studderd-Kennedy (1998) discusses a general principle of particulation , known as “ particulate principle of self-diversifying systems” as coined by W. Adler, by which holistic entities are broken down into discrete components which are then combinable. The particulate principle explains the formation of discrete primitives, combinable into hierarchical units, for example, chemical compounds, the genetic code. Particulation is part of self-organization as a general process of nature . It also explains the formation of phonetic gestures and the generative phonology out of holistic vocalizations, which opened the way to the formation of multileveled linguistic structure. In this context the “ particulate principle” as a general principle of nature is evoked to explain the highly complex shape of language and, compositionality as one of its most prominent traits with universal principles of self-organization.

The complexity approach successfully explains today's language diversity, arguing against the hypothesis of descent with gradual and protracted modification of a single protolanguage, or “ mother tongue” by projecting that as each speaking community has formed their own primitive languages where an initial chaotic stage of inconsistent individual meaning-form mappings was transformed into a highly systematic communal norm.

The Chaos theory has a place in evolutionary linguistics, both the biolinguistic aspects, i.e the

formation of the idiolect, and the sociolinguistic aspect, i.e. language diversity. That said, the language-relevant innate predispositions of the human individual and some aspects of linguistic behaviour are better explained with the theoretical instruments of the evolutionary theory. Thus, evolutionary linguistics would be better served by enriching its theoretical instrumentarium with elements of both.

7.4. The Language faculty: Self-organization+evolution

Chomsky and some of his followers have adopted the Gould/Lewontin's argument as they attribute the existence of FLN and FLB to interaction of event and process, of self-organization and evolution, given the fundamental differences in their functionality. The FLB showing evolutionary continuity with other species, has a standard evolutionary explanation. In earlier versions of the argument the existence of the FLN is attributed to one-time event event of restructuring of the genome producing a “hopeful monster”, known in the literature as the leap hypothesis. In more recent versions FLN is attributed to extragenetic events of reorganization and restructuring within the brain driven by the brain expansion and the space limitations of the cranial cavity, resulting in alteration of the neuronal connectivity, an instance of self-organization producing the FLN, a bio-cognitive novelty. (Hauser et al. 2002, Chomsky 2005 and elsewhere)

In short, representation of language in the human body is understood as addition: products of self-organization are added to products of evolution.

In the latest version the FLN, having appeared initially as a spandrel, produced by unspecified forces of physical matter, known as Chomsky's “third factor” (Chomsky, 2005), has later undergone exaptation for a function. Others speculate that the current function of FLN in the formation of modern language is a product of additional cycles of exaptation where speculations on preadaptations include :

- conceptual structure: Phrase structure in syntax is believed to be a cognitive exaptation of the thematic role structure in protolanguage e.g. agent, theme, goal, etc. (Calvin, Bickerton, 2000) Others argue that FLN is exaptation from Language of Thought (LOT) by J. Fodor.
- the social calculus (conceptualization of interpersonal relations), R. Dunbar (1998)
- phonology ; Phrase structure, the distinction between Noun Phrase and Verb Phrase is believed to be an exaptation from syllable structure(A. Carstairs-McCarthy, 1999).
- manual gestures for motor control, suggesting that spoken language had gestural origins, emerged initially in the manual domain. (in Corballis M. 2003 and elsewhere; Tomasello, M. 2008)

Others speculate that the original function of the language organ may have been spatial orientation, later put to use in forming linguistic structure. That said, these are mere speculations, not confirmed by empirical studies.

Nevertheless, these speculations reveal an implicit recognition that the evolution of language is better understood as a complex interaction of principles and processes which can only be taken as contributing partners.

