

CLIPP

Christiani Lehmanni inedita, publicanda, publicata

titulus

[Review of : Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd, *The Oxford handbook on grammaticalization*. Oxford, 2011]

huius textus situs retis mundialis

http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/rev_narrog_heine.pdf

dies manuscripti postremum modificati

24.07.2013

ocasio orationis habitae

-

volumen publicationem continens

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur 135/3

annus publicationis

2013

paginae

442-456

Review of:

Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd (eds.) 2011, *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics). ISBN 978-0-19-958678-3. xxxiv + 877 pp.

For a couple of decades, grammaticalization has been firmly established as a major research area in linguistics. It therefore appears timely that a volume of the Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics should be devoted to it. Of the two editors, the second in particular has made conspicuous contributions to that area, co-authoring, among many other things, a lexicon of grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002). Moreover, the two editors already published a handbook of linguistic analysis in the same series (Heine & Narrog (eds.) 2009), to which they contributed a chapter on “Grammaticalization and linguistic analysis”. The contributors to the present volume show a nice international distribution; many of them are renowned linguists to whom the study of grammaticalization owes important advances. The editors have aimed at broad coverage of the field and of approaches to it. In their introduction, they opt for a liberal presentation of the issues and their possible solutions rather than for a theoretically coherent account. Such accounts are provided in some of the other chapters, esp. by Harder & Boy, Langacker and DeLancey. Moreover, the volume sounds out the intersection of grammaticalization research with a couple of other strands of linguistics that had hitherto kept rather aloof. Instead of discussing all the contributions to the volume, which space limits forbid, this review will concentrate on the first three parts, which deal with theoretical and methodological issues, and only mention in passing the last two parts, dedicated to specific empirical domains and languages.

Critical survey

Part I of the volume, “Grammaticalization and linguistic theory”, discusses grammaticalization from different theoretical and disciplinary points of view. While this corresponds to a systematic top-down arrangement of subject matter, the level of discussion here is highly abstract, and illustration is largely confined to mentioning rather than analyzing examples. This arrangement is, thus, not too helpful for an uninitiated user who would start reading on p. 1. If one looks for a chapter apt to provide introductory reading, a good candidate might be DeLancey's chapter 29.

In their introduction, Heine and Narrog outline the structure of the volume, anticipating some of the recurrent themes. On p. 11, they claim: “Personal pronouns, and more generally person markers, belong to the most conservative parts of grammar.” This claim, if converted into a falsifiable empirical generalization, is probably false, witness the kind of evidence that the authors themselves recognize (renewal of person pronouns in Romance languages).

The chapter by Traugott on “Grammaticalization and mechanisms of change” is a rather inconclusive set of high-level meta-comments on positions found in the literature. As a note of self-defense, it might be mentioned that while the text (p. 25) attributes to Lehmann 2004:161 the claim that pure grammaticalization without analogy constitutes the norm as against analogically-oriented grammaticalization, there is actually no such claim *l.c.*, and in fact, if ‘norm’ refers to the majority of cases, it is probably the other way around. On p. 22,

the author claims that the pseudo-cleft allowing predicate focus in English originates about 1660 by reanalysis of a purposive construction. That cannot be so for a variety of reasons: First, the predicate focus construction is much older. Second, the two readings of the example provided are widely different, so general presuppositions for a reanalysis are not met. Third, the purpose construction might have any verb in the relative clause, while the focus construction requires *do*.

Olga Fischer deals with “Grammaticalization as analogically driven change?” First she gets rid of reanalysis (p. 40): “Speakers do not reanalyse, they substitute one pattern holistically for another.” Probably a mitigated version of this black-and-white scenario comes closer to the truth: Unless there is an analogical model, reanalysis does not take place. Fischer then downgrades grammaticalization to a particular kind of analogical change: “what ultimately decides whether a linguistic sign becomes part of a user’s grammatical system is whether it resembles in some way (semantically, formally or both) an already existing category. Grammaticalization does not lead to new grammatical structures in any general sense” (p. 42). In claiming this, she ignores both A. Meillet’s (1912:148) pioneering hypothesis “il y a vraiment création d’outils grammaticaux nouveaux, et non pas transformation” and the examples of pure grammaticalization (i.e. those not involving analogy) provided in Lehmann 2004, §3.2. On p. 32, the author purportedly asks: “What empirical evidence do we have for grammaticalization ...?” However, she somehow manages to exchange this question by the question of the underlying mechanism in the grammaticalizing speaker-hearer (p. 33f), obfuscating, thus, the issue.

