



The role of pragmatics in cyclic language change: Introduction

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.00040.mos>

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hansen, M-B. M. (2020). The role of pragmatics in cyclic language change: Introduction. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 21(2), 165-181. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.00040.mos>

Published in:

Journal of Historical Pragmatics

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



The role of pragmatics in cyclic change: Introduction

Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, The University of Manchester

1. Cyclic language change

The concept of linguistic cycles (or spirals) was first mentioned by von der Gabelentz (1901), Jespersen (1917), and Meillet (1921), and has been further explored in grammaticalization theory (e.g. Lehmann 1982, Heine & al. 1991, Bybee et al. 1994, Heine 1997). It refers to a type of a stepwise, recurrent, and inherently directional evolution, which results in the renewal of linguistic markers.¹ It may be found repeatedly within one language, but also across languages.

It must be emphasized from the outset that, as used here, the concept of cyclic change is a metaphorical one. Importantly, it is a linguist's metaphor, in the sense that the idea that a particular set of changes constitute a cycle is not claimed to have psychological reality for individual language users. Rather, the idea of a cycle describes what linguists may perceive when studying evolutions that not infrequently have taken centuries to complete.

1.1 (Morpho)syntactic cycles

The best known type of cyclic language change, discovered in the early 20th century, and which has been the object of renewed interest in the past decade (cf. van Gelderen 2011, 2017, van Gelderen, ed. 2009, 2016, Larrivée & Ingham 2011, Bouzouita et al. fc), is (morpho)syntactic cycles, or grammaticalization cycles, where the material that changes cyclically is limited to grammatical items inside the core clause. The meaning contribution of such items consists in structuring the "real world" situation described by the clause. Grammaticalization cycles thus concern what Hansen (2008: 16) calls the "content level" of discourse.

Van Gelderen (2011) identifies a total of seven well-documented types of diachronic cycles pertaining to (morpho)syntactic constructions across a wide variety of languages, and yet other cycles have been adduced in at least some languages (e.g. Rupp & Tagliamonte 2017, Vindenes 2018, Waltereit this issue).

The most familiar (morpho)syntactic cycle is probably the negative cycle known as Jespersen's Cycle. Here, an item functioning as a marker of standard clause negation in a given language (e.g. Old French preverbal *ne*) is first optionally accompanied by an additional marker in certain contexts (e.g. postverbal *pas* or *mie* in Old French). Gradually, the newer marker becomes obligatory, whereupon the older negative marker starts to drop out in more and more contexts (as is the case with preverbal *ne* in contemporary colloquial spoken French), and may disappear completely (as is virtually the case in contemporary conversational Québécois French). The newer marker may eventually move into the syntactic slot that used to belong to the older marker in some or all contexts (thus, *pas* has become preverbal in infinitival clauses in standard French):

$$(1) \quad ne \ V > ne \ V \ (pas) > ne \ V \ pas > (ne) \ V \ pas > V \ pas > pas \ V$$

In other cases, the original negative marker eventually merges with the newer marker (e.g. Old English *ne* + *ówiht* 'not a thing' > *nought*; Old Latin *NE* + *OENUM* 'not one' > *NON*). Eventually, the cycle may start over again with another item optionally accompanying the new standard negator. As

¹ I use the term "renewal" in what Reinöhl & Himmelmann (2017) call a "descriptive sense", i.e. no claim is made that renewal is a type of language change in its own right.

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

has been shown in the literature (e.g. Jespersen 1917; Schwegler 1990; Schwenter 2006; Kiparsky & Condoravdi 2006; Lucas 2007; Van der Auwera 2009; Hansen & Visconti 2009, Wallage 2017; Hansen 2018b), the cyclic evolution of negation constructions following the pattern first described by Jespersen (1917), albeit with some variations, can be observed in many different languages at different periods of time.

The standard assumption made by proponents of generative grammar is that (morpho)syntactic cycles are driven by feature economy. Change from lexical to grammatical status is characterized by upward movement in the syntactic structure, and the subsequent loss of a movement dependency is a consequence of a merge operation. The cyclic character of this change is explained by a universal preference of merge over movement (Roberts 1993, Roberts & Rousseau 2003, van Gelderen 2004, 2017).

However, recent work on instantiations of specific (morpho)syntactic cycles in specific languages (e.g. Detges & Waltereit 2002, 2016; Schwenter 2006; Hansen & Visconti 2009; Grossman & Polis 2014; Rosemeyer & Grossman 2017; Rupp & Tagliamonte 2017; Hansen 2018b; Vindenes 2018; Detges 2018, this issue; Waltereit this issue) suggests that pragmatics may in fact be the driver, such that the innovative items or constructions are initially specialized for certain types of pragmatically loaded context, and only gradually extended to all contexts.

