[Review of: B. Heine, T. Kuteva (2003) World lexicon of grammaticalization]

Fischer, O.C.M.

Link to publication

Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002. xii + 387 pp.
(ISBN 0 521 80339 X hb, 0 521 00597 3 pb)

Reviewed by Olga Fischer (University of Amsterdam)

Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva have produced a most valuable reference work
for historical linguists, typologists and other linguists from various theoretical
backgrounds who are interested in grammaticalization theory or in grammatical
change. Their *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* makes available and pulls
together a wealth of data collected by numerous scholars over the last three
decades when the phenomenon of grammaticalization acquired a new lease of
life, while also making use of much work done by linguists in the form of
grammars and dictionaries written on both well-known and lesser-known
languages. The aim of the lexicon is to make data available which "may be of
help for diachronic reconstruction" (p. 1) and which at the same time may
describe and explain the relation between grammar and meaning, the corre-
spondences between different grammatical meanings, and, in particular, the
relations that exist between grammatical and lexical categories within one and
the same linguistic form.

The book contains the following sections: (1) an introduction, which
describes what the authors understand by grammaticalization (its mechanisms
and causes) and deals very briefly with the position taken by formal linguists
(e.g. Newmeyer 1998) and a number of historical linguists (e.g. the articles by
Brian Joseph, Richard Janda and Lyle Campbell in a special issue of *Language
Sciences* 23 [2001]) that grammaticalization is not a distinct process but rather
an epiphenomenon because it consists of mechanisms which play an indepen-
dent role elsewhere in language change; (2) an overview of the 'grammatical
concepts' used in the lexicon itself, indicating that these concepts should be
seen as quite 'loose' categories incorporating grammatical categories (e.g.
AGREEMENT, GENDER), semantic-functional categories (e.g. EMPHATIC,
EVIDENTIAL) as well as more lexical concepts (e.g. SUCCEED, SAME); (3) the
actual lexicon, each entry headed according to 'source-concepts' and the
'targets' they develop into, followed by a list of languages in which the process
in question occurs (with very full references to books/articles discussing the

languages in question), examples from those languages (showing in most cases first the use of the source meaning, and next that of the target), and a general description of the way in which the process fits into a more general development or is linked to other grammaticalization processes. The book is rounded off with three Appendices, providing a source-target as well as a target-source list (very useful to search for items the other way around), and a list of languages giving language family and provenance.

The kind of information provided in the *World Lexicon* will be of interest to anthropologists and sociologists too, in that the phenomenon of grammatical-ization is in fact a type of ritualization or conventionalization that is also to be found in social life in general. The connection between ritualization and grammaticalization has been described particularly well by John Haiman (1994, 1999), who has shown that human (and indeed also animal) activities which are frequent and which are used to 'sign' or communicate a message tend to become ritualized by repetition, force of habit or sheer laziness (a process called "sublimation" by Haiman 1999). Thus, for example, humility towards an addressee can be shown physically by prostrating oneself, and this may become ritualized by showing only the beginning of the prostration, i.e. by simply kneeling down. The next stage in the "sublimation trajectory" might be the reduction of this 'signing' of humility by indicating it only in the manner of one's voice (e.g. by using a high-pitched or 'small' voice) or by reducing it to words on the propositional level indicating that one feels small and insignificant (referring to oneself as 'a servant' or 'a slave'[1]). This trajectory can then be traced even further down when the lexical item that is used frequently, grammaticalizes or lexicalizes so that it becomes conventional and opaque, and finally difficult to interpret as a sign of humility (after which indeed the whole cycle must start again, because an increase in grammaticality involves a decrease in sincerity or clarity). Thus the attitude of 'smallness' may become hidden in the use of grammaticalized diminutive affixes, or may become lexicalized into a phrase like *ciao* in Italian (which literally means 'slave'). The *Lexicon* under review here shows very nicely how the diminutive developed in many languages from the propositional word for 'child' (p. 65), while in other languages this affix developed from the adjective meaning 'small' (not given as a 'source' in the *Lexicon*, but cf. Jurafsky 1996). It is also well-known that many languages use the diminutive in order to make the message softer or sweeter, less rudely direct (cf. Haiman 1999: 44). In other words, grammaticalization is a fact of life, like ritualization, and hence of great interest to anyone working in the human sciences.