In the chapter on “Grammaticalization and generative grammar: a difficult liaison”, Elly van Gelderen reviews the problems that generative grammar has had with grammaticalization, the gradually increasing toleration of this field in the model, and finally argues (p. 45) “that the child’s innate principles are in fact responsible for grammaticalization, and that generative grammar can therefore gain much insight from grammaticalization processes.”

Peter Harder and Kasper Boye deal with “Grammaticalization and functional linguistics”. For them (p. 58), “Grammaticalization has a central position in such a [usage-based] theory, because it is the process whereby grammar emerges out of usage.” The authors propose a coherent theory of grammaticalization. Grammatical expressions are defined (p. 60) as ones that “are coded as discursively secondary in relation to one or more syntagmatically related expressions.” In line with this, (p. 63) “Grammaticalization is the diachronic change which gives rise to linguistic expressions which are coded as discursively secondary.” The concept of discursive secondariness is rendered concrete by the restriction that grammatical items “cannot under normal circumstances be used to convey the main point of a linguistic message”, which notion is, in turn, operationalized by the criterion of stressability. While this may be an important observation, it requires us to deny grammatical status to stressable formatives like interrogative, demonstrative and (tonic) personal pronouns, modal verbs, negators and many others. Moreover, the alleged structural counterpart of this semantic aspect, “a dependency relation”, remains obscure.

In her chapter on “Usage-based theory and grammaticalization”, Joan Bybee starts explaining the concept of chunking (known to most of the other authors as phraseology and univerbation) by the example of the complex preposition *in spite of*. She correctly observes

the decategorialization of the erstwhile noun *spite* in the process. However, by reducing grammaticalization to chunking, she misses the distinction between grammaticalization and lexicalization: this loss of analysability has nothing to do with grammaticalization and instead is a definitional feature of lexicalization (s. the chapter by Lightfoot below). The criteria used in order to measure the extent to which the phrase has been univerbated have been applied systematically in German studies of complex prepositions since Beneš 1974. Moreover, while it is true that both grammaticalization and lexicalization are reductive processes, there is an essential difference with regard to syntactic structure: lexicalization destroys it by deleting boundaries. Grammaticalization does not delete boundaries, it just shifts a construction to a lower complexity level.

In his chapter on “Grammaticalization and cognitive grammar”, Ronald Langacker reformulates familiar grammaticalization processes in terms of cognitive grammar. He offers a semantic foundation for grammaticalization in the form of “conceptual compression”, illustrating in detail with the grammaticalization of the *be going to* future. By subjectivity, Langacker essentially means aspects of the speaker’s ongoing linguistic activity as opposed to aspects of the referential world. Metaphorical extensions in grammaticalization often lead from the latter to the former and would then come under the concept of subjectification. Langacker’s descriptions of grammatical meaning are unrivalled, but he has little to say on the formal side of grammar and grammaticalization. For instance, on p. 84f, he describes the semantic bleaching leading to the grammatical functions of *be* and *have*, keeping silent over their complementary distribution both in English and cross-linguistically. Nor are we told about the role of *be* in the progressive form *be going to*.

In their chapter on “Construction grammar and grammaticalization”, Nicolas Gisborne and Amanda Patten report on two cases of constructional change and try to show that they are cases of grammaticalization. In construction grammar, grammaticalization is modelled as schematization of constructions. The authors claim (p. 102): “The construction grammar framework allows us to model the changes predicted in grammaticalization theory”. That seems a bit saucy. In particular, the nature of grammaticalization as a reductive process has not been accounted for.

In the chapter on “Grammaticalization and linguistic typology”, Walter Bisang contributes to “a typology of manifestations of grammaticalization” (p. 106). In several South East Asian languages, words change into grammatical formatives which, on the one hand, show few symptoms of phonological erosion and, on the other hand, allow diverse interpretations on the basis of inferences. These languages, thus, do not display co-evolution of form and meaning. Moreover, such formatives do not form paradigms; grammaticalization manifests itself more in syntagmatic rigidity.