Thus, for instance, Hansen & Visconti (2009) and Hansen (2018b) show that Old French bipartite negation using *pas* and *mie* was pragmatically marked, inasmuch as the postverbal markers were originally confined to negating discourse-old propositions. In these authors' Old French data, propositions negated by *ne-pas/mie* may represent (i) denials/rejections or (ii) repetitions/paraphrases of previously expressed propositions, (iii) (pragmatic) presuppositions of the preceding discourse, or their negation, or (iv) (negation of) invited inferences from the preceding discourse, as exemplified in (2)-(5) below. In contrast, propositions negated by preverbal *ne* alone can represent information that is completely new, both to the discourse and to the hearer.

- (2) Fols est li reis ki vos laissat as porz. [...] « Ultre, culvert ! Carles n'est mie fol,... »
(Chanson de Roland, vv. 1193, 1207, c. 1100)
'Mad is the King who left you in these passes. [...] "Out of my sight, villain! Charles is not mad,..."'
- (3) Segur soiez, ne dotez pas (Enéas, v. 611, c. 1155)
'be certain, do not doubt'
- (4) Lasse, por koi l'apeles ? de sorcurs n'avras mie ! (Li vers del Juise, v. 77, 1125-1150)
'Wretch, why do you call upon him ? You won't get any help!'
- (5) Sil fiert sur sun escu bendé / k'il la li ad freit e quassé, / le hauberc rumpu et desafré ; /
mes nen a pas sun cors dampné (Gormont et Isembart, v. 125, c. 1130)
'Thus he strikes on his banded shield so that he cracked and broke it, fractured and tarnished his hauberk, but did not harm his body'

Hansen & Visconti (2009) hypothesize that so-called Janus-faced contexts such as that in (6) were responsible for a subsequent reanalysis of the postverbal markers as unmarked for the given-new dimension, and that this reanalysis allowed them to become generalized to all contexts of standard clause negation. In (6), the negated proposition rejects a preceding request, but also stands in contrast to the content of the immediately following clause, and hearers are free to interpret either of those relationships as the textually more important one:

- (6) Et quant len li volt demander qui il estoit, il n'en tint onques plet a ax, ainz respondi tot pleinement qu'il ne lor droit ore pas, car il le savroient bien a tens se il l'osoient demander. (Queste del Saint Graal, p. 8, c. 1220)
'And when they would ask him who he was, he never exchanged words with them, but replied quite plainly that he wouldn't tell them now, for they'd soon find out if they dared to ask.'

1.2 Semantic-pragmatic cycles

Most recently, researchers have discovered the existence of semantic-pragmatic cycles, or cycles of pragmaticalization (Ghezzi & Molinelli 2014, Hansen 2014, 2018a/c, fc), that is, cycles of change affecting linguistic items that express more subjective, context-dependent and non-truth-conditional meanings, such as the speaker's stance, or how the utterance fits into the surrounding discourse, contributes to the common ground etc., i.e. items that function at what Hansen (2008: 16) calls the "context level" of discourse.

Semantic-pragmatic cycles are characterized by the following stages and properties:

- A given linguistic expression *e* that originally has a content-level function may, from a certain point in time, develop one or more context-level functions, and thus become "pragmaticalized" (Erman & Kotsinas 1993).
- At some point, a new expression *e'* may begin to fulfil the content-level function originally associated with *e*. Depending on whether or not *e* has lost its source meaning, it may thus find itself in competition with or replaced by *e'* at the content level.
- In turn, *e'* may itself become pragmaticalized, developing context-level uses that strongly resemble those of *e*.
- Eventually, *e* may disappear from the language altogether, or at least find itself increasingly confined to specific genres or registers.
- In some cases, more than two expressions may be involved in a semantic-pragmatic cycle, either within a given language or across a mother language and a daughter language, such that the same cycle is repeated with a new expression *e''*, and so forth.

An example of this type of cycle are the successive developments of the (by now obsolete) Old French adverb/connective *ainz* and of Old and Modern French *plutôt*.² Both of these items originally expressed temporal anteriority or comparison ('earlier', 'sooner'), as shown in (7)-(8) below. This is a content-level use, in which the markers clearly have truth-conditional import.

- (7) ...ains que de chi me parte,... (Doön de Mayence, c. 1250, 36-37)
'...before I leave here,...'
- (8) ...que par poison elle avoit fait son pere morir pour parvenir plus tost a son heritage ; (Roman du comte d'Artois, 1453, 49-50)
'...that she had poisoned her father to come into her inheritance sooner.'

