The impact of input and output domains: towards a function-based categorization of types of grammaticalization

Svenja Kranich*

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Department of English Linguistics, Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, D-55128 Mainz, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

A wide variety of semantic–pragmatic processes have been linked to grammaticalization, such as pragmatic enrichment (Hopper and Traugott, 2003) and the loss of pragmatic meaning (Heine and Reh, 1984). As this example shows, not all of these subprocesses are compatible with each other. It therefore makes sense to assume that different subprocesses may be linked to different stages, different input or different output types of grammaticalization processes.

In the present paper, various types of changes will be analyzed with respect to the semantic and pragmatic changes that typically accompany them, using mostly examples from English, German and the Romance languages.

On this basis, a classification will be proposed, which will support the view that it is fruitful to make a distinction between primary and secondary grammaticalization (i.e. grammaticalization from lexical as opposed to from grammatical sources). Furthermore, the present approach provides further evidence that pragmaticalization should best be seen as its own type of change, rather than as a subtype of grammaticalization.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

There is no shortage of general claims concerning tendencies in semantic and pragmatic changes occurring before, in and after grammaticalization, but to date they have not been unified, and it is apparent that some of them contradict each other to some extent (e.g. the notions that meanings tend to become pragmatically enriched and the notion that meanings tend to become bleached). It seems crucial to examine categorically whether there are changes typical of the preliminary, early or late stages of grammaticalization processes[1] and to what extent the type of meaning changes observed depend on the input type (lexical or grammatical) and on the output type (e.g. a marker with grammatical vs. pragmatic meaning). The aim of this investigation is on the one hand to gain clarity about the properties of these different types of change, and on the other, to obtain a semantic–pragmatic basis for the distinction of different types of change.

Both input and output type have played a role in previous attempts to distinguish primary from secondary grammaticalization. According to Kuryłowicz's (1965: 69) definition, "[g]rammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a

---

* Tel.: +49 6131 39 20334; fax: +49 6131 39 23808.
  E-mail addresses: kranich@uni-mainz.de, svenjakranich@gmail.com.

[1] Previous research has already taken first steps towards distinguishing types of subprocesses associated with primary and secondary grammaticalization (Traugott, 2002, 2010; Kranich, 2010a; Norde, 2012), but the present paper wishes to take a more fine-grained perspective by concentrating on functional (rather than formal – phonological, morpho-syntactic) processes and analyzing their relation to different stages in greater detail. The focus on the role that might be played by different input and output domains of grammaticalization processes, by contrast, has not been tackled systematically in any previous work according to my knowledge.

morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from less grammatical to a more grammatical status". If one assumes that the first type of change can be labeled primary and the second type secondary grammaticalization, then secondary grammaticalization should differ from primary grammaticalization in two ways: firstly in terms of its grammatical rather than lexical input, and secondly concerning its output, which should not just be grammatical but "more grammatical".

One problem we may see regarding this definition is that "more grammatical" is hard to define. Diewald (2010) has made a valuable proposal as how to solve this dilemma, stressing the fact that becoming "more grammatical" can basically be understood as equivalent to becoming more paradigmatic. That means that the functions of more grammatical elements are more strongly determined by their position in a specific paradigm (Diewald, 2010).

Givón, who coined the terms secondary grammaticalization, sees reanalysis as a prerequisite to speak of secondary grammaticalization. According to him, secondary grammaticalization means that already grammaticalized patterns in "morpho-syntax can give rise, via secondary grammaticalization, to other morpho-syntactic patterns" (Givón, 1991: 305). This means that following this definition, it would not be sufficient for a change to be classified as secondary grammaticalization to witness, for instance, an optional marker of aspect turning into an obligatory one (a change that would increase paradigmaticity, hence make the marker 'more grammatical'), but we would also need to see a change in the type of meaning expressed by the marker (e.g. from aspect to tense) and in its morpho-syntactic configuration.