Writing on “Grammaticalization and sociolinguistics”, Terttu Nevalainen and Minna Palander-Collin report on the time that the second phase of Jespersen’s cycle (discontinuous negation becomes simple negation) takes in different Germanic and Romance languages, on the social evaluation of English adverbs provided by *-ly* and on the complication of the spread of parenthetical *I think* by pragmatic factors. All in all, no differences between the spread of grammaticalization and of other kinds of grammatical change have been observed.

Holger Diessel, in “Grammaticalization and language acquisition”, compares the fate of grammatical elements in the two processes and finds parallels in the semantic development, but no analogue in language acquisition to other factors of grammaticalization. It is, therefore, not clear that semantic changes applied by children have much to do with grammaticalization.

In “Grammaticalization and language evolution”, Andrew D.M. Smith elaborates on the cognitive mechanisms underlying metaphor and reanalysis and claims these to have been operative in the evolution of “ostensive-inferential communication”. It seems that the theory of language evolution can draw richer insights than that from grammaticalization theory.

In “Grammaticalization and linguistic complexity”, Östen Dahl proposes a Neo-Humboldtian theory of evolutive typology (developed in earlier work), where long-running grammaticalization finally leads to a “mature”, complex state, displayed by the flexive type.

In their chapter on “Grammaticalization and directionality”, Kersti Börjars and Nigel Vincent offer a circumspect discussion of the problem of degrammaticalization, all too often dealt with cursorily and without sufficient theoretical and empirical foundation. Their conclusion is that there are very few genuine examples of degrammaticalization; but they make no choice among the alternate explanations for unidirectionality. Their treatment could have benefited from acquaintance with Lehmann 2004 (referred to by other contributors to the volume), which puts a number of common misunderstandings of the issue straight. In particular, German *zig* ‘umpteen’ is an invalid example of degrammaticalization not because it is a “citation form” (which it is not), but for the reasons mentioned *o.c.* §4.1.

In Marianne Mithun’s chapter on “Grammaticalization and explanation”, the objective is not to explain grammaticalization, but to show how an account in terms of grammaticalization can explain (better than alternative approaches) certain synchronic facts, and in particular Navajo verbal morphology, used here as a specimen. In principle, the approach is sound and illuminating. It is perhaps necessary to add that affixes and affixal paradigms do not necessarily accrue one by one to a stem. The following scenario is also found: At one stage, there is a periphrastic construction of an auxiliary and a non-finite verb, where some material (e.g. pronouns) agglutinates to the left and the right of the auxiliary, while other material (e.g. adverbs) accrues to the full verb. At a later stage, the complex auxiliary form univerbates with the full verb, leading thus to a layered rather than linear morphological structure. Such a development is known from Swahili. All in all, this chapter is more a (rather detailed) (diachronic-)descriptive account of Navajo verb morphology than a chapter on grammaticalization and explanation.

In “Grammaticalization: a general critique”, Brian D. Joseph is concerned that research in grammaticalization amounts to an undue “privileging of one cluster of changes over others” (p. 198), reminding us of the existence of many other types of linguistic and, in particular, of grammatical change. The chapter contains a large set of rather misplaced criticisms, e.g. (p. 200): “This principle of unidirectionality is generally viewed as foundational for grammaticalization” in the face of Lehmann 2004, §4.2 putting this straight; and there are, once again, spurious examples of degrammaticalization, e.g. *hiccoughing* being reanalysed as *hicking up*. However, some persuasive examples are adduced of changes both from derivational to inflectional morphology and vice versa. If one considers the former of these

changes as grammaticalization – as does Wischer on p. 361 –, then the latter automatically becomes a kind of degrammaticalization (as discussed by Norde, p. 482).

Part II “Methodological issues” shows convincingly how sound scientific method serves the case of grammaticalization theory. In particular, quantitative analyses of the distribution of grammaticalized items and constructions over centuries, as they are possible in well-documented languages, demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that grammaticalization is a process which may proceed in a series of small steps, all in the same direction. No attempt to reduce grammaticalization to other kinds of grammatical change, in particular analogy and reanalysis, can model this oriented character of grammaticalization.