7.5. CAS :integrating the theory of evolution and the Chaos theory in understanding the

evolution of human language

T. Schoenemann (2017) defines complexity as “the property of a real world system that is manifest in the inability of any one formalism being adequate to capture all its properties” (Schoenemann, 2017, p. 70). Formulating language evolution in terms of CASs demonstrates the value of theoretical integration in understanding complex phenomena and the evolution of language as one of them. That said, it reflects the properties of inorganic matter and, in my mind, has significant explanatory limitations for understanding the human organism, mind, and language, as well as language evolution, phenomena hardly explicable by simple processes in simple units of matter. Its interpretation in biological contexts as co-evolution adds understanding of coordination in biological processes, adding the time dimension to the already complex interactions in space, limited to inorganic matter.

It is universally acknowledged that language is a complex entity, but the very definition of how is complexity defined is far from agreed upon. Some understand complexity of a system as lack of order, others identify a complex system as one positioned at the edge of order and chaos. S. Mufwene views language “in constant state of flux, in search of equilibrium” (Mufwene, 2014). Adopting the complex adaptive systems theory in understanding the internal dynamics of languages focusses on the fact that languages are stable but flexible systems, composed of various components, each semi-independent, but connected by membership in an integrated whole.

The adoption of the Complex Adaptive Systems framework as coordination of processes and contexts highlights some crucial aspects of language evolution as a multifaceted process of coordinated adaptations in different contexts at multiple levels and time frames, in terms of co-evolution as coordination of three types of evolutionary processes, i.e. the human genome, learning mechanisms and cultural practices, adding an additional levels of complexity. Scholars differ in their focus on the systems included in the interactive complex.

L. Steels (2011) identifies social relations, the language system and cognition as mutually influencing one another. T. Schoenemann (1999, 2005) advances the argument that syntax evolved as a result of a bottleneck formed by the cognitive capacity to conceptualize in exquisite detail the world and the limitations of human physiology to communicate this rich content with limited physiological resources under the time restrictions of a conversation.

T. Givon, (1979, 2002) argues that complex grammar emerges as a result of extending the spheres of language use from the limitations of the immediate circle of individuals to a larger and more informationally diverse society. In this context change of function triggers a demand for transformation in the language system in terms of transformation from loosely connected utterances and meaning-based linguistic communication in a “society of intimates” into a tightly organized system of sentences with highly regularized syntactic structure. Thus, social changes trigger behavioural changes resulting in change in language functions and, consequently, in the language system.

For others grammar emerges from the discrepancy between the enormous size of language and the processing limitations of the human brain, (M. Christiansen, N. Chater 2008). Grammatical rules and categories emerge as a solution to this inadequacy. Yet others explain compositionality and grammar as emergent through iterated language attainment by youngsters as every new generation introduces new regularities given that regular patterns are preferred

by learners. (S.Kirby, 1998; K.Smith, S. Kirby, H. Brighton 2003).

Co-evolution between human speech capacities and elevated cognitive capacities demonstrated by extended human semiosis is the advanced articulatory dexterity in the articulation of the quantal vowels /i,a,u/ resulting in the ability to learn and retain a large lexicon. (Liebermann, 2006 and elsewhere).

Co-evolution of human development and language as a behaviour resulted in a human developmental instinct for babbling.

“ The disposition to babble is thus adaptive in a social group that already benefits from communication in speech. It seems likely that a capacity for finer tuning of the articulators and more precise coordination of their interaction evolved biologically as the benefits of well articulated speech emerged. This would have been a case of gene-culture, more specifically gene-language, co-evolution.” (Hurford, 2011, p. 488),

Co-evolution within the components of language, i.e. meaning, structure and form as a communicative technology (L. Steels 2011) adds another dimension.

Co-evolution of brain and its functions is the substantial increase in absolute brain size as one of the defining features of human species. The increased cognitive capacities made possible by a larger brain made a crucial contribution to the evolutionary success of homo sapience species over other homo species by developing complex culture , language and civilization . So, alterations in the physical properties of the brain have facilitated the appearance of cognitive abilities which would otherwise be impossible. On the other hand the increased cognitive capacities necessitated higher energy which imposed higher nutritional demands to the human organism . This, on the other hand, triggered evolution in the lifestyle of the homo sapient species, manifested in the increased consumption of meat, resulting in “ arms race ” between human biological body and cognition.

