

Grammaticalization: A specific type of semantic, categorical, and prosodic change*

1. Introduction

A substantial portion of the literature on grammaticalization has been engrossed, for quite some time now, in the pursuit of universal features of that type of linguistic change, and in an attempt to determine exactly what cases can be seen as instances of grammaticalization and what cases cannot. Reviewing the major approaches to grammaticalization proposed over the past thirty years, one can discern three large groups of views, even though the overall picture remains rather complex:

- i. According to the most general approach, grammaticalization encompasses any linguistic change by means of which some linguistic expression or structure, at any particular linguistic level, becomes (more) grammatical in nature. In terms of the most generally held, somewhat less all-embracing version of this view, grammaticalization is a process whereby lexical items begin to serve some grammatical function, or assume additional grammatical roles¹; this is, in fact, a recapitulation of Kuryłowicz's classical definition². In this framework, agglutination is one of the prototypical manifestations of grammaticalization. Some of the approaches that can be seen as belonging here describe grammaticalization, defined as above, as a mere tendency, allowing for the existence of exceptions, i.e., for processes of de- or anti-grammaticalization³.

* The writing of this paper has been supported by a Bolyai Research Grant.

¹ E.g. Hopper/Traugott 2003, xv; Brinton/Traugott 2005, 99.

² Kuryłowicz 1965, 52.

³ E.g. Haspelmath 1998, 318, 1999, 1044; Traugott 2001, 1.

- II. The second group of views says that grammaticalization as a type of linguistic change does not exist; rather, it is a mere epiphenomenon of separate mechanisms⁴ existing independently of one another, such as semantic, phonological, and structural changes⁵. Some of the approaches belonging here interpret grammaticalization as a kind of reanalysis (*ibid.*), that is, they reduce it to a kind of structural change.
- III. In terms of the third approach, grammaticalization is described as an independent type of change that can be told apart from other types by some specific features it exhibits. This claim primarily contrasts with the second group of views, given that a number of representatives of the first view accept the idea of »independent type of change«, too⁶, but they often fail to sufficiently define which features are exclusively characteristic of grammaticalization (and not of other types of change). Thus, the above triad can eventually be reduced to two opposing camps: those supporting the idea of grammaticalization as change and those criticizing that idea.

In a critical overview, Joseph Campbell⁷ concluded that all definitions of grammaticalization have a single common trait: the claim that some linguistic unit turns into one of a more grammatical nature. This is apparently not enough for us to see it as an independent type of change since a linguistic item can become grammatical or more grammatical in a number of diverse ways. The main objective of the present paper is to show that grammaticalization does have its specific features even if it otherwise exhibits extensive variability.

⁴ The term *mechanism* is meant here to cover changes that may be parts of larger/more complex changes but may, obviously, occur on their own, too.

⁵ E.g. Newmeyer 2001.

⁶ E.g. Hopper/Traugott 1993, 62; cf. Newmeyer 1998, 233–234.

⁷ Campbell 2001, 114.

2. Analytic criteria

Traces of the fact that grammaticalization cannot simply be equated with reanalysis can be found in Roberts and Roussou's formalist monograph »Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization«, too. Although the authors maintain that linguistic changes are random parametric changes, they nevertheless describe grammaticalization »as an instance of upwards reanalysis, which gives rise to new functional material«⁸. That is, even if it is reanalysis, it is not just any old kind of reanalysis. They further observe that »[t]he cases of grammaticalization we have considered so far show that lexical (or functional) to functional reanalysis goes along with a change in the meaning of the reanalysed element«⁹. As can be seen, at least two mechanisms are necessarily combined in grammaticalization: a structural and a semantic one.

If we want to describe grammaticalization as an independent type of linguistic change, we have to look for common features gleaned from empirical studies as Campbell¹⁰ did. However, in addition to his »something becomes (more) grammatical in nature«, there must be other recurrent features as well since, as we just saw, grammaticalization invariably involves both structural and semantic features, and is hence always a complex change. But this is still not enough for us to take it to be an independent type of change: not only the types of relevant changes but also the course of their progress is important. Thus, we have to concentrate on at least three factors:

- a) Directionality, i.e., in which direction the process takes place.
- b) Changes that are parts of the given instance of grammaticalization, especially invariant mechanisms. We have to exclude processes that are not present in all instances of grammaticalization and we have to exclude changes that precede or follow grammaticalization but are not parts of it.
- c) The course of the change at hand: whether it is gradual or abrupt.