² Both markers had a range of different orthographies in Medieval French. In the case of *plutôt*, both analytic and unverbated forms exist in the Middle Ages, with no clear distributional differences. Eventually, in the 18th c., the original analytic form (by then written *plus tôt*) became specialized for temporal, i.e. content-level uses, whereas the unverbated, lexicalized form *plutôt* became specialized for context-level uses.

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

Subsequently, both *ainz* and *plutôt* acquired a context-level use in which they express subjective preference on the part of a discourse referent (typically, but not necessarily, the agent of the main verb), as seen in (9)-(10):

- (9) Et les diz phisiciens li conseilierent que il ne mengast pas du poucin [...], ainçois tenist diete. (G. de St Pathus, Miracles de St Louis, 1300, 116-117)
'And these doctors advised him not to eat chicken [...], but rather/on the contrary to keep a diet.'
- (10) O dieux begnins, ne veuillés revocquer / La vie des humains car il n'est (pas) temps, / Vueillés plustost par douceur les vocquer, (La Cene des dieux, 1492, 110-111)
'Oh, benevolent Gods, do not recall the lives of human beings for it is not time, Rather, please call them gently.'

In a third stage, each marker comes to be used to express correction (including metalinguistic correction), as in (11)-(12) below.

- (11) ...ne *ne* fustes d'ome angendrez, / ançois fustes de pierre nez ; (Enéas, 1155, 55-56)
'...and you were not begot by a man, rather/on the contrary, you were born of a stone;'
- (12) ...car viande non digérée engendre mauvaises humeurs et ne nourist pas le corps mais plustost le corrompt. (J. Daudin, De la erudition ou enseignement des enfans nobles, 1360-80, 155-158)
'for meat that hasn't been digested begets bad humors and doesn't nourish the body but rather corrupts it.'

As shown in Hansen (fc), the gradual pragmaticalization of *ainz* precedes that of *plutôt*, and appears to be at least partly driven by the successive encroachment of the newer marker on each of the functional domains of *ainz*, until the latter finally disappears from the language in the 17th c.

Interestingly, the same cline of pragmaticalization, i.e. from marking temporal anteriority *via* subjective preference to correction, is also instantiated by both German *ehler* and English *rather* (e.g. Gergel 2016). *Eher*, however, does not form part of a cycle of pragmaticalization in the same sense as *ainz/plutôt*, i.e. it does not appear to be the case that each of the different uses of *ehler* renews a similar use of a single older marker that precedes *ehler* in the history of German. (As for *rather*, it may form a partial cycle with *sooner*, which also has a preferential use, but no corrective use.) Nevertheless, the fact that we find similar clines of pragmaticalization at this level of granularity across languages that are not direct descendants of one another, and at different times, is evidently of theoretical interest for many of the same reasons that cyclicity in pragmaticalization will be argued to be (cf. sect. 1.4 below).

A given semantic-pragmatic cycle may recur more than once in a language. Thus, taken together, the evolution of the Latin adverb NUNC ('now'), which is initially replaced in French by *or*, and subsequently by *maintenant*, both of which develop in almost exactly the same way as NUNC had done previously, constitutes precisely such a case of repeated cyclicity. These three items all start out as deictic temporal adverbs referring to the moment of speech ('now'), and they successively develop into sequencing devices indicating a new, and possibly contrasting, topic, strand of narrative events or arguments, as in (13) (Hansen 2018c):

- (13) Nous sommes attirés par ce qui nous flatte, de quelque façon que ce soit. Or François admirait le comte. (Radiguet, Bal. 1923, 89 – from TLFi)

'We're attracted to what flatters us, in whichever way. Now, François admired the count.'

Hansen (2018a) proposes a refinement of the concept of semantic-pragmatic cyclicity by distinguishing between two aspects of this kind of change, namely an onomasiological and a semasiological side. Onomasiology starts from a particular function and identifies the linguistic forms that express this function in a given language. Accordingly, an onomasiological cycle is defined by the (potentially repeated) replacement of markers used for a given context-level function by more recently emerged, and etymologically unrelated, items hailing from the same conceptual source at the content level. In other words, this subtype of pragmaticalization cycles involves renewal of the form expressing a given set of functions. The cases of *ainz/plutôt* and NUNC/*or/maintenant* are thus examples of onomasiological cycles. An onomasiological cycle in a different domain is illustrated by Ghezzi and Molinelli's (2014) analysis of the related pairs of expressions ROGO and QUAESO in Latin vs Italian *chiedo* and *prego*. ROGO and QUAESO both share the content-level source meaning 'I ask/request', and both subsequently developed a context-level function as politeness markers, but for QUAESO this change reached a more advanced stage than in the case of ROGO. The very same evolution ('Ips verb of request' > 'politeness marker') has been repeated independently by the Italian verbs *chiedo* and *prego*, with *prego* being the unmarked element in this pragmatic function.

