



Secondary grammaticalization and the English adverbial *-ly* suffix



Kristin Killie

Department of Foreign Languages and Translation, University of Agder, Postbox 402, 4604 Kristiansand, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Available online 31 October 2014

Keywords:
Secondary grammaticalization
Adverbialization
-ly adverbs
Zero adverbs
Adjectives
English

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the secondary grammaticalization of the English adverbial *-ly* suffix and makes claims about the concept of secondary grammaticalization. Secondary grammaticalization is defined as the development of a new grammatical function in an already grammatical element. It is shown that the development of the *-ly* suffix involves a number of the processes which are associated with grammaticalization, e.g. paradigmaticization, specialization, obligatorification, subjectification, layering and persistence. However, none of these processes seem to be exclusive to secondary grammaticalization, as the process is defined here. It is argued that the concept of grammaticalization should be redefined, and some possible definitions are suggested. It is also suggested that future studies should divide grammaticalization processes into types according to the nature of the target element, as suggested by Kranich (this issue). Such an approach may perhaps uncover categorical differences between different types of grammaticalization processes. Another important claim is that the concept of obligatoriness should include both language internal obligatoriness and communicative obligatoriness, where the latter also includes socially determined obligatoriness. Further, the concept of paradigmaticity should include the opposition of social variants.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction: aims and organization

In this article I discuss the concept of secondary grammaticalization, in search of common and defining properties. My discussion is based on a case study of the English adverbial *-ly* suffix. I explore the various developments that have affected the suffix after its initial grammaticalization and compare my findings with other findings and claims in this field. I address the following questions:

- (1) What are the defining features of secondary grammaticalization? How can secondary grammaticalization be distinguished from primary grammaticalization?
- (2) Which types of changes can be described using the notion of secondary grammaticalization?
- (3) What is the relation between secondary grammaticalization and other processes that have been associated with grammaticalization, e.g. subjectification and pragmaticalization?

E-mail address: kristin.killie@uia.no.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some background to the concepts of primary and secondary grammaticalization, subjectification, and pragmaticalization. Section 3 describes the secondary grammaticalization of the adverbial *-ly* suffix, relating it to the concepts introduced in Section 2, while Section 4 sums up the previous discussion, focussing on the properties of secondary grammaticalization and the way forward.

2. Grammaticalization: definitions and concepts

Section 2.1 briefly introduces the concept of grammaticalization, including the division into primary and secondary grammaticalization, while Section 2.2 discusses various processes which have been said to characterize grammaticalization phenomena.

2.1. Grammaticalization and the definition of grammatical meaning

The term 'grammaticalization' goes back to Meillet (1912: 131, 133) and is traditionally understood as a process whereby a lexical item is reanalysed as a grammatical morpheme or construction. This syntactic reanalysis is accompanied by a semantic reinterpretation of a very specific, lexical meaning into a more general, grammatical one. The relevant process is referred to as semantic bleaching, erosion, or reduction, or as desemanticization etc. (Heine, 2003: 579).

The basic definition of grammaticalization as the transfer of an element from the lexical to the grammatical sphere may seem clear. However, as there is no consensus about what counts as 'grammar' or 'grammatical', it is anything but clear which changes should be counted as instances of grammaticalization. This question must, of course, be clarified before one can have a proper discussion about the characteristics of grammaticalization. In this article, I adopt the comprehensive definition of grammar proposed by Diewald (2010, 2011). Diewald argues that what characterizes grammatical elements is that they are 'relational', i.e. they point to something outside themselves. According to Diewald, 'it is possible to distill an abstract feature which is the common denominator of grammatical meaning: the existence of a basic relational structure, which may be applied to different pointing fields, thus achieving deictic, anaphoric and other connective relations' (2011: 371; cf. also Diewald, 2010).¹ Thus, a pronoun points to a noun phrase or clause in the discourse, or to an object which is not specifically mentioned in the discourse, but which is implicit. Conjunctions and conjuncts point back to a previously mentioned proposition, and the discourse and grammatical function of modal particles – to mark a turn as non-initial – is very similar (Diewald, 2011: 378). Diewald's view of grammar is in line with the view expressed by Traugott, who sees grammar as 'structuring communicative as well as cognitive aspects of language' (Traugott, 2003: 626; cf. also Traugott, 1982).

When grammatical meanings are defined as systematically encoded relational meanings, it follows that grammaticalization involves the development of such meanings. Diewald argues that the development of tense and the development of modal particles are similar: both link the linguistic level to the communicative level: 'The only difference between them is their respective formal realization and their specific semantic/functional domain' (2011: 382; cf. also Diewald, 2010). Diewald terms the development of discourse markers 'pragmaticalization' and argues that this process is simply a subtype of grammaticalization which involves elements belonging to a different domain than what is traditionally counted as grammar, such as tense or number marking (2011: 384; cf. also Barth and Couper-Kuhlen, 2002: 357 and Lima, 2002).

2.2. Primary vs. secondary grammaticalization

The grammaticalization of a construction need not stop with its initial grammaticalization: grammaticalized elements may continue to develop. Kuryłowicz (1965: 52) therefore argues that grammaticalization consists in 'the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from less grammatical to a more grammatical status'.² Givón (1991) refers to the development from lexical to grammatical as 'primary' grammaticalization and to the change from less to more grammatical as 'secondary' grammaticalization. The concept of secondary grammaticalization is, however, not very well understood. One main problem is what it means to develop 'a more grammatical status'. There are basically two different approaches to this question, one focussing on morpho-syntax, the other taking semantic-pragmatic factors into account.

The traditional, morpho-syntactic approach conceptualizes the development towards a more grammatical status as movement along a grammaticalization cline such as the one illustrated in Fig. 1.

Here a lexical element is first grammaticalized into a derivational affix in a process of primary grammaticalization. This derivational affix may subsequently develop into an inflectional affix in a process of secondary grammaticalization (cf. also

¹ A similar idea is expressed by Bühler (2012), who argues that lexical elements name, while grammatical elements point. Pronouns, definite articles, demonstratives, conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs all have a pointing function and are therefore grammatical items. They are thus essentially deictic or anaphoric. A similar analysis is proposed by Boye and Harder (2007, 2009, 2012), who claim that lexical elements are characterized by 'primariness' and 'addressability', while grammatical elements involve 'non-addressability' and 'coded secondariness'.

² In the same vein, Heine et al. (1991: 2) define grammaticalization as the process 'where a lexical unit or structure assumes a grammatical function, or where a grammatical unit assumes a more grammatical function'.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1103078>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1103078>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)