⁸ Roberts/Roussou 2003, 205.

⁹ Ibid. 219.

¹⁰ Campbell 2001.

In what follows, we attempt to delimit grammaticalization according to these three criteria; we discuss the second and third ones in a combined manner.

The question obviously arises whether we should distinguish primary (some linguistic construction becomes grammatical) from secondary grammaticalization (a later phase in which some already grammatical unit assumes an additional grammatical function). Since we wish to argue for grammaticalization being an independent type of linguistic change, we will treat it as a single process in what follows, albeit in cases of secondary grammaticalization we will take events preceding (and leading up to) them into consideration, too.

3. Directionality

We will refrain from treating the issue of directionality in its full depth here; we have summarized our views on it in other papers¹¹. In those places we argued that the unidirectionality of grammaticalization is confirmed by numerous empirical studies, whereas cases of degrammaticalization cannot be defined in a unitary manner. Such »belittlement« of degrammaticalization is contested by Norde in her »Degrammaticalization« where she lists a total of fifteen cases in which instances of degrammaticalization can legitimately be assumed. She classifies these cases into three groups¹²:

- a) Degrammation: a function word is reanalyzed as a content word, often via pragmatic inference. E.g. Welsh *yn ol* »after« > *nôl* »go to fetch sg.«¹³, where an adverbial element turns into a verb.
- b) Deinflectionalization: an inflectional affix becomes less bound and simultaneously becomes richer in semantic or functional substance; a good example is the *s*-genitive in English or in Swedish. There are a number of differences between Old Swedish and Modern Swedish *-s*: as time went

¹¹ E.g. Dér 2008a, Dér 2008b, 12, 29, 52, 54, 68, 69, 71, 74ff.

¹² Norde 2011, 133–227.

¹³ Willis 2007.

by, its syntactic scope enlarged (from a single word to a whole NP), and it assumed a determiner function.

- c) Debonding: inflectional or derivational morphemes or clitics become free morphemes. This happened e.g. in Irish where the 1pl verbal ending turned into a 1pl pronoun (*-maid* > *muid*). Norde claims that this is the most frequently attested subtype of grammaticalization, as opposed to types (a) and (b) that occur rather infrequently.

Even though such lists of shared features and Norde's definition and criteria of degrammaticalization¹⁴ are far more convincing than earlier sporadic analyses of counterexamples, most of the arguments against them¹⁵ remain valid:

- a) Rarity: although the sheer number of changes is not held to be relevant by everyone, it was the topic of several heated debates, with respect to degrammaticalization, in the grammaticalization literature¹⁶. The number of legitimate (and known) cases of degrammaticalization is clearly below twenty at the moment (very far from the »myriads of counterexamples« mentioned by Janda), whereas the number of grammaticalization cases runs into several hundred by a modest estimate, but more realistically it is one order of magnitude larger¹⁷. This, we think, is an important criterion if we argue for the independence of a change, given that only a regularly recurring kind of change can be taken to be a separate type.
- b) Going right through the cline (vs. lack of continuity): we know of no instance of degrammaticalization that has gone right to the end of the grammaticalization cline (in the opposite direction), whereas with respect to grammaticalization, hundreds of such examples are known. In degrammati-

¹⁴ Norde 2009, 120–132.

¹⁵ Strangely enough, Norde takes just these to be the definitive features of degrammaticalization: opposite directionality, novelty (see in the text), rarity (see in the text), and lack of continuity (thus, degrammaticalization is not the mirror image of grammaticalization, cf. Norde 2009: 120–123).

¹⁶ Lindström 2005, 85ff; Newmeyer 2001, 205; Janda 2001, 299; for a summary, see Dér 2008a, 136f.

¹⁷ Cf. Haspelmath 1998, 249; Heine/Kuteva 2002 discusses 400 cases.

calization, a linguistic unit normally takes a single right-to-left step along the cline¹⁸. From that point of view, single-step degrammaticalization is a rather special event and not the opposite of grammaticalization in the typical case.