In “Grammaticalization and linguistic variation”, Shana Poplack reminds us of synchronic variation as the counterpart of change and, consequently, synchronic layering of forms of different degrees of grammaticality as the counterpart of diachronic grammaticalization. She offers variationist methodology as a tool to operationalize and test hypotheses on grammaticalization. Illustrating from Brazilian Portuguese, she shows how the periphrastic future with *ir* ‘go’ first competes with other, partly synonymous means of coding future reference and gradually ousts these from their specific domains, ending up as virtually the only future expression in the colloquial register. Comparison with data from French and Spanish yields the surprising result that the contextual grammatical factors favouring the spread of the synthetic future differ in the three languages, rendering cross-linguistic generalizations on the conditions of the grammaticalization of ‘go’ to a future marker hazardous.

Rena Torres Cacoullos and James A. Walker write on “Collocations in grammaticalization and variation”. They show that periphrastic constructions and collocations get condensed over time, and provide the criteria and measures for it. This has relatively little to do with grammaticalization.

In “Grammaticalization and corpus linguistics”, Christian Mair discusses the importance of electronic corpora and of frequency studies in research on grammaticalization and, by querying English corpora, shows that the phrasal conjunction *on (the) basis (that)* is currently at an incipient stage of grammaticalization.

“Grammaticalization and language change in the individual” is another contribution from the Helsinki variationist group, this one by Helena Raumolin-Brunberg and Arja Nurmi. The analysis of variation in the linguistic biographies of three Early Modern Englishmen concerning the use of auxiliaries and modals does not show that processes of grammaticalization may be observed “in individuals’ linguistic practices over their lifetime” (p. 262) or that the diffusion of grammaticalization processes differs from the diffusion of other kinds of linguistic change.

In “Grammaticalization in non-standard varieties of English”, Bernd Kortmann and Agnes Schneider report on 22 changes in the tense/aspect domain and 9 changes concerning pronouns which are observable in contact-based and traditional varieties of English worldwide. Some of them are very wide-spread in the Anglophone world, others are apparently due to particular substratum influence. One conclusion worth quoting is that no difference in kind between internal and contact-induced grammaticalization phenomena can be discerned. However (p. 277), “the only clear cases of innovations in the

grammaticalization history of English (or, more generally, Germanic) are those which are contact-induced.”

This topical area is taken up in the next chapter on “Grammaticalization and language contact” by Yaron Matras. The author attempts to uncover the mechanisms underlying ‘contact-driven grammaticalization’, conceiving it as a case of language convergence in the bilingual speaker’s mind.

In “The areal dimension of grammaticalization”, Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva focus on definiteness and future tense marking to show how the grammar of one language may be replicated by another. Sharing the contact-linguistic perspective on grammaticalization with the previous chapter, their emphasis is more on the development of ‘grammaticalization areas’.

Béatrice Lamiroy and Walter de Mulder compare “Degrees of grammaticalization across languages”, putting Spanish, Italian and French on a cline of increasing grammaticalization according to a large set of criteria. The point here is that a relative degree of grammaticalization can be assigned to a language as a whole and that languages may differ in their rate of grammaticalization.

In “Grammaticalization and semantic maps”, Heiko Narrog and Johan van der Auwera show how the results of grammaticalization research may be visualized by semantic maps.

Part III “Domains of grammaticalization” is devoted to the role played by grammaticalization in the components and subcomponents of the language system and discourse. In “Grammaticalization and prosody”, Anne Wichmann deals with the reduction of prosodic prominence accompanying grammaticalization and causing segmental erosion. The argument is largely based on “discourse markers”. Now, cliticization has often been seen as a typical ingredient of increase of bondedness (also in the subsequent chapter, p. 346f). However, it suffices to look at Romance conjugation (e.g. the Spanish future *cantaró* ‘I will sing’ and conditional *cantaría* ‘I would sing’) in order to see that affixes may be stressed. The relationship between grammaticalization and prosody is not so straightforward.

In the chapter on “The gradual coalescence into ‘words’ in grammaticalization”, Martin Haspelmath reviews the various criteria of bondedness and wordhood and concludes that, since they are partly independent of each other, the transition of a syntactic construction into a word form is a complex and gradual process rather than an instance of (categorical) reanalysis.

The complex relationships between “Grammaticalization and word formation” are tackled by Ilse Wischer. Derivation is seen to resemble grammaticalization, phrasal compounding instead comes under lexicalization, and hypostasis (independentization of affixes) under conversion.