The above example shows that the development of grammaticalized forms is not independent of the situation in which they are used. The authors of the *Lexicon* agree with this but interpret the 'situation' in a much narrower way than I would do. They argue that the way in which grammaticalized forms develop "is not independent of the constructions to which they belong", and continue as follows: "The study of grammaticalization is also concerned with constructions and with even larger discourse segments" (p. 2). This indicates that they are mainly thinking of the **linguistic** elements in and around the source-concept, which together make up the grammaticalized form that is represented by the target.[2] This is evident from such source entries as COME TO and COME FROM (pp. 71–9), which develop into different targets depending on the preposition used. However, the *Lexicon* does not explain why each of these two source-concepts in turn may develop differently. The target developing from COME FROM may be a near-past or perfect as well as an ablative marker, while COME TO has as many as five different target developments (benefactive, change-of-state, future, proximative, purpose). In other words, we do not learn from the description which factors may influence the development of one target rather than another.

It seems clear that we need to look not only at the way the linguistic elements are syntagmatically ordered, but also at the much broader context in which these constructions are used: how they are lined up paradigmatically within a language, and indeed how they function within the complete context of the grammar of each language and how they relate to the culture of the language community (as argued above).[3] In this more 'complete context' I would certainly include the synchronic grammar of the language at the time of the change, because whether a particular form will grammaticalize or not, and in which direction, depends on the existent grammatical structure as much as on the presence of a particular source-concept. For instance, if the language under consideration has a clear verbal inflectional tense system, but no inflectional nominal system, and if for some reason the original past tense marker has disappeared (maybe as a result of a previous grammatizalization process), then it is more likely that the COME TO source-concept will develop into a past tense marker than into an ablative. Similarly, what is also very important in a potential grammaticalization process, is whether the future grammaticalized element follows or precedes the headword on which it will become dependent. If it follows, and the language happens to be an inflectional language by suffixation, then the source element may become a suffix and reach a higher degree of grammaticalization (i.e. it may develop from VERB into AUX >

AFFIX and even ZERO). If, however, the source element precedes its headword in that same language, then the process may develop no further than VERB > AUX, i.e. only one step on the grammaticalization chain. It is obvious that not all this information can be given in the *Lexicon* in each case, since that would make the work at least twice as long, but it would have been useful to have a discussion of this in the introduction, and to have the effect of the grammatical circumstances worked out in more detail at least in some of the entries, specifically where the details are known.

Another factor that may play an important role in grammaticalization is the basic word order of a language, or, more specifically, the adjacency or non-adjacency of specific elements. Word order is crucial, for instance, if one wishes to explain the virtual absence of the grammaticalization of HAVE TO into a modal verb of obligation in Dutch as compared to English. If Dutch can be said to have undergone that development at all, it is clearly very restricted. Dutch *hebben te* can only be said to be a modal in constructions such as (1):

(1)   Je   hebt het maar te doen
       you have it   only to do
       'you have to do it', 'you cannot but do it'

In this construction, the adverb *maar* indicates that there is only one option left out of all options that the subject may have, and that is that 'you do it'. In other words, the obligative sense is forced as it were by the use of *maar*. Other constructions where English can use *have to* as a modal, such as *To maintain our health we have to eat three meals a day, I don't have to have it, It has to be true that* etc. do not exist in Dutch, and are not found in German either. These subtle differences cannot be culled from the *Lexicon* because under the source-concept POSSESSION (pp. 243–245) the German and English cases are mentioned as if they are the same (the Dutch case is not given). In Fischer (1994) I have shown that this difference can be accounted for by the fact that in Modern English *have* and the *to*-infinitive are always adjacent, in both subordinate and main clauses (due to SVO word order), so that *have to* could indeed develop into a fixed phrase before the infinitival headword, and hence into a modal auxiliary, whereas in Dutch and German the word order varies in the two types of clauses (because both languages have basic SOV word order with V2 movement in the main clause), so that the positions of *haben/hebben* and the *zu/te*-infinitive are not fixed. The absence of regular adjacency with the infinitival headword is likely to stop the grammaticalization to a modal auxiliary in its tracks, even though conceptually the verbs mean the same in the three