In contrast to onomasiology, semasiology starts with a linguistic form and studies the functions that may be expressed by that form. The notion of semasiological cyclicity thus captures the remarkable fact that what is etymologically the same item may undergo similar types of semantic-pragmatic changes more than once in the history of a language (and/or across a mother language and at least one of its daughters). This is exemplified by the evolution of Lat. IAM ('as of now, already') > Old Fr. *ja* (< IAM) > Fr. *déjà* ('already' < *dès*, 'as of' + *ja*), all of which developed scalar as well as stance-marking and/or connective meanings from a temporal-aspectual source meaning (Hansen 2014). In other words, rather than directly inheriting the context-level uses of their immediate etymological forebear, both Old French *ja* and its descendant *déjà* appear to have initially returned to a functional "square one" at the content level, only subsequently developing context-level uses of types that are more or less similar to those found with the older variant of the *etymon*.

Such cases can, of course, simultaneously be considered from the onomasiological perspective, given that semasiological cycles require similarity of both functions and form, whereas onomasiological cycles require only similarity in the functions fulfilled by the items involved. This appears to make semasiological cycles an intriguing subset of onomasiological cycles, a distinctive property of which is that they involve functional renewal but no, or only partial, formal renewal. Thus, from Latin IAM to Old French *ja*, there is no change in form (apart from regular phonological change), but the functional evolution from the content level to the context level appears to start over. In the evolution from *ja* to *déjà*, there is partial – but only partial – formal renewal represented by the collocation with, and later incorporation of, the preposition *dès*, and for the third time a very similar functional evolution is repeated starting from the same temporal content-level source meaning.

Scivoletto (this volume) argues that an additional, different type of semasiological cycle ought to be distinguished, namely cases where an item first undergoes semantic change that involves the addition of a particular semantic feature. Subsequently, the expression loses that feature again, but because its meaning has pragmaticalized further in the meantime this results in a spiral-like evolution, rather than a return to the point of departure.

It is important to emphasize that, as already suggested, there is no opposition between onomasiological and semasiological cycles of pragmaticalization: rather, the latter constitute a

subtype (or subtypes) of the former. Both types of cycle are driven by meaning, in particular contextually driven inferencing processes that result in reinterpretation of conventional meanings. Thus, although the terms "onomasiological" vs "semasiological" may seem to imply a system-based vs a sign-based perspective on cycles of pragmaticalization, both types of cycle arguably present evidence against a predominantly system-based explanation of cyclic change. Thus, a strictly system-based point of view would struggle to explain how what is essentially the same functional evolution could take place several times over in a given language, even where the diachronic intervals involved are so extensive that the nature of the overall linguistic system has changed considerably in the meantime.³

1.3 Parallels and interrelations between types of cycles

A central question raised by the discovery of semantic-pragmatic cycles in conjunction with recent arguments in favor of seeing pragmatics as a (or indeed the) principal driver of (morpho)syntactic cycles would seem to be the question of what parallels and interrelations there might then be between the two types of cycle.

Firstly, both grammaticalization and pragmaticalization have been assumed to be unidirectional (Detges & Waltereit 2016: 635). In the case of grammaticalization, the unidirectionality hypothesis has, however, been subject to substantial – and cogent – criticism (e.g. Norde 2009), such that unidirectionality is no longer regarded by many (if not most) scholars as an exceptionless principle of grammaticalization, but merely as a strong statistical tendency. The existence of semasiological cycles such as the one formed by *IAM* > *ja* > *déjà*, where the meaning of an expression that has evolved from the content level to the context level subsequently returns to the earlier content-level stage (cf. sect. 1.2 above) shows that the same applies to cycles of pragmaticalization.

Secondly, there is some evidence that the distinction between onomasiological and semasiological cycles of semantic-pragmatic change may to some extent be paralleled in the case of (morpho)syntactic cycles. Thus, the standard negative cycle from Latin to French involves the repeated recruitment of nominal elements to "reinforce" a basic clause negator, as seen in (14):

- (14) NE+OENUM ('one (thing)') > NON > *ne* > *ne+pas/mie/point* ('step'/'crumb'/'point')

While being etymologically distinct, the nominal source elements in question all share the semantic property of expressing a minimal quantity of something. In that sense, the evolution of OENUM, on the one hand, and *pas/mie/point*, on the other, from optional negation-reinforcing markers to an integral part of the standard clause negators in their respective languages constitutes an onomasiological cycle.