Scott DeLancey’s chapter on “Grammaticalization and syntax: a functional view” is based on an all-encompassing conception (p. 366): “Grammaticalization is not simply a mechanism by which morphological structure develops; it is the constant, universal tendency of language out of which all structure arises.” Furthermore, he contends (p. 368) “that what is constant across languages is recurrent grammaticalization pathways, not universal categories. ... Thus the limits and possibilities of syntax are defined by the range of possible motivated constructions and the phenomena of grammaticalization ..., not by constraints on the possible

outputs of the process". The major specific point is gradient categoriality as the outcome of grammaticalization.

"Grammaticalization and word order change" is the topic of the chapter by Chaofen Sun and Elizabeth C. Traugott. On the basis of English and Chinese examples, they show that a change in word order may either be a consequence of a grammaticalization process or may trigger further grammaticalization processes. A subset of the examples merely shows that under grammaticalization, an item may join a different distribution class and consequently become subject to the order constraints on that class; that does not actually affect the word order rules of the language.

The chapter on "Grammaticalization and semantic change" by Regine Eckhardt tries to give a formal account of the semantic changes in grammaticalization. Illustrating with modal verbs and particles, with auxiliaries and negation from the history of German and English, she provides detailed semantic analyses. The formalization, however, does not in general go beyond the prose descriptions found in the literature and occasionally contributes nothing, as when the "formal" paraphrase offered for epistemic *could* again contains *could* (p. 394).

Basing his chapter on "Pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization" on relevance theory, Steve Nicolle distinguishes between conceptual and procedural meaning and argues (p. 407) "that grammaticalization begins with the addition of procedural information to the meaning of a construction". What may then be lost, by bleaching, is conceptual meaning. Subjectification, on the other hand, is taken in Langacker's sense and therefore not grounded in pragmatics.

Richard Waltereit "Grammaticalization and discourse" deals with the grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of items that were first (p. 423) "used in discourse with a rhetorical purpose."

In "Grammaticalization and conversation", Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen shows how bipartite constructions may be thought to evolve through integration from conversational exchanges. Thus, left dislocation may be conceived as a 'collapsed form' (p. 429), in one speaker's utterance, of a 'recognition search sequence' involving both interlocutors. While the idea is intriguing, the abstract process posited here has no direct bearing on any grammaticalization scale, since patterns of connected discourse thus created precede, so to speak, the left pole of those scales.

The chapter on "Grammaticalization and lexicalization" by Douglas Lightfoot differs from most of the others by presenting essentially a research report – perhaps the most appropriate thing to do in a situation where scholars still mean widely different things by the terms in question. His suggestion of singling out 'narrow lexicalization' from among all the processes by which something may enter the inventory might well carry over to grammaticalization; s. below.

In "Grammaticalization and pragmaticalization", Gabriele Diewald argues that while most previous studies have subsumed under pragmaticalization a set of processes which work like grammaticalization except that they do not lead into grammar, pragmaticalization is, instead, (p. 451) "an integral part of grammaticalization." This argument presupposes that we regard deixis as a component of pragmatics (rather than semantics) and, at the same time, the relational character of grammatical meaning as ultimately grounded in deixis.

In “Iconicity vs. grammaticalization: a case study”, John Haiman deals with grammaticalization as transition from transparency to compactness, illustrating with the formation of a ‘why p’ interrogative sentence by condensation of a bi-clausal construction of the type ‘how does it come about that p’. No generalizations about the role of iconicity in a pregrammatical stage of language evolution and the increasing arbitrariness brought in by grammaticalization emerge from this largely descriptive account.

Muriel Norde defines “Degrammaticalization” as gain in autonomy or substance. For a couple of examples, she shows that they underwent changes which must be described by a reversal of Lehmann’s (2002[T]) parameters of grammaticalization. A relevant example is Old Bulgarian *něčito* ‘something’ becoming the Modern Bulgarian noun *nešto* ‘thing’. All in all, she sides with Börjars & Vincent in regarding degrammaticalization as an exceptional process.

