

An Van linden, Jean-Christophe Verstraete & Kristin Davidse, eds. 2010. *Formal evidence in grammaticalization research*. (Typological Studies in Language 94.) Amsterdam & New York: John Benjamins. Pp. viii + 344. ISBN 978-90-272-0675-6.

Reviewed by GABRIELE DIEWALD, Leibniz Universität Hannover

This volume contains ten studies on theoretical and empirical topics of grammaticalization. Nine papers are expanded versions of presentations given at the conference “From ideational to interpersonal: Perspectives from grammaticalization” (FITIGRA) that took place at the University of Leuven from 10 to 12 February 2005. The contribution by Zygmung Frajzyngier was not given at the conference, but was commissioned especially for this volume.

The motto of the original conference and the title of the resulting volume indicate a remarkable shift, with the latter encompassing a much broader view on the topic. This may be put down to the fact that research like the one which – usually under the name of (inter)subjectification – treats the semantico-functional cline from ideational to interpersonal meaning needs to be backed-up by a comprehensive conception of grammaticalization including aspects beyond the semantico-functional and pragmatic range. It is one of the assets of this volume acknowledging this fact and aiming at a full coverage of all processes and linguistic levels involved in grammaticalization.

In the introduction, the editors of the volume rightly point out that research in grammaticalization has succeeded in connecting as distinct fields of linguistics as typological and comparative approaches, diachronic and synchronic descriptive studies of individual languages, usage-based and corpus-oriented models as well as language acquisition research. This wide propagation almost naturally has led to an emphasis on semantic and functional aspects of dynamic processes in language, as they may be seen as the common denominator of all these fields. It has thus brought with it the danger of neglecting more formal and structure-based aspects of grammaticalization. Recognizing the situation, the editors explicitly steer against this drift and declare that one of the purposes of the present volume is to function as a kind of corrective to this development.

Consequently, the following two general topics are identified and declared the central issues of the volume. The first issue concerns the “system-internal factors steering the direction of grammaticalization”, the sec-

ond issue deals with “recognition criteria for grammaticalization” (p. 2). From those two fields, “formal evidence” – in the wording of the editors – for grammaticalization and its particular components and features can be gained, whereby the term “formal” means evidence from the semasiological and structural as opposed to the onomasiological and functional perspective, and does not refer to formal models of description and theorizing.

According to the editors, the volume can be divided into two parts. The first part, consisting of the four papers by Fischer, Frajzyngier, Yap, Choi & Cheung, and Van den Nest, unites studies dealing with more general aspects and processes of grammaticalization, in particular taking into account the respective grammatical systems backing the process. The second part, including six papers by Smessaert & Van den Belle, Fried, Shibasaki, Sohn, Liu and Schlüter, is devoted to the recognition of formal criteria in the sense explained above that can be used as diagnostics for grammaticalization processes. Here, several suggestions known from the literature are taken into account, for example, pathways and clines of grammaticalization, parameters of grammaticalization as suggested by Lehmann (1995 [1982]), as well as frequency and less investigated features like tone.

As all studies refer to empirical data – though with varying intensity – and all papers aim at relating their findings with the general aspects addressed in the volume as a whole – again with varying intensity – the subdivision into these two parts is not particularly prominent.

Fischer’s paper takes up the issue of scope, which in Lehmann’s parameters is one of the six criteria to measure degrees of grammaticalization, and which had led to some debate and confusion in the past. Fischer sets out for a revision of this issue, taking the grammaticalization of the English modals as a test case, and ending up with the conclusion that Lehmann’s parameters “may after all work better than some of us have been prepared to believe in the last few years” (p. 38), and that they may prove to be most effective as a diagnostic of grammaticalization on the level of individual linguistic signs (as opposed to constructions).

Frajzyngier’s contribution, entitled “Grammaticalization within and outside a domain”, widens the field of possible cases of grammaticalization in claiming that the restructuring of oppositions among existing grammatical markers is a means of creating new grammatical markers. This process – called “grammaticalization within a domain” – is characterized by the

re-use of existing formal distinctions for the coding of newly grammaticalized functions, which are not semantically or functionally motivated by the forms. Among the encoding strategies for this type of grammatical markers are tone distinctions as well as stress, linear order, gemination, and reduplication. On the other side, grams representing “grammaticalization outside a domain” are built up by the recruitment of new erstwhile lexical or less grammatical material, which underwent the known processes of grammaticalizing together with the specific changes in morphosyntactic and semantic features. The paper discusses “grammaticalization within a domain” by a survey on the grammaticalization of tone in several Chadic languages. It seems that the process of encoding new grammatical distinctions with the help of formal differentiation that is already present in the language but “non-functional” so far, has a parallel in phenomena like folk etymology, when morphological reanalysis is triggered by a process of (re-)motivating – imposed, non-etymological – form-meaning correspondences in existing morphophonological material.