Conversely, the evolution of the negative coordinating conjunction (NEQUE/NEC > *ne* > *ni* '(n)either/(n)or') from Latin to Modern French appears to instantiate something rather like a semasiological cycle. In Classical Latin, the conjunction is compatible only with strong negative polarity contexts: thus, it always negates the clause it introduces, and it does so without the presence of other negative markers in the clause, just like Modern English *neither/nor* do. The Old French

³ Note that is in no way meant to suggest a wholesale rejection of any influence of the linguistic system upon the evolution of individual items and constructions. On the contrary, in the Peircean model of meaning and meaning change developed in Hansen (2008), the linguistic system forms part of the so-called "immediate ground" against which any given sign is interpreted. The changing nature of that system is likely to be part of the reason why "new cycles are not identical to the earlier ones" (van Gelderen 2017: 467).

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

conjunction *ne*, on the other hand, can only negate if accompanied by the standard preverbal clause negator *ne*, and the conjunction is regularly found in so-called affective (or "weak negative") polarity contexts such as conditionals, yes/no interrogatives, and comparatives, in which it does not have negative meaning, but corresponds to *either/or* in Modern English. Finally, in Modern French, *ni* has returned to exclusively marking strong negative contexts, going even further in this direction than Latin NEQUE/NEC, inasmuch as *ni* can only connect two clauses if both are negative. Due to the action of Jespersen's Cycle (cf. sect. 1.1 above), it can once again express negative meaning in the absence of the standard clause negator. In other words, throughout its history, this conjunction has completed an almost perfectly cyclical three-stage evolution which has, to all intents and purposes, returned it to its functional starting point (cf. Hansen in prep.).

Thirdly, there is some indication that (morpho)syntactic and semantic-pragmatic cycles may interact directly with one another. Thus, Hansen (2013) notes that, in some dialects such as Swiss French (Fonseca-Greber 2007), the original French preverbal clause negator *ne* appears to have taken on a new pragmatic function which is highly reminiscent of the function that the newer postverbal negator *pas* had in Medieval French (see sect. 1.1 above). In addition to having undergone the Jespersen Cycle described in sect. 1.1 above, *ne* and *pas* have thus arguably completed a full semantic-pragmatic cycle, such that the erstwhile (semantic) function of *ne* is nowadays fulfilled by *pas*, whereas the original (pragmatic) function of *pas* can currently be fulfilled by *ne* in the dialect(s) concerned.

1.4 Further perspectives

As a type of language change that follows recurrent patterns, the study of cyclic change can be expected to deepen our understanding of regularities of language change. But linguistic cycles are not only of interest to diachronic linguistics. As cross-linguistic patterns, they can provide a window on basic building blocks of human cognition and/or interpersonal behavior.

Thus, two important – and basic – questions are: What are the cognitive domains from which source elements are preferentially recruited? And can we identify target domains that are particularly "heavy" recruiters across languages and time periods? While these questions have been extensively dealt with in the case of (morpho-)syntactic cycles (Heine et al. 1991, Raible 1996, Heine 1997, Bybee et al. 1994), they need further investigation in the case of semantic-pragmatic cycles.

Further, what is the nature of the forces that keep cycles moving? As noted above, a variety of recent studies have argued that pragmatics plays a key role. In some cases, the more specific driver has been argued chiefly cognitive in nature, having to do with aspects of discourse processing. In others, features of interaction and interpersonal behavior related to notions such as (inter)subjectification, argumentation, and facework have been adduced as plausible explanations. In all cases, very common patterns of inferencing which – despite being of a fundamentally abductive nature – seem to hold across space and time, independently of specific cultures and linguistic systems, appear to play a central role in triggering reinterpretations and their subsequent entrenchment.

Aside from being of interest in their own right, answers to the above questions will also contribute potentially valuable evidence to current debates within functional-typological linguistics between a result-oriented and a source-oriented approach to linguistic universals (cf. Schmidtke-Bode et al., eds., 2019).

2. The papers in this issue

The first three papers add to the still modest, but growing, body of empirical work on cyclicity in the development of pragmatic markers. It is worth noting that the case studies described in these three papers all involve markers whose source meanings are temporal in nature, just like the three previously described by Hansen (2014, 2018c, fc). Although some cases not involving temporality have been described in the literature (Ghezzi & Molinelli 2014, Fedriani & Ghezzi 2014, and Cuenca 1992-93 – the latter two without explicitly adducing cyclicity as an explanatory concept), this suggests that temporality may be a semantic domain that is particularly prone to trigger cyclic developments.

The opening paper, by **Chiara Fedriani** and **Piera Molinelli**, discusses "Functional expansions of temporal adverbs and discursive connectives: from Latin TUM, TUNC, *dumque* to Old Italian *dunque*". The authors first document the existence of what amounts to a semasiological cycle in Classical to Late Latin, as the marker TUM is replaced by the etymologically related TUNC, a content-level temporal value preceding a context-level resultative value in both cases. They then show how, in Central Romance, the context-level functions of TUM/TUNC were inherited by a marker derived from Latin DUMQUE, a form which in Late Latin was sometimes conflated with TUNC. This replacement is analyzed as an onomasiological cycle. The authors emphasize that both these cycles result from speakers' application of recurrent functional principles, and that, in that sense, they must be understood as changes from below.