Part IV of the volume is devoted to “Grammaticalization of form classes and categories”. Elly van Gelderen, Paolo Ramat, Christa König, Walter de Mulder, Anne Carlier, Björn Wiemer, Manfred Krug, Laurel J. Brinton, Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, Kees Hengeveld, Debra Ziegeler, Aleksandra Y. Aikhenvald, Noriko O. Onodera, Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Toshio Ohori, Guy Deutscher, Anna Giacalone Ramat, Caterina Mauri, Sandra A. Thompson and Ryoko Suzuki deal with agreement, adverbials, case relators, definite articles, passives, auxiliaries, complex predicates, negatives, tense, aspect, modality, evidentiality, discourse markers, reference systems, subordination, quotatives, coordinators and final particles.

While English figures prominently among the object languages of the first four parts of the handbook, followed by Romance languages, but with all other languages keeping a very low profile, part V “The different faces of grammaticalization across languages” finally does some justice to grammaticalization research on other languages. It contains chapters by Roland Pfau, Markus Steinbach, Bernd Heine, Martin Hilpert, Adam Ledgeway, Mario Martelotta, Maura Cezário, Björn Wiemer, Lars Johanson, Seongha Rhee, Heiko Narrog, Toshio Ohori, Hilary Chapell and Alain Peyraube on sign languages, African, Germanic and Latin-Romance languages, Brazilian Portuguese, Slavic and Turkic languages, Korean, Japanese and Sinitic languages. There is a single bibliography for the set of chapters, comprising an impressive 82 pages.

Discussion

As is commonly the case when a concept gains in importance in a scientific field, it is applied to additional phenomena, with the consequence of semantic bleaching. For instance, Dahl (p. 153) defines grammaticalization as “the processes by which grammatical structures and grammatical markings arise and evolve, including but not restricted to the development from lexical to grammatical morphemes.” Several other contributors endorse a concept of grammaticalization which embodies essentially the making (the “emergence”) of grammar. However, as Fischer (p. 32) puts it: “The widening of the field involved in the phenomenon called grammaticalization has led to a weakening of the power of grammaticalization as a clearly circumscribed process of change.” When Meillet (1912) coined the term ‘grammaticalization’, he not only restricted its application to single meaningful units, but also opposed it to other kinds of grammatical change, especially to analogical change. The first restriction

may be regarded as a typical symptom of Meillet's time, and most researchers have dropped it by now, viewing grammaticalization in the context of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations of the meaningful unit affected. The second restriction, however, is systematic in nature. The mechanisms of analogy are independent of those of grammaticalization; in a concrete historical instance, one may have one or the other or both or neither. This narrow concept of grammaticalization is a valid and necessary one. One feels tempted to take up Lightfoot's proposal (s. above) concerning the term 'lexicalization' and dub 'narrow grammaticalization' the process that subjects meaningful units more to structural constraints of the individual language system.

Several authors (e.g. Diewald) have adopted the position that was originally put forward by critics of grammaticalization research, viz. that grammaticalization is not a unified phenomenon but rather a fortuitous agglomeration of independent elementary processes which a theory of linguistic change needs, anyway. If that is the case, then the methodologically appropriate reaction would seem to be an attempt to straighten the concept of grammaticalization and delineate it cleanly against neighboring concepts. For instance, it is true that phonological erosion and semantic bleaching occur outside grammaticalization. That, however, is well captured by subsuming grammaticalization, together with lexicalization, under the generic concept of reductive change. Similarly, metaphor is such an independent operation which may contribute to grammaticalization. It is, however, not constitutive for grammaticalization, as we shall see below. If we strive for a narrow concept of grammaticalization, the consequence will be that a couple of phenomena that are dealt with in this volume – and which probably fall under a broad concept of grammaticalization – cannot be subsumed under it. The relevant properties of grammaticalization must be structural, since grammar is structure; it is neither a kind of meaning nor a kind of phonological form. The definitional criterion of getting increasingly subject to structural constraints of the individual language system should be applied to all those cases of pragmatization and subjectification, to the formation of modal particles, discourse markers, conversational phraseologisms etc. The goal must be to elaborate a diversified conceptual system in which each of these finds its place, rather than throwing them all in the basket of grammaticalization.