- c) Alternative explanations: analyses involving degrammaticalization do not in themselves exclude other, competing explanations of the same phenomenon. With respect to adverb > verb changes mentioned above, Hungarian *fel* 'up', *le* 'down', *el* 'away', *vissza* 'back', etc. seem to be good examples as they can occur on their own, e.g. **Fel a hegyre!** 'Climb the hill!' (lit. 'Up the hill!'), **Vissza az útra!** 'Return to the road!' (lit. 'Back to the road!'), **Fel a fejjel!** 'Cheer up!' (lit. 'Up with the head!') **Le a ruhákkal!** 'Remove your clothes!' (lit. 'Down with the clothes!'). However, nothing excludes an alternative account claiming that these are cases of ellipsis, given that these adverbs cannot be used as verbs in any other context¹⁹.
- d) Retraction: Haspelmath's notion of retraction²⁰ can be understood on the basis of the phenomenon of expansion observable in grammaticalization: given that in cases of grammaticalization new meanings or new constructions come into being (e.g. A1, A2, A3, A4), their older (A1) and more recent, grammaticalized versions (A2, A3, A4) may survive or disappear from current language use. Retraction is the phenomenon where it is not the older but rather the new version(s) that disappear(s), and the observer may get the impression that degrammaticalization has taken place as the use of a less grammatical unit becomes (more) apparent. For instance, Haspelmath²¹ mentions the functional changes of English *man* and *dare* as instances of retraction. In her book, Norde also takes the possibility of retraction into consideration, and introduces a degrammaticalization criterion accor-

¹⁸ As pointed out by Norde herself, cf. 2009, 8.

¹⁹ Cf. Dér 2008a, 139.

²⁰ Haspelmath 2004, 33f.

²¹ Ibid.

ding to which the process must result in a new gram²². This means that the item produced by degrammaticalization must assume a novel function, e.g. in the case of A4, something that differs from all of the earlier ones (A1, A2, A3). However, in concrete analyses, the retraction test does not work (or not unambiguously). In the case of Bulgarian *nešto*, the assumed course of semantic changes is as follows: ›thing‹ > ›something (indefinite pronoun)‹ > ›thing‹ (the latter two meanings co-exist in present-day Bulgarian but their morphosyntactic behavior differs). In semantic terms, the analysis is less than convincing, given that apparently the same nominal meaning reappeared that had existed before²³. As an analogous example, we might mention Hungarian *micsoda* ›what (on earth)‹ that exists in present-day language use both as an interrogative pronoun and as a noun; in its latter role it either means ›something unspecified‹ or, in certain contexts (especially with a possessive suffix: *micsodám*, *micsodád*, etc.), ›(my/your/etc.) private parts‹. However, this is a quite customary phenomenon in the case of pronouns; nominal and pronominal functions are hard to tell apart, and (especially with respect to indefinite pronouns like *nešto*) the boundary between the two is fairly difficult to draw. In our view, then, these are not unambiguous cases of degrammaticalization.

The conclusion is that the unidirectionality of grammaticalization can be maintained as a hypothesis at least.

4. Mechanisms of grammaticalization and their relationships to one another

With respect to grammaticalization, two typical mechanisms are usually mentioned: semantic »weakening« or »bleaching«, that is, a gradual disappearance of lexical meaning, and formal alterations,

²² Norde 2009, 9, 121.

²³ *Ibid.*, 143ff.

under which label reanalysis and phonological reduction are usually referred to. (Of course, the term »formal alterations« can be interpreted in a number of diverse ways just like »structural changes«²⁴.)

4.1 Phonological reduction: shortening, destressing

Let us first turn to the role that phonological reduction plays in grammaticalization²⁵. Phonological reduction may mean destressing and syllable truncation, that is, the shortening of forms, occasionally accompanied by the fusion of several items in a given construction. Less careful articulation in itself does not imply phonological reduction.

The question is whether phonological reduction is invariably part of all cases of grammaticalization. The answers found in the literature are controversial. Roberts and Roussou point out that this mechanism was observable in 13 out of 18 cases they looked at and add that the reduction involved in grammaticalization tends to be more radical than phonological changes are in general²⁶. The authors' examples come from English and from Romance languages and Greek, and involve grammatical items with a variety of functions (modals, articles, future tense forms, etc.). As far as can be seen, their examples involve changes that started and resulted in new functions several centuries ago.