The analysis presented in the second paper, "Connectives and cyclicity; from the Latin temporal phrase *illa hora* to the Italian discourse marker *allora*", by **Chiara Ghezzi** and **Piera Molinelli**, relates closely to that of the preceding paper. The authors propose that, together with that of *dunque*, the functional evolution of *allora* from Old to Contemporary Italian can be seen as forming an onomasiological cycle, *allora* having gradually replaced *dunque* in the majority of its functions, present-day uses of the older marker being found mainly in just two main types of context. In addition, the authors argue that *allora* itself has undergone a cyclic development at the formal, morphological level.

In the third and final paper in this group, "Semasiological cyclicity in the evolution of discourse markers: a case from Sicilian", **Giulio Scivoletto** proposes that semasiological cyclicity has more than one subtype. Using the evolution of Sicilian *mentri* as his case study, Scivoletto shows that a new context-level function resulting in the conventionalization of an innovative meaning trait may develop out of the content-level uses of an existing marker and that, subsequently, this meaning trait may be lost again as the marker goes on to acquire yet other functions at the context level. The author perceives a parallelism between this loss of a pragmatic function and the loss of a specific linguistic form that we find in cases of onomasiological cyclicity. As a result, he proposes that where onomasiological cycles tends towards zero on the form side of the linguistic sign, "strong" semasiological cycles will tend towards zero on the meaning side.

The following two contributions form a second group of papers focusing on the role played by pragmatics in two different cycles of grammaticalization. Both of these contributions look at the interrelations of different formal variants in the expression of a given grammatical category, thus taking a predominantly onomasiological perspective on the cycles they describe.

In "Parallels between the negative cycle and the rise of *wh*-interrogative marking in French", **Richard Waltereit** adduces evidence for a hitherto unrecognized interrogative cycle in French. Thus, *wh*-

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

interrogatives can potentially take three different forms in contemporary French, viz. short, long, and extra-long, this terminology reflecting their respective degree of morphological markedness. In Old French, the long form was not only morphologically, but also pragmatically, marked with respect to the short form. In contemporary French, where the short form is rarely encountered when the interrogative pronoun functions as either an inanimate direct object or as a subject attribute, a similar relationship obtains between the long and the extra-long form. In other words, in such contexts, the long form has replaced the short form as the unmarked one, while the extra-long form has been recruited to fulfil a pragmatic function similar to the one fulfilled by the long form in older stages of the language. Waltereit moreover posits a parallelism between this interrogative cycle and the negative cycle in French, arguing that in both cases a reversal of anaphoric direction was crucially involved in the grammaticalization of the erstwhile marked expression.

In the second paper on grammaticalization cycles, **Ulrich Detges** looks at "Future markers in Western Romance: cyclic change, synchronic variation, and diachronic competition". Detges argues that the repeated emergence of new future-tense markers in Spanish and other languages is pragmatically driven, because the renewal of these markers guarantees that speakers will always have effective ways of highlighting the relevance of a future state of affairs to the moment of speech. The author moreover makes the point that cyclical renewal of markers within a given functional domain will frequently not result in the eventual ousting of what he calls the "canonical" construction, but that competition and replacement may instead take place chiefly among the newer, pragmatically and sociolinguistically marked, constructions. This shows that cyclic change is not triggered by deficiencies in the language system itself, but rather that, via their instantiation of stereotypical argumentative strategies, innovative future-tense constructions represent linguistic means to solve recurrent problems in interaction.

Finally, the closing paper, "Some reflections on semantic-pragmatic cycles" by **Salvador Pons Bordería** and **Ana Llopis Cardona**, has a predominantly theoretical aim, viz. to sharpen our understanding of semantic-pragmatic cyclicity and how such cycles are distinct from, or may overlap with, other types of semantic-pragmatic change. The authors start by defining six features that must be present for a given set of changes to qualify as a semantic-pragmatic cycle, and they adduce the evolution of the Spanish nouns *macho* and *tío* into vocatives with an attention-getting function as an example of such a cycle. They then contrast cycles with three other types of change: First, the very similar evolution of the noun *güey* in Mexican Spanish, which is argued to be a case of "concomitant development", inasmuch as the varieties using *macho/tío* vs *güey* are geographically separate and do not influence one another. A second type of change that is reminiscent of, but ultimately distinct from a cycle, is "replication", illustrated by Spanish *lo mismo* and *igual*. In the case of the former marker, pragmaticalization is gradual and inference-driven, whereas in the case of *igual*, it is abrupt and motivated by analogy with the older marker *lo mismo*, rather than by bridging contexts. Thirdly, the evolution of the paradigm of reformulation markers in Spanish bears some superficial similarity to a cycle, but instead of older markers being eliminated by new ones, what we find is simply a "paradigm increase".