To complicate matters even more, some aspects of language evolution are better explicable with self-organization, e.g. emergence and proliferation of a new linguistic form in terminology, a new expression, etc. Even entire language systems have emerged in a very short time, e.g. sign languages. Internalization of some aspects of language is dominated by Darwinian processes.

Summary and conclusions

The theory of evolution and the Chaos theory explain complex design in two very different ontological spheres. The Chaos theory explain complex design in physical mater in terms of perpetual alteration of order and disorder. In this context the term Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) the formation of complex design in physical matter is explained with the perpetual alternation of order and disorder in multiple physical systems with mutually coordinated and synchronized behaviours.

The theory of evolution explains complex design in life forms in terms of perpetual adaptation to the environment for preservation of life. The Chaos theory is also evoked as alternative explanation for complex design in life forms in terms of alternation of stasis and flux, stability and spontaneous emergence of novelty.

In the context of the evolutionary theory CAS theory is evoked to explain complex design in life forms with interaction of self-organization and selection as “ mutual embrace of

spontaneous order and selection's crafting of that order" (S. Kauffman, 1995, chap. 1 p. 6)
Language is a highly unusual entity: it is a multifaceted, heterogeneous phenomenon : its components represent all ontological categories: from physical matter (sound waves, atoms and molecules in the human body), to biological material (organs, tissues and neurons), to abstract concepts.

It is a truism that it is a challenge for any one formalism, no matter how high the level of abstraction of its terminology and principles, to explain reality in all its facets. This is event more applicable to language. No wonder explaining its existence has proven to be a challenge for humanity since the beginning of history.

That said, an integration of two theoretical perspectives promises to offer a much better understanding of the events and processes which lead to its current form.

References

Anderson, P. 1972, More is different, *Science*, 177, p. 393-396

Barr, D. 2004, Establishing conventional Communication systems. Is common knowledge necessary? *Cognitive Science*, p.937- 962

Batten, D., Stanley, S., Boschetti, F. 2008, Visions of evolution: self-organization proposes what natural selection disposes, *Biological theory* 3(1), doi: 10.1162.biot.2008.3.1.17

de Boer, B.,1998, Emergence of sound systems through self-organization, www.ai.rug.nl/~bart/naic98.pdf

de Boer, B. 2005, Self-organization in language, doi: 10.1017/CB09780511542275.009

de Boer, B. 2011, Self-organization and language evolution, in Gibson, K. , Tallerman, M. Eds. *Oxford Handbook of language evolution*, Oxford University Press, p. 612-620

Calvin, W., Bickertn, D. 2000, *Lingua ex machina, Reconciling Darwin and Chomsky with the human brain*, MIT Press

Camazine S. 2001, Why self-organization, in Camazine et all. eds. *Self-organization in biological systems* ,Chap.5, Princeton Univ. Press

Carstairs-McCarthy, A. , 1999, *The Origins of Complex Language: An Inquiry into Evolutionary Beginnings of Sentences, Syllables and Truth*, Oxford Univ. Press

Chater,N., Christiansen, M. 2008, Language as shaped by the brain, *Behaviour and brain scences*, 31, p.489-558

Chomsky, N. 2000. *New horizons in the study of language and mind*, Cambridge Univ. Press,