languages, and the same pragmatic inferences are at play. This is not to say that without adjacency no grammaticalization at all is possible. However, it is interesting to see, for instance, that the grammaticalization of English perfect *have* (which is usually adjacent to the past participle with which it forms the perfect in both main and subordinate clauses) only developed once English had become basically SVO. In addition, it has grammaticalized further in English than in Dutch or German (where the cognates of *have* are not necessarily adjacent to the past participle), in that *have* is the only auxiliary of the perfect in English (i.e. also with intransitive participles which used to have *be* as an auxiliary), whereas in Dutch and German the cognates of *have* and *be* are still used in the perfect in accordance with their original source-constructions (e.g. English *He has come* vs Dutch/German *Hij is gekomen/Er ist gekommen* 'he is come').

For this reason, I find it hard to agree with the authors that the process of grammaticalization "is above all a semantic process", that "[t]his process is context dependent" and that "grammaticalization can *therefore* be described in terms of context-induced reinterpretation", i.e. reinterpretation by pragmatic inferencing (p. 3, emphasis added). I would not wish to deny that pragmatic inferencing plays a very important role in the process, but it does not ensure that the process will actually take place, and that the source-concept will indeed develop into a grammatical element. The role of pragmatic inferencing may well be an indispensable element, but it is the shape of the grammar of the language in question that is often decisive.

Not taking other factors as seriously as the semantic/pragmatic one has another corollary. Apart from the problems already described in note 3, the *Lexicon* shows a clear tendency to accept the occurrence of both the source and the target meaning in one and the same language — or in many cases indeed only the occurrence of the target meaning — as an indication that this is an instance of an ongoing grammaticalization process. This assumption or reconstruction is then often defended by the argument that the process occurs elsewhere, i.e. is typologically frequent, or on the basis of the fact that there is historical evidence for such a process in other languages. The reader must be aware, therefore, that many of the language entries in the *Lexicon* may be no more than assumptions. In this light, I found it rather surprising that synchronic instances form the bulk of the evidence provided to show the reality of a grammaticalization chain, and that historical evidence is relatively scant. Especially in cases where a language has a long textual history, one might expect historical evidence to have been given pride of place, because it offers somewhat more certainty about the existence of a chain.

To conclude, I would like to give some examples of entries where the diachronic evidence seems neglected, even though it is clearly available, in the hope that perhaps more diachronic instances will become incorporated into the next edition. Apart from diachronic evidence, some of these examples also provide additional evidence from language families not mentioned in the *Lexicon* entry.

p. 36 ALL > SUPERLATIVE: In this category *all* becomes a marker of the superlative in combination with some other element, usually some comparative predication. But it could be mentioned that *all* is used in both Middle English (ME) and Dutch as a prefix derived from the genitive case of *all* to strengthen the superlative, as in ME *alderfayrest,* Du. *allermooist* 'the most beautiful'.

p. 43 VP-AND > SUBORDINATOR: Old English (OE) and ME *and* is used as conditional subordinator, in the sense of *if.*

p. 52 BEGIN > INCEPTIVE: Here Modern English *start to* is mentioned but this has hardly been grammaticalized. A much better example is OE *ginnen* (past tense *gan*), which in ME became a fixed phrase which could take only the bare infinitive, and grammaticalized even further from an inceptive marker into a more general discourse marker (cf. Brinton 1990).

p. 55 BENEFACTIVE > PURPOSE: a better example of Modern English *for* developing into a purpose marker than the one given in the entry, is from ME, where *for* came to be used before the *to*-infinitive to strengthen the sense of purpose. This use of *for to* is still found in Scottish and in some American English dialects. What I missed under the entry of 'benefactive *for*' is its development into a complementizer, as happened in late ME, and is still in use in Modern English as in *It is necessary for it to rain soon.*

p. 74 COME TO > CHANGE-OF-STATE: No examples are provided here from Indo-European (IE) languages, but a good instance is the grammatical-ization in the history of Dutch of *komen te* ('come to') as in *Hij kwam te vallen* 'he came to fall', i.e. 'he fell'.

p. 97 COPULA, LOCATIVE > CONTINUOUS: Here again no examples are given from IE languages, but it is a well-known development in Dutch as well as in Irish, illustrated in examples (2) and (3) below.