The semantic side of grammaticalization needs to be studied more thoroughly. A more than sufficient number of competing proposals on the general nature of grammatical meaning and the processes generating it are on the table. It seems clear that grammatical meaning cannot be defined in substantive terms. While one can enumerate semantic categories and features that tend to recur in the grammars of languages, these do not provide a criterion to tell a grammatical from a lexical meaning. A formal approach to grammatical meaning would take into account its defeasibility. Consider as a background fact that generally, the combination of lexical items of opposite meaning, like *female stallion*, leads to a contradiction. Now if one of the meanings thus combined is a grammatical meaning, then that gives way to the other one. For instance, gender in human nouns tends to imply sex; but it suffices to put a noun in a lexical context which forces the opposite sex, and the feature based on the gender disappears (*meine Hilfskraft ist Vater geworden* 'my assistant has become a father'). The same goes for tenses: unless there are indications to the contrary, they may carry

a specific temporal meaning. But again, it suffices to use a past tense form in a context that forces future reference, and the grammatical meaning is annulled. As a last example, consider the question implication of an interrogative construction; it disappears if the construction is combined with a lexical item signaling a different illocutionary force, e.g. *please*. This is a formal manifestation of what Harder & Boy mean by the “discursive secondariness” of grammatical meaning.

As for the processes generating grammatical meaning, metaphor and metonymy have been in favor with grammaticalizationists. Metaphor has long been identified as the chief mechanism of semantic extension. If active in grammaticalization, it leads to semantic bleaching and is therefore easily reconcilable with the general notion of grammaticalization as a reductive process. The role of its systematic counterpart, metonymy, is much less clear. Bybee (p. 77) simply assumes that “adding certain inferences” is a feature of grammaticalization, passing in silence over the fact that it runs counter to the “losing features of meaning” which she also regards as constitutive. Likewise, Bisang (p. 105-108) sees metaphor and metonymy involved in grammaticalization. We must face the fact that we can either maintain that grammaticalization is a reductive process, therefore involving desemantization, or that semantic components inferred from the context may be incorporated into the meaning of the grammaticalized item. Some have sought the solution to the apory in serializing the two processes. Thus, Langacker (p. 83) quotes with approval Traugott’s proposal that grammaticalization first involves semantic enrichment, then loss. Similarly, Nicolle as reported above suggests that the first phase of grammaticalization involves accrual of “procedural” components, while the second phase involves loss of “conceptual” meaning. Since these are independent and, in an essential respect, opposite processes, they cannot found grammaticalization as a unified process. This again makes us look for a primarily structural foundation of grammaticalization, of which semantic and phonological processes are but by-products.

The relationship of grammaticalization with pragmatics, although a recurrent topic in the volume, remains far from clear, mainly because the concept of pragmatics is controversial. If one takes it as narrowly as Diewald (s. above), then pragmatization may even be a natural ingredient of grammaticalization. However, such a concept of pragmatics is not needed. Consider the understanding emerging in a speech situation, the joint creation of sense by the interlocutors. Part of it is contributed by the meaning of the signs they use according to the rules of grammar. In other words, it is contributed by the language system. It is there that semantics resides. The sense of the utterance, however, is something that belongs to the speech situation. It involves the combination of the interlocutors’ world knowledge, experience and assessment of the speech situation with their knowledge of the language system. Pragmatics is concerned with that portion of it all that does not belong to the language system and is, therefore, not coded in the utterance, but essentially inferred. If that is so and if grammaticalization is a process enriching the structure of the language system, it follows that pragmatics has no direct relationship with grammaticalization. It is quite possible that grammaticalization involves the coding of “procedural” information; but to the extent it is coded, it is part of the language system, thus, not of pragmatics.

Several of the contributions to the volume endorse Bybee's (2003) idea that grammaticalization leads to greater autonomy of the expressions involved, by which she means the emancipation of coalescing material from their lexical sources and from the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations of the latter. It should, however, be clear that that is the defining feature of lexicalization. When a complex preposition like Span. *a pesar de* 'in spite of' (ch. 18) is first formed, it is a syntactic construction consisting of three items of the inventory. The freezing of the collocation creates, first of all, a new entry in the inventory, which is precisely lexicalization. Apart from that, the new unit may be grammaticalized in its construction (s. Lehmann 2002[N]).

Bybee (ch. 6) and Torres Cacoullos & Walker (ch. 18) find the driving force of grammaticalization in frequency. However, frequency is itself only an effect of some cause. It is, in fact, a consequence of the increasing subjection of the grammaticalized item under constraints of the language system. Increased frequency, in turn, leads to automatization. And automatization is finally the essential cause for the virtual irreversibility of grammaticalization.