In the case of **recent** processes of grammaticalization, the contribution of phonological reduction is by no means invariably apparent, the typical reason being that the given change has not yet reached a phase in which the »visible form« of phonological reduction, the shortening of an item, takes place; this usually occurs in later phases of grammaticalization changes. As opposed to affixes, function words simply fail to lose any of their phonological material in a number of cases. And nothing guarantees that the grammatica-

²⁴ Cf. Dér 2008b, 31–42 for the details.

²⁵ Lehmann 2002, 112f; Heine/Reh 1984, 21; Hopper/Traugott 2003, 72, 127, 154, 222.

²⁶ See Roberts/Roussou 2003, 224f with detailed documentation.

lization process would move on from the function word stage, that is, it would ever lead to shortening/reduction.

Most Hungarian suffixes had acquired their present shape by the end of the Old Hungarian period (exceptions include transitional items like *-fajta* ›sort of‹, *-féle* ›type of‹, *-szerű* ›kind of‹ that are referred to as derivational suffix-like posterior constituents in part of the literature and as downright derivational suffixes elsewhere). Shortening of items undergoing grammaticalization was hardly attested from the Middle Hungarian period onwards; even types of function words that used to get reduced earlier (like the oldest layer of preverbs: *belé* > *bel*, *be* ›in‹, *felé* > *fel* ›up‹, *megé* > *meg* (perfectivizer), *elé* > *el* ›away‹, *kí* > *ki* ›out‹, *lé* > *le* ›down‹), failed to undergo reduction in later periods. It is difficult to see why phonological reduction ceased to be a frequently occurring mechanism after the earliest periods of the history of this language. It is true that it was in Proto-Hungarian and in Early Old Hungarian that large-scale phonological changes used to be the most active in general; but, given that one of the major common features of items undergoing grammaticalization is their extreme frequency of occurrence²⁷, the usual prerequisite of phonological reduction, high token frequency, was continuously present even in later periods.

We have already pointed out that shortening is primarily characteristic of more advanced phases of grammaticalization processes. In addition to the emergence of Hungarian suffixal morphemes, another good example is that of the future forms in English: Hopper/Traugott²⁸ claim that, in the case of *be going to* > *gonna*, reduction took place after reanalysis. Others say that phonological reduction may either lead up to or follow grammaticalization²⁹. Consequently, phonological reduction that occurs in the course of a lengthy process of changes may or may not be related to the grammaticalization that goes on simultaneously; this can only be claimed with confidence if it can be shown that the meaning of an item became (more) grammatical in nature **while** it was undergoing

²⁷ Bybee 2003, 602ff.

²⁸ Hopper/Traugott 2003, 3.

²⁹ Heine/Reh 1984, 17; Lightfoot 1991, 171, cited by Hopper/Traugott 2003, 124.

phonological reduction. An intriguing case in point is the Hungarian triplet *azt hiszem ~ asziszem ~ asszem* ›I think‹ whose paradigm is summarized in Table 1:

1sg present	azt hiszem ~	asziszem ~	asszem
1sg past	azt hittem ~	aszittem	
2sg present	azt hiszed ~	asziszed ~	asszed
2sg past	azt hitted ~	aszitted	
3sg present	azt hiszi ~	asziszi	([?] asszi)
3sg past	azt hitte ~	aszitte	
1pl present	azt hisszük ~	aszisszük ~	([?] asszük)
1pl past	azt hittük ~	aszittük	
2pl present	azt hiszitek ~	asziszitek	([?] asszitek)
2pl past	azt hittétek ~	aszittétek	
3pl present	azt hiszik ~	asziszik ~	([?] asszik)
3pl past	azt hitték ~	aszitték	

Table 1: Full and reduced forms of *azt hinni* ›to think (that)‹ in present-day Hungarian

Before the advent of internet and of written communication via cell phones, *asziszem* and *asszem* exclusively existed as spontaneous speech data; no written attestation was known until the emergence of what is often called »written spoken language« except in some literary pieces imitating spontaneous speech (the first attestation of *asziszem* in the Hungarian Historical Corpus [HHC] comes from 1954, and the first occurrence of *asszem* from 1990).

Veszelszki argues that the shortest version (*asszem*), unlike the longer forms, is being grammaticalized into a discourse marker or attitude marker³⁰. On the basis of her analysis of a corpus of internet forums, she presents a survey of its modal and pragmatic meanings. For instance, she claims that *asszem* expresses epistemic uncertainty in the following example (›ÁV‹ will be used to identify examples directly borrowed from Veszelszky):

³⁰ Veszelszki 2010, 261.