Together, the six papers in this issue enhance our understanding of the role of pragmatics in cyclic language change in a variety of ways: They do so descriptively, by adducing a range of further case studies from the domains of pragmaticalization or grammaticalization, and they do so theoretically, by proposing further conceptual distinctions and/or new explanations for the cyclic patterns observed.

As one would expect, the papers also raise further questions, which space restrictions prevent us from treating in any depth here, but which ought to be addressed in future research. Perhaps the most

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

salient question concerns the consequences of thinking about language change in terms of metaphors such as that of a "cycle" (or "spiral"), in the first place. While metaphors can help reveal aspects of a phenomenon that might otherwise have gone unnoticed, they can – conversely – also take on a life of their own, occluding potentially important facets of the data that they are used to describe, see for instance the critical discussion of the – likewise metaphorical – notion of "competition" between constructions in De Smet et al. (2018). The contributors to this volume undoubtedly have subtly different conceptions of what a cycle is, which are reflected in the different ways in which they choose to model the specific cycles they are interested in. Such differences may have consequences for the types of changes that can be described as cycles, the kinds of change that cycles are seen as contrasting with, and the kinds of explanations that are proposed to account for them.

Much work still remains to be done on the role of pragmatics in cyclic language change, and the present special issue will hopefully provide not only inspiration and incentive, but also some direction, for interested researchers to contribute to this agenda.

Acknowledgements

I thank the British Academy for awarding me a Small Research Grant (SG162425, August 2017-December 2018) for the purpose of organizing two workshops on "Cyclicality in Semantic/Pragmatic Change: from Latin to Romance". Those workshops, along with a thematic panel on Semantic/Pragmatic Cyclicality held at the 15th International Pragmatics Conference, Belfast, 16-21 July, 2017, allowed the papers in this issue to be developed.

I also thank the colleagues who anonymously and constructively reviewed my introduction and the six other papers appearing in this special issue. The usual disclaimers apply.

References

Bouzouita, Miriam, Anne Breitbarth, Lieven Danckaert, and Elisabeth Witzgenhausen (eds). Forthcoming. *Cycles in Language Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cuenca, Maria Josep. 1992-93. "Sobre l'evolució dels nexes conjuntius in català." *Llengua & Literatura* 5: 173-213.

De Smet, Hendrik, Frauke D'hoendt, Lauren Fonteyn, and Kristel Van Goethem. 2018. "The Changing Functions of Competing Forms: Attraction and Differentiation." *Cognitive Linguistics* 29(2) : 197-234.

Detges, Ulrich. 2018. "Strong Pronouns in Modern Spoken French. Cliticization, Constructionalization, Grammaticalization?" *Linguistics* 56(5): 1059-1098.

Detges, Ulrich, and Richard WALTERIT. 2002. "Grammaticalization vs Reanalysis: a Semantic-Pragmatic Account of Functional Change in Grammar." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 21(2): 151-195.

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

Detges, Ulrich, and Richard Waltreit. 2016. "Grammaticalization and Pragmaticalization." In *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*, ed. by Susann Fischer, and Christoph Gabriel, 635-657. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Erman, Britt, and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. "Pragmaticalization: the Case of *ba'* and *you know*." *Studier i modern språkvetenskap* 10: 76-93.

Fedriani, Chiara, and Chiara Ghezzi. 2014. "The Pragmaticalization of Verbs of Movement and Exchange in Latin and Italian: Paths of Development from Lexicon to Pragmatics." In *Studia linguistica et philologica. In honorem Prof. Univ. Dr. Michaela Livescu*, ed. by Ilona Badescu, and Mihaela Popescu, 116-139. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.

Fonseca-Greber, Bonnibeth Beale. 2007. "The Emergence of Emphatic *ne* in Conversational Swiss French." *Journal of French Language Studies* 17: 249-275.