The study of Yap, Choi & Cheung on the delexicalization of the Chinese item *di* from a locative noun, originally meaning ‘bottom’, into a sentence final stance marker presents a classic grammaticalization study with rich diachronic data. It provides cross-linguistic generalization concerning the path towards a sentence final attitudinal marker – also known as “main clause nominalization” – in confronting the Chinese data with data from other East Asian and Tibeto-Burman languages. It is shown that the tendency towards sentence final stance marking is a common feature of Chinese (an SVO language) and other related languages (which are SOV). Its easy availability in Chinese is due to the fact that Chinese has prenominal modification – despite being an SVO language, for which this feature is marked – and thus behaves parallel to the neighbouring SOV languages, for which prenominal modification is the default case.

The contribution by Van den Nest, an empirical study of synchronic variation as well as diachronic development, is devoted to “asyndetic or conjunctionless conditionals in German and English”. The author refers to Jespersen’s (1940) claim that these constructions arose from paratactic juxtaposition, a claim which was questioned by Harris & Campbell (1995), and which the author investigates anew. Working with the notions of the emergence of grammatical distinctions in and from dialogic structure as formulated by Hopper & Traugott (1993 [2003]), and speech-situation evocation as well as with Lehmann’s parameters (in particular, bondedness,

paradigmatic variability, and specialization), the author substantiates and modifies Jespersen's claim and demonstrates that asyndetic conditionals can emerge from discourse.

The second part of the volume consists of six papers devoted to more in-depth, detailed empirical studies, which take up the general problem of "recognition criteria", that is, the diagnostics of grammaticalization processes from a language specific, data-driven perspective.

The contribution by Smessaert & Van Belle on the developmental path taken by Dutch *anders* on its way from manner expression to attitudinal discourse marker, offers a thorough study on semantic and functional change. It distinguishes three types of usage of *anders* (adverb, conjunction, discourse marker), asserting the validity of functional and semantic stages as originally proposed by Traugott (1989). In addition, it addresses the question of "recognition criteria" by isolating distinctive features and their specific clustering for the three types of usage (+/- comparative, +/- phoricity), whereby the most grammaticalized stage is realized by minus values for both features (cf. Diewald & Ferraresi 2008 for quite analogous suggestions concerning modal particles in German). Finally, the linguistic items are tested with the help of the grammaticalization parameters and their dynamics, which confirms their respective degrees of grammaticalization as suggested by the synchronic analysis. Thus, this paper presents new data on a particular case and at the same time attests the validity of the concept of semantico-functional stages in grammaticalization paths as well as the validity of the operational diagnostics offered by the grammaticalization parameters.

The paper by Fried presents a diachronic study of the complex and diversified semantic, morphological and syntactic changes which interact in the case of the Old Czech participle acquiring adjective features, i.e. a functional shift from predication to modification. Fried claims that this "recalibrating of the morpho-semantic features" (pp. 22of.) has to be taken care of in all its detail. Focusing on those partly contrary developments, the paper raises the question of grammaticalization and lexicalization, and offers as a solution an explicit construction grammatical approach, which takes into account all relevant attributes of all levels of linguistic structure and argues that degrees of grammaticalization have to be evaluated by considering all levels of linguistic structure and all accessible facts.

The following two studies (Shibasaki, Sohn) pay special attention to the role of frequency in grammaticalization in the vein of Bybee (2003).

The study of Shibasaki takes up the question of the role of frequency in semantic change in the development of the Japanese second person form *omae*. Sketching the diachronic history of this form, which started as a noun and developed into a pronoun, since Late Old Japanese, Shibasaki contends that “frequency serves as a cause of semantic change” (p. 239), which seems to refer in particular to an advanced stage of the process, when the item undergoes wide distribution and stereotyped interpretation. Notwithstanding the fact that talking about frequency as a “cause” of semantic change might be seen as striking an unduly deterministic note, which is not confirmed by the data, the study rightly points to the interaction of frequency and semantic change.