- (1) **Asszem** a jogi terminus nem a fajtalankodás, hanem a fajtalanság. (ÁV)
›I guess the legal term is not perversion but fornication.‹

The same item may also express speaker's attitude (face saving, apologizing, etc.):

- (2) **Asszem** inkább te értetted félre, amit idéztél. (ÁV)
›I guess it was you who misunderstood what you cited.‹

These »novel« functions, however, are not restricted to the short form; the longer versions may likewise have these functions, that is, the above examples do not lose the meaning attributed to them if we replace *asszem* by *azt hiszem* in them.

Veszelszki supports her grammaticalization argument by various syntactic tests. On the analogy of other cases in which superordinate clauses had turned into discourse markers (*bizony* ›I trust‹ > ›indeed‹, *látom* > *lám* ›I see‹ > ›behold!‹, etc.), it seems to be a good idea with respect to *asszem*, too, to explore whether the conjunction *hogy* ›that‹ can be added: this can in fact be a good indicator of the progress a given form has made on the grammaticalization cline. However, in the case of *asszem*, the conjunction can always be added – except, quite logically, in cases where that item occurs utterance/turn finally:

- (3) Hát akkor meg is van a megoldás, **asszem**. (ÁV)
›Well then, we've got the solution, I guess.‹

That is, *asszem* can be moved around within the sentence and (provided it is not in final position or added as an afterthought) it can always be followed by the conjunction *hogy*. In other words, traces of its status as a superordinate clause are rather firmly preserved:

- (4) **Asszem, (hogy)** hát akkor meg is van a megoldás.
›I guess (that) we've got the solution, then.‹

- (5) Hát akkor, **asszem, (hogy)** meg is van a megoldás.
›Well then, I guess (that) we've got the solution.‹

(6) Egyik oldalon vannak az Erdélybe a 17. században **(asszem)** érkezett örmények leszármazottai. (ÁV)
›On the one hand, there are the descendants of Armenians who had arrived in Transylvania in the seventeenth (I guess) century.‹

In the example in (6), *asszem* can also be replaced by either of its longer forms, but it cannot be followed by *hogy* since it does not precede the portion that it qualifies (›in the seventeenth century‹). What is more interesting here is the mobility of *asszem*, that is, the optionality of the main clause–subordinate clause order (as the ›I guess‹ can follow as well as precede the subordinate clause, or indeed be inserted into it). However, this is again not restricted to *asszem*; the longer forms can also do the same:

(7) Hát akkor meg is van a megoldás, **azt hiszem**.
›Well then, we have the solution, I think.‹

(8) Egyik oldalon vannak az Erdélybe a 17. században **(azt hiszem)** érkezett örmények leszármazottai.
›On the one hand, there are the descendants of Armenians who had arrived in the seventeenth century (I think) in Transylvania.‹

In other words, *asszem* is not more mobile than the corresponding longer forms. The rest of Veszelszki's syntactic tests (*ibid.*) are not very successful, either. It is true that some instances of *azt hiszem* ›I think‹ (as opposed to *asziszem* or *asszem*) can undergo order change (*hiszem azt*) or *azt* ›that-accusative‹ can be replaced by *úgy* ›so‹ in them (*úgy hiszem*); but neither the order change nor the replacement can be done with all occurrences of *azt hiszem* (and hence they have no probative force), and the functions of *úgy hiszem* are not always equivalent with those of *azt hiszem*, either. Where the alternative forms do not carry different meanings, replacement, movement, and the addition of *hogy* all seem to work (all the examples in (9)–(13) can be translated as ›Well then, we have the solution, I think/I believe/I guess‹:

(9) Hát akkor meg is van a megoldás, **azt gondolom**.