Balance

Despite the comprehensive look of the table of contents, the volume leaves us with a few desiderata. A chapter on the history of research into grammaticalization is conspicuously missing from part I (Haspelmath, in his contribution to part III, does devote two pages to it). As a consequence, recognition of the pioneering work by A.W. Schlegel (1818) reduces to one reference (p. 720) where it is deemed "simplistic". In his chapter 57, Heine has the research history on grammaticalization in African languages start with Givón 1971, disregarding Brockelmann 1908-13 (esp. 359-362) and Meinhof 1936. Second, given the particular perspective chosen in the chapter entitled "Grammaticalization and linguistic typology", the volume does not sufficiently reflect the fact that both at its early beginnings with Humboldt and Schlegel and in its renaissance in the 1970s, grammaticalization research has been intimately linked to linguistic typology, especially to its functional variant. Thirdly, while sociolinguistics in its various facets is well represented in the volume, psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics are missing. According to a well-established theory of the functional correlate for grammaticalization (Givón 1989), it is essentially a kind of automatization. That notion is certainly amenable to psycho- and neurolinguistic methods.

The volume comes closest to the ideal of a handbook in parts IV and V. It is there that a certain aspect of the entire field is subdivided according to a simple criterion, the chapters display a certain parallelism and jointly achieve a rather equable coverage of the field. Apart from that, the merits of the volume do not lie in its function as a handbook. One should not expect it to codify what may be considered established knowledge in the field. For one thing, the research strand is young, unripe and heterogeneous. For another, several of the contributors do not take on the task of explaining in a systematic, encyclopaedic manner what is known, and rather aim at proposing new, sometimes controversial theses. Central concepts of grammaticalization theory such as bleaching, renewal, univerbation, etc., while figuring in the subject index, are nowhere defined. The subject index is incomplete. For instance, in the lemma 'univerbation', the chapter that most uses the term (ch. 35) is not referenced. Some

contributions simply miss the handbook genre, witness such formulations as “but I will argue that ... I shall show how ...” (p. 331). The bibliography contains no less than 29 entries referring to (as yet) unpublished manuscripts. Cross-references to other chapters have obviously been inserted by the editors, and equally obviously, authors ignore each other’s chapters. For instance, Joseph’s, Matras’s and Norde’s chapters propose cases of degrammaticalization that are refuted in Börjars & Vincent’s chapter, with no cross-references between them. In many respects, the collection is more like a thematically coherent conference volume than a handbook. Its merits lie in the achievement of bringing together specialists from numerous fields of linguistics and with widely different methodological approaches to focus on a common topic. It offers both interesting data and challenging, sometimes original theoretical claims. It certainly constitutes a milestone in grammaticalization research.

References

- Beneš, Eduard 1974, "Präpositionswertige Präpositionalfügungen." Engel, Ulrich & Grebe, Paul (eds.), *Sprachsystem und Sprachgebrauch. Festschrift Hugo Moser zum 65. Geburtstag*, Teil 1. Düsseldorf: Schwann (Sprache der Gegenwart, 33); 33-52.
- Brockelmann, Carl 1908-13, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. 2 Bde. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard (Nachdr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966).
- Bybee, Joan 2003, ‘Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: the role of frequency’. Joseph, Brian D. & Janda, Richard D. (eds), *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell; 602–623.
- Givón, Talmy 1989, *Mind, code and context. Essays in pragmatics*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2002, *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Narrog, Heiko (eds.) 2009, *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics).
- Lehmann, Christian 2002, *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Second, revised edition. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität (ASSidUE, 9).
- Lehmann, Christian 2002, “New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization”. Wischer, Ilse & Diewald, Gabriele (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (TSL, 49); 1-18.
- Lehmann, Christian 2004, "Theory and method in grammaticalization." *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 32(2 [2005]):152-187.
- Meillet, Antoine 1912, "L'évolution des formes grammaticales." *Scientia* 12(26):6ff. Reimpr.: Meillet, Antoine 1921, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Tome II. Genève. Slatkine & Paris: Champion; 130-148.
- Meinhof, Carl 1936, *Die Entstehung flektierender Sprachen*. Berlin: D. Reimer.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm von 1818, *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales*. Paris: Librairie grecque-latine-allemande.