Chomsky, N. 2002, *On nature and language*, Cambridge Univ. Press

- Chomsky, N., 2005, Three Factors in Language Design, *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 36, No.1, 1-22, MIT
- Chomsky, N. 2006, *Language and mind*, MIT
- Chomsky, N., Lasnik, H. 1993, Principles and parameters theory, in *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary research*, Berlin, De Gruyter
- Corballis, M. 2003, From hand to mouth, the gestural origins of language, in Christiansen, M., Kirby, S. Eds. *Language evolution*, p.3201-218, Oxford University Press
- Corning, P. 1998, The synergism hypothesis, On the Concept of Synergy and It's Role in the Evolution of Complex Systems, in *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 21(2), p. 133-172
- Corning, P. 2002, re-emergence of emergence, a venerable concept in search of a theory, *Complexity*, 7(6), p. 18-30
- Dawkins, R. 1976, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press
- Dor, D. Jablonka, E. 2000, From cultural selection to genetic selection, *Selection*, 1-3, p.33-55
- Dunbar, R. 1998, The Social Brain Hypothesis, in *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 6, p. 178- 190
- Edelman, J.B., Denton, M.J., 2007, The uniqueness of biological self-organization, challenging the Darwinian paradigm, *Biol. Philos.* 22, p. 579-601
- Ellis, N. 1998, Emergentism, connectionism and language learning, in *Language learning*, 48:4, p. 631-664
- Evans, N., S. Levinson, 2009, The Myth of Language Universals : Language Diversity and its Importance for Cognitive Science, *Behaviour and Brain Sciences*, 32, p. 429-492
- Fitch, T. 2010 *The evolution of language*, Cambridge University Press
- Givon T, 1979, *On Understanding Grammar*, Academic Press
- Givon, T. 2002, *Bio-linguistics, the Santa Barbara lectures*, John Benjamins
- Gould, S, J.; Eldbridge, N. 1972, Punctuated equilibria, alternative to phyletic gradualism, in Schopf, Thomas, Freeman, eds. *Models in paleobiology*, Cooper and Co. Publishing, San Francisco, p.82-115
-

Gould, S.J., R. Lewontin, 1979, The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: a Critique of the Adaptationist Programme, Proceedings from the Royal Society of London, Series B. Vol 205, No .1161, p. 581-598

Gould, S.J., E. Vrba, 1982, Exaptation, a missing term in the science of form, Paleobiology, Vol.8, no.1, p. 4-15

Haspelmath, M. 2007, " Pre-established categories don't exist, consequences for language description and typology, Linguistic typology, 11 (1), p.119-132, doi:10.1515/LINGTY.2007.011

Hauser, M. , Chomsky, N. Fitch, T. ,2002, The Faculty of Language, What is it, Who Has it, How did it Evolve, Science 298, p. 1569-1579

Heylighen, F. 1999, The science of self-organization and adaptivity, <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/EOLSS-Self-Organiz>

Heylighen, F. 2008, Complexity and self-organization, in Bates, M.; Maack, M., Encyclopedia of library and information sciences, Taylor and Francis

Heylighen , F. 2013, Self-organization in communicating groups, the emergence of coordination, shared reference and collective intelligence, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-32817_10

Hurford, J. 2011, Linguistics from evolutionary point of view , in R. Kempson, T. Fernando, N. Asher, eds. Handbook of the philosophy of science, vol. 14, Philosophy of linguistics, p. 473-498, Elsevier, or www.lei.edu.ac.uk/~jim/handbook.phil.ling.pdf)

Jablonka ,E., M. Lamb, 2005, Evolution in Four Dimensions , MIT Press,

Janda, R. Joseph,B., 2003, On language, change and language change, in Handbook of Historical Linguistics, Blackwell, p. 3-180

Johnson, B., Lam, S.K. 2010, Self-organization, natural selection and evolution: cellular hardware, genetic software, BioScience vol.60, No. 11, p. 879-885

Kauffman, S. 1993, The origins of order,: self-organization and selection in evolution, Oxford University Press

Kauffman, S. 1995, At home in the universe, The search for laws of self-organization and complexity, Oxford University Press

Kauffman, S. 2006, Beyond reductionism, reinventing the sacred.edge.org

Kirby, S. 1998, Language evolution without natural selection, Edinburgh Occasional Papers in Linguistics,
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/913b/d6f5ed007104b6552e72ec96aa07e336133b.pdf>

Kirby, S. 2000, Syntax without natural selection: How compositionality emerges from vocabulary in a population of learners, in C. Night, M. Studdert-Kennedy, J. Hurford, eds. The evolutionary emergence of language, Social function and the origins of linguistic form, Cambridge University Press, p. 303-323

