

What's Grammatical in Grammaticalization?*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Rhee, Seongha. 2007. What's grammatical in grammaticalization? *Studies in Modern Grammar* 48, 109-143. The scope of research in grammaticalization has been among the controversial topics in recent grammaticalization scholarship, since it is tied to the question of what is grammaticalization. In the heart of the controversy is the different conceptualization of the concept of 'grammar' and 'grammaticality', because grammaticalization, *per se*, is procedural, involving acquisition of or increase in grammaticality, or the characteristics of grammar. Despite the fact that there are innumerable instances of linguistic change that may be unequivocally labeled as grammaticalization, there are also a large number of linguistic changes that lie in the borderline, whose statuses in terms of grammaticalization entirely depend on the definition of grammar. This paper presents the controversy in several categories; proposes that certain changes that may fall outside the traditional conceptualization of grammaticalization may still have to be addressed in the grammaticalization studies. It proposes that the significant changes of linguistic forms that are grammatical either as a source or a target do not violate the unidirectionality should be considered as instances of grammaticalization, and that the widely-accepted principles of grammaticalization including unidirectionality should be not diagnostic principles but heuristic principles. This paper further identifies the remaining issues that call for clarification of the diverse notions surrounding grammaticalization.

Key words: grammaticalization, grammaticality, research scope, terminology, grammatical change

* This research was supported by the 2005 Korea Research Foundation Grant (#2005-031-A00011) for publication of *A Dictionary of Grammaticalization*, and its earlier version was presented at Spring 2007 Conference of the Society for Modern Grammar, May 19, 2007, at Kyungpook National University. The author is greatly indebted to the comments from the conference audience and from the three anonymous reviewers of the Journal. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

1. Introduction

Since the term 'grammaticalisation' (grammaticalization) was first introduced to the modern linguistic science by Antoine Meillet (1912), the notion of grammaticalization has been defined in various ways. Different conceptualization of 'grammar' and 'grammaticality' is reflected in different definitions of 'grammaticalization'. These differences in conceptualization of grammar (and therefore in the definition of grammaticalization) brought forth certain significant consequences. Among them is the controversy as to the question of what constitutes grammaticalization, or where is the boundary that separates grammaticalization from other types of linguistic change.

With this background, this paper addresses the issues surrounding the scope of grammaticalization studies. This paper reviews some of such controversies surrounding the terminology (in §2), and those of grammaticality and grammaticalization (in §3). Further, it discusses the types of linguistic change that need to be differentiated from grammaticalization and some issues that need to be resolved (in §4). In the course of the description of controversies, proposals as to the research scope are presented as appropriate.

2. On Terminology

In the endeavor of identifying what constitutes grammaticalization it is essential to see how grammaticalization is defined. Another important notion 'unidirectionality' is also looked at to facilitate the discussion, because unidirectionality is often considered the single most important principle that characterize the grammaticalization process, even to a point of identifying it with grammaticalization.

2.1 Grammaticalization

Since Antoine Meillet (1912), who coined the term 'grammaticalisation', this concept has attracted attention of language researchers in the functional paradigms, and has proved helpful for understanding not only the synchronic states of affairs of language but also the workings of the human cognition which enables the strategic uses of language in meaning negotiation between interlocutors.

From the early grammaticalization studies, grammaticalization was conceived of as a process whereby a lexical item becomes a grammatical item. This is well captured in how Antoine Meillet, the first scholar to use the term 'grammaticalisation', characterized it: "l'attribution du caractère grammatical à un mot jadis autonome [attributing grammatical characteristics to an erstwhile autonomous word]" (1912), which is echoed in the widely subscribed definition of grammaticalization by Kurylowicz (1965: 69), who included in the scope those changes that involve increases in grammaticality (grammaticality in the sense of 'grammatical nature', not of 'conforming to grammatical rules') as shown in (1):

- (1) Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status, e.g. from a derivative formant to an inflectional one.

However, recent literature on grammaticalization agrees that it is not enough to define grammaticalization as merely the process by which a lexical item becomes a grammatical morpheme, but rather that it is important to say that this process occurs in the context of a particular construction. From this perspective, it may be more accurate to say that a construction with particular lexical item(s) in it becomes grammaticalized,

instead of saying that it is a lexical item that becomes grammaticalized (Bybee 2001).