Breban (2012, this volume), who focuses on secondary grammaticalization, aims at sharpening the concept and arrives at the conclusion that it might be beneficial to limit the term 'secondary grammaticalization' to instances that exhibit formal reanalysis, thereby coming quite close to Givón's original suggestion. She proposes to recognize two separate types of 'later-stage grammaticalization': type 1, which exhibits formal reanalysis and to which Breban (2012, this volume) proposes we should restrict the label "secondary grammaticalization", and type 2, which would include all other cases of items becoming more grammatical and for which she proposes the label "extended grammaticalization".

Type 1 is defined as a "development [that] shows a re-configuration within the existing grammatical structure of the language. Be it positional shift or morphologization, the item's external structural engagement changes" (Breban, 2012). This type is exemplified by the historical development of *several* from descriptive adjective to individualizer to quantifier or by the change of a morpheme from marker of aspect to tense marker. Type 2 is defined as a process of grammatical development that does not exhibit such external re-configuration: "The structural relation remains to the same external elements. Even though the bond between these elements can become tighter, as in the fusion of *the ilk* to *thilk*, the participants in the relation are the same ones" (Breban, 2012). The development of *same* from emphasizer to marker of anaphora, the development of definite article *the* from a demonstrative (Breban, 2012), or the development of the (English) progressive from foregrounding device to aspect marker (Kranich, 2008, 2010b) would thus all fall under type 2, "extended grammaticalization" (see also Breban, this volume; Breban et al., 2012).

Breban's (2012, this volume) [2] distinction is most crucially based on the formal properties of the changes, such as changes in external structural engagement, formal reanalysis. Functional changes play a lesser role in her distinction. In grammaticalization studies, semantic–pragmatic changes have often been deemed to be primary, triggering the observable formal changes (e.g. Detges and Waltereit, 2002; Diewald, 2002; Heine, 1992, 2002; Hopper and Traugott, 2003 [1993]; Traugott, 1989, 2010; Traugott and Dasher, 2002; Traugott and König, 1991). As Detges and Waltereit (2002: 172) put it, "semantic change is normally the cause of subsequent (syntactic, morphological and phonological) change of form rather than its by-product".

Keeping in mind this primacy of functional changes, the present paper will investigate what kind of classification we arrive at if the functional changes typical of different types of change are taken as the key to classifying them: Are there different types of semantic–pragmatic processes that typically accompany changes from lexical to grammatical marker and that are notably different from the typical semantic–pragmatic changes involved in the development from grammatical to "more grammatical" marker? What happens if the output of the process is not a grammatical but a pragmatic marker? Is there evidence that makes it desirable to assume a separate type of change with the label pragmaticalization? Or is pragmaticalization just a type of grammaticalization?

These questions are not merely issues of labeling particular types of change – if that were the case, they would be of little interest to anyone except scholars trying to bring some order into the grammaticalization paradigm. But this is not the case. There are real conceptual differences at stake here that should be of interest to anyone studying how language works and how language change happens. From a construction grammar perspective, these questions can be rephrased as trying to find out firstly, whether a (more or less) concrete vs. schematic input to a process of functional reinterpretation has an impact on the type of reinterpretation that is possible or likely, and secondly, whether we can say something general about typical processes necessary to arrive at a new meaning pertaining to a particular output domain (e.g. constructions managing speaker–hearer interaction). Both questions will allow us better insights into how new constructions (i.e. new form-meaning pairs) emerge over time.

These are the questions that the present paper will focus on. In the next section, the various semantic–pragmatic processes that have been associated with grammaticalization will be presented in detail. We will then study to what extent they are

---

[2] Breban (forthcoming) no longer suggests a division of secondary grammaticalization into two types ('secondary' and 'extended' grammaticalization); instead, she reaches the conclusion that "[o]verall, the changes identified [in previous work on secondary grammaticalization] […] can all be captured within a general definition of grammaticalization, and neither of them justify the addition of secondary grammaticalization as a separate notion". The present paper will show that, if one takes a more fine-grained approach, this view cannot be confirmed, since the development of grammatical items from lexical sources exhibits a very different profile of semantic–pragmatic subprocesses than the development of grammatical items from grammatical sources. Instead, it is assumed that Breban's (2012) aim at clarifying the nature of different types of grammaticalization is fruitful and should be pursued further.