(2) *Hij is aan het* werk
    he is at   the work (noun)
    'He is working'

(3) *Tá sé ag scríobh*
    he is at writing (noun)
    'He is writing'.

p. 117 DO ('to do, to make) > CAUSATIVE: Here an example of Modern English *make* as a causative is provided, but the much older development where *do* becomes a causative in Old/Middle English is not mentioned. This case is interesting because it may have further grammaticalized into dummy *do*.

p. 230 PEOPLE > PLURAL: The Dutch pronoun *jullie* used in the second person plural also provides an instance of this process: *jullie* is derived form *je* (second person singular pronoun) + *lieden/lui* 'people' (cf. Van den Toorn *et al.* 1997: 423).

These are just a few examples to show that there is still some work to be done on the *World Lexicon*, but this is not meant as a criticism; on the contrary, such gaps are inevitable in a work encompassing such a large amount of data. It is to be hoped that this *Lexicon* will be followed by further editions, since it will be a most useful reference work for many linguists for years to come, who can use it as a source to find out what grammaticalization pathways are possible, natural and frequent in language. It will serve as a goldmine of information when used in this way, but it may become a trap if the grammaticalization paths given here are used to predict or indeed reconstruct a grammaticalization process in a language without taking into consideration other linguistic circumstances pertaining to that language.

Notes

1. Note the conventional way of closing letters in most older cultures, signing off with 'your servant' or 'your obedient devoted wife' etc.).

2. These 'linguistic elements' also cover the pragmatic-semantic meaning of these elements in their context. Heine and Kuteva clearly show that the new, more grammatical meaning carried by the 'target' is often "context-induced" (p. 3). More on this point below.

3. The authors do address this question in their introduction, when they mention that "[g]rammaticalization does not occur in a vacuum, and other forces also shape the evolution of grammatical forms, language contact being one" (p. 9). They then elaborate on the importance of language contact, wondering whether "instances of grammaticalization that clearly occurred due to borrowing [should] be excluded" (p. 9). This is especially relevant for creoles and pidgins, where it has been argued (cf. Bruyn 1995, 1996) that many seemingly natural grammaticalization processes are in fact borrowings from a substratum language. The policy adopted in the Lexicon is to take all these kinds of data into account as long as they follow some natural process. This has some clear disadvantages, since it may give the impression that a particular process is far more widely used than is in fact the case, and since it may suggest that a particular target is the outcome of a process which has in fact not taken place, with the additional danger of interpreting a range of grammaticalized forms as consecutive stages rather than synchronically equivalent constructions.

References

Brinton, L. (1990) The stylistic function of ME *gan* reconsidered. In S. Adamson, V. Law, N. Vincent and S. Wright (eds.) *Papers from the 5th international conference on English historical linguistics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 31–53.

Bruyn, A. (1995) *Grammaticalization in Creoles: The development of determiners and relative clauses in Sranan.* (Studies in language and language use, 21.) Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Bruyn, A. (1996) On identifying instances of grammaticalization in Creole languages. In P. Baker and A. Syea (eds.) *Changing meanings, changing functions: Papers relating to grammaticalization in contact languages.* London: University of Westminster Press. 29–46.

Campbell, L. (2001) What is wrong with grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 23.1: 113–161.

Fischer, O.C.M. (1994) The development of quasi-auxiliaries in English and changes in word order. *Neophilologus* 78.1: 137–164.

Haiman, J. (1994) Ritualization and the development of language. In W. Pagliuca (ed.) *Perspectives on grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 3–28.

Haiman, J. (1999) Action, speech and grammar. The sublimation trajectory. In M. Nänny and O. Fischer (eds.) *Form miming meaning: Iconicity in language and literature.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 37–57.

Janda, R.D. (2001) Beyond 'pathways' and 'unidirectionality': On the discontinuity of language transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* 23.1: 265–340.

Joseph, B. (2001) Is there such a thing as grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 23.1: 163–186.

Jurafsky, D. (1996) Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language* 72.3: 533–578.

Newmeyer F.J. (1998) *Language form and language function.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Toorn, M.C. van den, W.J.J. Pijnenburg, J.A. van Leuvensteijn and J.M. van der Horst (eds.) (1997) *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

~