- (10) Hát akkor – **azt gondolom, (hogy)** – meg is van a megoldás.
 (11) **Azt gondolom, (hogy)** hát akkor meg is van a megoldás.
 (12) Hát akkor, **úgy vélem, (hogy)** meg is van a megoldás.
 (13) Hát akkor meg is van a megoldás, **úgy hiszem.**

As the foregoing unambiguously show, *asszem* can be replaced by its longest version, *azt hiszem*, in each and every case. This suggests that the former is not more grammaticalized than the latter, that is, the long form has exactly the same meanings as the short one:

- (14) **Asszem/Azt hiszem**, ezt megbeszéltük.
 ›I think we've agreed on that.‹
 (15) **Asszem/Azt hiszem**, beszélnem kell vele.
 ›I think I've got to talk to him.‹

The only difference between the two forms is that the long version can occur in all genres and registers while *asszem* is more restricted: it is preferred in more informal contexts, especially in spontaneous spoken and written-spoken (internet) language. Thus, grammaticalization has occurred in the long form as well as in the short one, and has nothing to do with phonological reduction in the sense that the shortest form would be the most grammaticalized one at the same time.

It is argued by e.g. Wichmann³¹ that **prosodic** changes (like de-stressing) occur early in the course of grammaticalization, especially on the basis of discourse markers like English *of course* or *I think*. She claims that prosodic alterations, the gradual loss of prosodic prominence, invariably precede segmental alterations in grammaticalization³². It is possible, then, that the shortening of *asszem* is the forerunner of a later semantic change that cannot be observed as yet (this is also supported by the increase in the form's frequency of occurrence).

³¹ Cf. Wichmann, Simon-Vandenberg/Aijmer 2010, 149; Wichmann 2012.

³² This is also argued, on the basis of the behavior of other grammaticalized items, by Dehé/Stathi 2012 and Markó/Dér 2012.

Consequently, certain prosodic (suprasegmental) changes may be part of the processes of grammaticalization,³³ even if they never reach the stage of phonological reduction or if the latter is not observable up to a certain stage of the grammaticalization process.

4.2 Grammaticalization = specific semantic change + category shift (and destressing)

In what follows, we will attempt to disprove claims to the effect that grammaticalization is nothing but structural change, or that it is a purely semantic type of change, or some subtype of the one or the other.

When people talk about grammaticalization, it is some semantic aspect that is most often referred to, resulting in a number of misleading platitudes often encountered in the linguistic literature of recent decades. One of those commonplaces is that the process is characterized by semantic »bleaching«³⁴; another one is that grammaticalization is a kind of abstraction (e.g. metaphorization). The main problem with these claims is that they overly simplify a very complex and very specific change. If we look at what in fact happens to the meaning of a linguistic item while it is grammaticalized, we find the following:

- The item gradually loses some of its referential meaning and simultaneously acquires functional (grammatical, pragmatic) meaning components. The two events overlap (more or less, as the case may be); that is, it does not have to be the case that the item first loses its lexical meaning and then acquires a grammatical one. This is important because other items may also lose some of their lexical meaning but do not necessarily undergo grammaticalization.

³³ Grammaticalization research has not been focusing on the phonetic/phonological study of spontaneous speech so far, hence further research will have to tell us whether all grammaticalization processes are indeed characterized by destressing in an early phase. Analyses published so far all support this idea (see references above).

³⁴ For the details, cf. Dér 2008b, 22f.

- The item does become more abstract in its meaning during grammaticalization but its meaning does not merely become more abstract – the output of grammaticalization invariably falls in the functional domain of language; hence, not all processes of abstraction necessarily lead to grammaticalization. A relevant example is one of the semantic changes of the Hungarian word *nyelv*: ›tongue‹ > ›language‹.
- The semantic change involved in grammaticalization is distinct from bidirectional semantic reanalysis³⁵ since
 - it can be described without using the concept of structural reanalysis (see below);
 - it is not bidirectional like semantic reanalysis;
 - it is invariably a gradual process; and
 - it may precede the structural change(s) involved in grammaticalization, while semantic reanalysis always follows them.

On the other hand, grammaticalization is also special in its structural aspect as it involves a specific shift of category, given that the structural change it involves is

- gradual, just like its semantic consequence;
- unidirectional, just like its semantic consequence; and
- not identical with conversion since it may involve linguistic units of any level, not just words or part-of-speech categories.

The structural change involved in grammaticalization is often described in formalist circles as structural reanalysis. Campbell says that structural reanalysis »changes the underlying structure of a grammatical construction, but does not modify surface manifestation«³⁶. But that underlying structure »includes (1) constituency, (2) hierarchical structure, (3) grammatical categories, (4) grammatical relations, and (5) cohesion«, while surface manifestation includes »morphological marking (e.g. morphological case, agreement, gender), and (2) word order« (ibid.). As can be seen, whatever happens in the structure of a linguistic unit must be related to reanalysis. As

³⁵ Cf. Eckardt 2006.