von der Gabelentz, Georg. 1901. *Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle. Language Change and the Language Faculty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2017. "Cyclicality." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts, 467-488. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Gelderen, Elly (ed). 2009. *Cyclical Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Gelderen, Elly (ed). 2016. *Cyclical Change Continued*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gergel, Remus. 2016. "Modality and Gradation. Comparing the Sequel of Developments in *rather* and *eher*." In *Cyclical Change Continued*, ed. by Elly van Gelderen, 319-350. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ghezzi, Chiara, and Piera Molinelli. 2014. "Deverbal Pragmatic Markers from Latin to Italian (Lat. QUAESO and Italian *prego*): the Cyclic Nature of Functional Developments." In *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Chiara Ghezzi, and Piera Molinelli, 61-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grossman, Eitan, and Stéphane Polis. 2014. "On the pragmatics of subjectification: the emergence and modalization of an Allative Future in Ancient Egyptian." *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 46(1): 25-63.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2008. *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues. A Study with Special Reference to the French Phasal Adverbs*. Oxford/Leiden: Elsevier/Brill.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2013. "Negation in the History of French." In *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean, vol. I: Case Studies*, ed. by David Willis, Christopher Lucas, and Anne Breitbarth, 51-76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2014. "Cyclicality in Semantic/Pragmatic Change: Old French *ja* between Latin IAM and Modern French *déjà*." In *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Chiara Ghezzi, and Piera Molinelli, 139-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2018a. "Cyclic Phenomena in the Evolution of Pragmatic Markers. Examples from Romance." In *Beyond Grammaticalization and Discourse Markers. New Issues in the Study of Language Change*, ed. by Salvador Pons Bordería, and Oscar Loureda Lamas, 51-77. Leiden: Brill.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2018b. "The Expression of Clause Negation: from Latin to Early French." In *Latin tardif/français ancien : continuités et ruptures*, ed. by Anne Carlier, and Céline Guillot-Barbance, 267-295. Berlin : De Gruyter Mouton.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2018c. "The Role of Inferencing in Semantic-Pragmatic Cyclicality : the Case of Latin NUNC and French *or/maintenant*." *Open Linguistics* 4: 127-146.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. Forthcoming. "De *ainz* à *plutôt* : un cycle de pragmatization." In *Autour de la reformulation*, ed. by Olga Inkova. Geneva: Droz.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. Submitted. "In Defense of a Pragmatic View of Reanalysis." In *Whither Reanalysis?*, ed. by Ulrich Detges, Richard WALTEReit, Esme Winter-Froemel, and Anne Wolfgruber. Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Syntax*.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard, and Jacqueline Visconti. 2009. "On the Diachrony of "Reinforced" Negation in French and Italian." In *Grammaticalization and Pragmatics: Facts, Approaches, Theoretical Issues*, ed. by Corinne Rossari, Claudia Ricci & Adriana Spiridon, 137-171. Leiden: Brill.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and Other Languages*. Copenhagen: Høst & Søn.

Kiparsky, Paul, and Cleo Condoravdi. 2006. "Tracking Jespersen's Cycle." In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, and Angela Ralli, 172-197. Mytilene: Doukas.

Larrivée, Pierre, and Richard A. Ingham (eds). 2011. *The Evolution of Negation. Beyond the Jespersen Cycle*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change." *Lingua e stile* XX(3): 303-318.

Lucas, Christopher. 2007. "Jespersen's cycle in Arabic and Berber." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105(3): 398-431.

Meillet, Antoine. 1921. "L'évolution des formes grammaticales." In his *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 130-148. Paris : Honoré Champion.

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

To appear in Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, ed. "The Role of Pragmatics in Cyclic Language Change." Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(2), 2020.

Reinöhl, Uta, and Nikolaus Himmelmann. 2017. "Renewal: a Figure of Speech or a Process *sui generis*?" *Language* 93(2): 381-413.

Roberts, Ian. 1993. "A Formal Account of Grammaticalization in the History of Romance Futures." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 13: 219-258.

Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosemeyer, Malte, and Eitan Grossman. 2017. "The road to auxiliariness revisited: the grammaticalization of FINISH anteriors in Spanish." *Diachronica* 34(3): 516-558.

Rupp, Laura, and Sali Tagliamonte. 2017. "This here town: Evidence for the Development of the English Determiner System from a Vernacular Demonstrative Construction in York English." *English Language and Linguistics* 23(1): 81-103.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten, Natalia Levshina, Susanne Maria Michaelis, and Ilja. A. Seržant (eds.). 2019. *Explanation in Linguistic Typology: Diachronic Sources, Functional Motivations and the Nature of the Evidence*. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Schwegler, Armin. 1990. *Analyticity and Syntheticity. A Diachronic Perspective with Special Reference to Romance Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schwenter, Scott A. 2006. "Fine-Tuning Jespersen's Cycle." In *Drawing the Boundaries of Meaning. Neo-Gricean Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics in Honor of Laurence R. Horn*, ed. by Betty J. Birner & Gregory Ward, 327-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. "The Jespersen Cycles." In *Cyclical Change*, ed. by Elly van Gelderen, 35-71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vindenes, Urd. 2018. "Cyclic Renewal of Demonstratives." *Studies in Language* 42(3): 641-668.

Wallage, Phillip. 2017. *Negation in Early English. Grammatical and Functional Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.