The paper by Sohn is devoted to the Korean negative verb *-canh-*, deriving from the fusion of the committal suffix *-ci* plus the negation verb *anh-*, and its development into an interactive marker. In a corpus study of spoken and written discourse, it traces the role of boundary tones in grammaticalization. The paper shows that differences in tone patterns interact with frequency and that together they influence grammaticalization. While source forms are associated with a high boundary tone, the newly grammaticalized form shows strong affinity to a low boundary tone, the latter in turn being associated with increased frequency.

The paper by Liu is devoted to the grammaticalization of a numeral classifier (*yige*) into a marker of indefiniteness in spoken Taiwan Mandarin, which together with a parallel development of the demonstrative *nage* meaning ‘that’ into a definite article is assumed to lay the ground for a newly developing grammatical category of determiners in Taiwan Mandarin. The study uses synchronic spoken data from several genres for describing the distribution of *yige*, and argues for its emerging status as an indefinite article. As there are no diachronic data, the suggested pathway of grammaticalization for *yige*, though plausible, remains hypothetical.

The last paper by Schlüter takes up the hotly debated issue of the unidirectionality of grammaticalization in questioning whether the marginal modal *dare* in English can be seen to be involved in a process of de-auxiliarization. In a careful analysis and argumentation it is shown that since the sixteenth-century *dare* has displayed a variety of usages between more lexical and more grammatical functions in a complex diachronic situation. The author sums up her findings referring to “a complex picture that defies an easy localization of *dare* on the lexical–grammatical scale” as its diachronic movements “even tend to drift into opposite directions”. Possibly,

the notion of lexical split, which is not mentioned in the paper, would have been a helpful notion in addition to the explanations offered. Though not easy to operationalize, the notion of lexical split seems adequate for dealing with the type of complexity of the diachronic data met in the case of modals, all the more so as this type of situation is quite common in Germanic modals as well as in a number of other auxiliaries in Germanic and Romance languages. Source items developing into auxiliaries for TAM categories tend to be polyfunctional, thus encouraging lexical split, including the rise of new lexical verbs from some morphological variant of the source item (e.g. German *möchten* from the subjunctive II forms of the modal *mögen* ‘may’; English main verb *will* versus auxiliary *will/would* etc).

The six case studies and the four more general papers present interesting data on the particular categories and languages investigated. Beyond that they collectively contribute to the more theoretical issues of grammaticalization studies, more precisely, to what in this volume is called “formal evidence” for grammaticalization. The following three issues can be highlighted in this respect:

- (i) The contributions impressively demonstrate the applicability and operational quality of instruments developed in grammaticalization studies (e.g. Traugott’s functional stages, Lehmann’s parameter) and of notions used in constructional approaches. Combined according to each language specific situation, they provide reliable diagnostics for the evaluation of degrees and paths of grammaticalization in a wide variety of categories.
- (ii) The volume through several case studies points to the fact that synchronic spoken data, frequency and intonation patterns provide rich and barely tapped resources for further knowledge on the exact micro-processes constituting linguistic change, and thus accompanying grammaticalization.
- (iii) The problems and data discussed in the volume emphasize the necessity of still deepening the reflection on grammaticalization and its interaction with related processes, on theoretical notions to be used and on models to be employed.

In short, the volume offers a number of highly relevant advances in particular theoretical and methodological issues of grammaticalization, and provides new and instructive material on individual cases of grammaticalization.

References

- Bybee, Joan L. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticalization: The role of frequency. In Brian Joseph & Richard D. Janda, eds. *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 602–623. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Diewald, Gabriele & Gisella Ferraresi. 2008. Semantic, syntactic and constructional restrictions in the diachronic rise of modal particles in German: A corpus-based study on the formation of a grammaticalization channel. In Elena Seoane & María José López-Couso, eds. *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*, 77–110. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003 [1993]. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1940. *A modern English grammar on historical principles*. Part 5: *Syntax*, Vol. 4. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31–55.

Reviewer's address

Deutsches Seminar, Germanistische und Angewandte
Linguistik
Königsworther Platz 1
D-30167 Hannover
Germany
gabriele.diewald@germanistik.uni-hannover.de

received: 28 February 2012