³⁶ Campbell 2001, 141.

Traugott and Trousdale writes³⁷, »any structural change will involve reanalysis. Since diachronic grammaticalization involves structural change, reanalysis should necessarily be involved.« But not everybody has the same opinion. Haspelmath argues, quite on the contrary, that grammaticalization and reanalysis are two non-overlapping classes of processes, that is, all that is true of the one is not true of the other.³⁸ Campbell³⁹, on the other hand, claims that none of the features assumed by Haspelmath are characteristic of the usual definitions of reanalysis, referring to a famous book by Harris and Campbell (»Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective«, 1995). It follows that, in Campbell's view, reanalysis is not bidirectional, not abrupt, and its input is not ambiguous (Haspelmath claims the opposite on all three counts), that is, »the implementation of reanalyses need not be abrupt, but rather typically is gradual in just the way Haspelmath imagines for grammaticalization«⁴⁰. However, Campbell is wrong: »reanalysis is gradual here only because Campbell is lumping together reanalysis with extension which is contrary to the main thesis of Harris & Campbell⁴¹ which holds that they must be considered distinct mechanisms«⁴². In addition, Harris and Campbell explicitly claim that »reanalysis itself is a discrete process, though the actualization process through which it meshes with the grammar is more gradual«.⁴³

The question now arises whether, given that reanalysis is abrupt, we have to exclude it from the description of grammaticalization. Two ways offer themselves: one is that we keep reanalysis as a subprocess of grammaticalization just like most of the literature does (see above) and ignore both the problem of abrupt change and the fact that some cases of grammaticalization can be accounted for without reanalysis⁴⁴. The other possibility is to refer to a type of

³⁷ Traugott/Trousdale 2010, 33.

³⁸ Haspelmath 1998, 327.

³⁹ Campbell 2001, 145.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 147.

⁴¹ Harris/Campbell 1995.

⁴² McDaniel 2003, 82.

⁴³ Harris/Campbell 1995, 49.

⁴⁴ Cf. Haspelmath 1998, Denison 2010.

change that is involved in each and every process of grammaticalization: category shift. According to Denison⁴⁵, just like in the cases of category shifts between non-functional major categories (e.g. noun > adjective, as in fun, key, rubbish), it is not necessarily true of grammaticalization, either, that it involves structural change (e.g. adjective > determiner, as in certain, various, several). As he points out, »[o]f course, with a syntax-centred model of language and more elaborately articulated syntactic structures, almost everything that can be said about language will be in some way ›structural‹«⁴⁶. Therefore, it is expedient to delimit changes involving constituent structure or hierarchical structure from those only involving categories (ibid.)⁴⁷.

As it is currently used, ›reanalysis‹ is but an empty label – just like ›grammaticalization‹ is if used in the broadest possible sense: it is exactly the manner of change that is left unexplained by it while distinct and quite separate processes are ostensibly accounted for with one fell swoop. In addition, reanalysis is not necessarily an invariant component of grammaticalization processes, and the shortening of a form is not that, either. On the other hand, loss of prosodic prominence is apparently just that.

In the present approach, we take grammaticalization to be a combination of three specific mechanisms that are invariably present in any instance of grammaticalization:

grammaticalization = specific semantic change + category
shift (+ destressing)

The advantage of this view is that it excludes the interpretation of grammaticalization as purely formal or purely semantic change, as well as views involving »a combination or result of several independent changes«. Furthermore, it easily and unambiguously allows us to include »pragmaticalization« among grammaticalization processes. However, it must be admitted that this approach is still unable to resolve the problem of whether the order in which these mecha-

⁴⁵ Denison 2010.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 116.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

nisms apply is invariable – and if it is not, how this affects the theory of grammaticalization.