Lewontin, R. 1998, Evolution of Cognition, Questions we will Never Answer, in Scarborough, Sternberg, eds. An Invitation to Cognitive Science...vol.4 p.106-132, MIT

Lewontin, R. 2002, The triple helix, genes, organism and environment, Harvard University Press

Longa, V. 2001, Sciences of complexity and language origins: an alternative to natural selection, Journal of Literary Semantics, 30, p.1-17

Longa, V. Lorenzo, G. 2014, Self-organization and natural selection: the intelligent auntie's vade-mecum, Biolinguistics :8,p. 130-140

Marcus, G., 2008, Kluge, The Haphazard Construction of the Human Mind, Houghton, Mifflin, New York

Maynard Smith, J., Szathmari, E. 1995, The major transitions in evolution, Oxford University Press

Mayr, E. 1988, Towards a new philosophy of biology, Essay one, Is biology an autonomous sciences, Harvard, <https://faculty.washington.edu>

Mayr, E. 2001, What evolution is, Basic books, Perseus Book Group

Morford, J. 2002, Why does exposure to language matter?, in Givon, Malle, eds. The evolution of language out of pre-language, John Benjamins Publish. p. 329-343

Nisbett, R., K. Peng, I. Choi, A. Norenzayan, 2001, Culture and Systems of Thought: Holistic Versus Analytic Cognition, Psychological review, 108 (2), p.291-310,

Oudeyer, P. 2006, Self-organization in the evolution of speech, Oxford Univ. Press,

Oudeyer P. 2011, Self-organization and complex dynamical systems in the evolution of speech www.pyoudeyer.com

Prigogine, I., Stengers, E., 1993, Order out of chaos, man's new dialogue with nature, Bantam books

Schoenemann, T., 1999, Syntax as emergent characteristic of the evolution of semantic complexity, in *Minds and machines*, 9, Kluwer Academic publishers, Netherlands, p.309-346

Schoenemann, T., 2005, Conceptual complexity and the brain, understanding language origins, in Minett, Wang, *Language acquisition, change and emergence*, City University of Hong Kong, p. 47- 94

Schoenemann, T. 2017, Complex adaptive systems approach to the evolution of language and the brain, in Mufwene, S., Coupe, C., Pellegrino, F., Eds. *Complexity in language*, Cambridge University Press, chap. 4

Seeley, T. 2001, When is self-organization used in biological systems. *Biol. Bull.* 202, (3) doi:10.2307/1543484

Smith, K., S. Kirby, H. Brighton, 2003, Iterated learning, a framework for the origin of language, *MIT, Artificial life*, 9, p. 371-386

Steels, L. , 1995, A self—organizing spacial vocabulary, *Artificial life*, 2 (3), p.319-332, MIT

Steels, L. 2011, Self-organization and selection in cultural language evolution, in L. Steels, ed. *Experiments in cultural language evolution*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, p. 1-37

Studdert-Kennedy, M. 1990, Language Development from Evolutionary perspective, Haskins Laboratories Status Report on Speech Research, SR 101/102, p. 14-27

www.haskins.yale.edu/SR101/SR101_02.pdf

Studdert-Kennedy, M. 1998, The particulate origins of language generativity: from syllable to gesture, in Hurford, J., Studdert-Kennedy, M., Knight, C., *Approaches to the evolution of language, social and cognitive bases*, Cambridge University Press, p. 203-221

Tomasello, M. 2008 *Origins of human communication*, MIT Press

Waddington, C.H., 1953, Genetic Assimilation of Acquired Character, in *Evolution*, vol.7, no.2, p. 118-126

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1953.tb00070.x>

Zaefferer, D., 1991, *Semantic universals and universal semantics*, Foris Publications

◇ Svetlana T. Davidova is a linguist, unaffiliated researcher, based in Toronto, Canada
address for correspondence: svetlana.t.davidova@gmail.com