References

- Brinton, Laurel J./Traugott, Elizabeth Closs: *Lexicalization and language change*, Cambridge 2005.
- Bybee, Joan: Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency, in: Brian D. Joseph/Richard D. Janda (eds): *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Malden/Oxford/Melbourne/Berlin 2003, 602–623.
- Campbell, Lyle: What's wrong with grammaticalization? In: *Language Sciences* 23 (2001), 113–161.
- Dehé, Nicole/Stathi, Katerina: *Grammaticalisation and prosody: the case of English sort/kind/type of constructions*. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization 5. 16 July 2012, Edinburgh 2012.
- Denison, David: Category change in English with and without structural change. In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott/Graeme Trousdale (eds): *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, Philadelphia/Amsterdam 2010, 105–128.
- Dér, Csilla Ilona: Önálló nyelvváltozás-e a degrammatikalizáció? [Is degrammaticalization a distinct process?]. In Gábor Tolcsvai Nagy/Mária Ladányi (eds): *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXII. Tanulmányok a funkcionális nyelvészet köréből*, Budapest 2008a, 121–160.
- *Grammatikalizáció [Grammaticalization]* = Nyelvtudományi értekezések 158, Budapest 2008.
- Eckardt, Regine: *Meaning change in grammaticalization. An inquiry into semantic reanalysis*. Oxford 2006.
- Harris, Alice/Lyle Campbell: *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*, Cambridge 1995.

- Haspelmath, Martin: Does grammaticalization reanalysis? In: *Studies in Language* 22 (1998), 315–351.
- On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Olga Fischer/Muriel Norde/Harry Perriodon (eds): *Up and down the cline: The nature of grammaticalization*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam 2004, 17–44.
- Heine, Bernd/Reh, Mechthild: *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*, Hamburg 1984.
- /Kuteva, Tania: *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge 2002.
- Hopper, Paul J./Traugott, Elisabeth C.: *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge 1993.
- *Grammaticalization*, Second Edition, Cambridge 2003.
- Janda, Richard D.: Beyond »pathways« and »unidirectionality«: on the discontinuity of language transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization. In: *Language Sciences* 23 (2003), 265–340.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy: The evolution of grammatical categories. In: *Diogenes* 51 (1975), 55–71.
- Lightfoot, David: *How to set parameters: Arguments from language change*, Cambridge 1991.
- Lehmann, Christian: *Thoughts on grammaticalization*, Second, revised edition, Erfurt 2002.
- Lindström, Therese: *The History of the concept grammaticalisation*, PhD Thesis, Sheffield 2005.
- Markó, Alexandra/Dér, Csilla Ilona: *Diskurzusjelölő vagy mutató névmás? A hangsúly szerepe a lexikális döntésben*. [Discourse marker or demonstrative pronoun? The role of stress in lexical decision]. In: *Magyar Nyelvőr* 136 (2012), 174–196.
- McDaniels, Todd: What's wrong with reanalysis? In: *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 21 (2003), 81–88.

- HHC. *Hungarian Historical Corpus*. <http://www.nytud.hu/hhc/>
- Newmeyer, Frederick J.: *Language Form and Language Function*. Cambridge/London 1998.
- Deconstructing grammaticalization. In: *Language Sciences* 23 (2001), 187–229.
- Norde, Muriel: *Grammaticalization*, Oxford 2009.
- Pusztai, Ferenc (ed.): *Magyar Értelmező Kéziszótár* [The Concise Dictionary of Hungarian]. Budapest 2003.
- Roberts, Ian/Roussou, Anna: *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*, Cambridge 2003.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C.: *Legitimate counterexamples to unidirectionality*, Paper presented at Freiburg University, October 17th 2001. <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/Freiburg.Unidirect.pdf>
- /Trousdale, Graeme: Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization. How do they intersect? In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott/Graeme Trousdale (eds): *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2010, 19–44.
- Veszelszki, Ágnes: Grammatikalizáció, különös tekintettel az asszemre [Grammaticalization, with special attention to asszem]. In: Vilmos Bárdosi (ed.): *Világkép a nyelvben és a nyelvhasználatban*, Budapest 2010, 249–265.
- Wichmann, Anne/Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie/Aijmer, Karin: How prosody reflects semantic change: A synchronic case study of of course. In: Hubert Cuyckens/Kristin Davidse/Lieven Vandelanotte (eds): *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin 2010, 103–154.
- Wichmann, Anne: *Grammaticalisation and prosody. Plenary paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization* 5. 17 July 2012, Edinburgh 2012.
- Willis, David: Syntactic lexicalization as a new type of degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 45 (2007), 271–310.