In addition to the addition of the notion of context as an important feature of grammaticalization, many other components that are thought of as important properties of grammaticalization also become incorporated in characterization of grammaticalization. Through elaboration of the terminology it is now widely understood that grammaticalization refers to the change whereby lexical terms and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]: xv), often accompanying phonetic reduction, syntactic rigidification, and semantic abstraction (Heine et al. 1991, Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993], Geurts 2000). The definitions and characterizations of grammaticalization, as have been widely subscribed to in recent scholarship, may be summarized as the following:

- (2) a. Grammaticalization is an evolution whereby linguistic units lose semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom, and phonetic substance, respectively. (Heine & Reh 1984)
- b. The [lexical > grammatical] change process occurs in the context of a particular construction. (Bybee et al. 1994)
- c. The change whereby lexical terms and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions (Hopper & Traugott 2003: xv).
- d. Grammaticalization is a process leading from lexemes to grammatical formatives. A number of semantic, syntactic and phonological processes interact in the grammaticalization of morphemes and of whole constructions. A sign is grammaticalized to the extent that it is devoid of concrete lexical meaning and takes part in obligatory grammatical

rules. (Lehmann 1995[1982]: vi)

- e. Grammaticalization often accompanies phonetic reduction, syntactic rigidification, and semantic abstraction (Heine et al. 1991, Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993], Geurts 2000).

2.2 Unidirectionality

In determining if a particular change qualifies to be considered as instances of grammaticalization, it is equally important to review what types of principles are operative in the processes of grammaticalization, because the changes that do not follow the principles may not be qualified as instances of grammaticalization. Diverse principles have been proposed, but among these, especially in the context of current discussion, is the unidirectionality principle, as proposed by Bybee et al. (1994).

According to the unidirectionality principle grammaticalization is unidirectional, and re-development does not occur from more grammaticalized stage to a less grammaticalized stage (Himmelmann 1992: 5, as cited in Lessau 1994). It is fundamentally an assertion about the orderliness and tractability of semantic change (Bybee et al. 1994). Since language change in general does not necessarily follow directions, unidirectionality is not a property of language change. Grammatical change with the label of grammaticalization, however, seems to display directionality and this property is often considered the most defining characteristic of grammaticalization. Unidirectionality involves different domains with distinct directional paths, as may be summarized in (3):

- (3) a. meaning: concrete to abstract
- b. function: lexical to grammatical
- c. phonological volume: more to less
- d. category: major to minor
- e. levels: high to low (e.g. syntax to morphology)

f. autonomy: free to bound

The importance of this principle is that its observance is often considered as the single most important criterion of grammaticalization, and further, particularly significant for the purpose of this paper, there are many different domains involved, as shown in (3) above, and many instances of linguistic change that are straightforward cases of non-grammaticalization may in fact observe the directionality in one or more of these domains. This will be addressed in Section 4.

3. Grammaticality and Grammaticalization

As grammaticalization is understood as a process of a linguistic form to become a part of 'grammar' by acquiring new or additional 'grammaticality', it is imperative that we look at these notions. Furthermore, we will address the changes that may be controversial in terms of grammaticalization status by evaluating the controversy and proposing a solution.

3.1 Grammar

As Cumming (1995) points out, the concept of 'grammar' is crucial in theorizing grammaticalization. It is so because grammaticalization is conceived of either creation of or increase in grammaticality, which in turn is based on the fundamental question of what grammar is.

Unlike formalists who view grammar as a well-delineated, self-contained, autonomous, *a priori* system, grammaticalization students, like most other functional theorists, view it as a more flexible system subject to the interlocutors' strategic use of language whereby the rules are constantly created or modified. In its extreme version, as proposed by Hopper (1987), grammar does not exist, but only grammaticalization does.

Therefore, grammar is only a set of tendencies toward a pattern; and it is 'emergent'. This idea is well presented in the following excerpt:

- (4) "The notion of emergent grammar is meant to suggest that structure, or regularity, comes out of discourse and is shaped by discourse as much as it shapes discourse in an on-going process. [...] Its forms are not fixed templates, but are negotiable in face-to-face interaction in ways that reflect the individual speakers' past experience of these forms, and their assessment of the present context, including especially their interlocutors, whose experiences and assessments may be quite different." (Hopper 1987: 142)

In a similar vein, Bybee (2007) proposes the notion of "the emergent lexicon", emergent in the sense that the lexicon is not a static storage but one under constant and active formation and re-formation involving many different kinds of connections, reflecting the language users' linguistic experiences. In this conception of the lexicon, the lexical storage is composed of linguistic units whose strength is determined by their cooccurrence patterns, thus containing not only words but also phrases and even sentences as unitized by their use frequency. Since these larger units contain grammatical items and grammatical templates with slots, the distinction between lexicon and grammar is by no means clear.

In the traditional conception of grammar, however, grammar is the opposite concept of the lexicon, and these two (supposedly) polar concepts of lexical vs. grammatical distinction is paralleled with the content vs. functional distinction, which, in turn, is paralleled by the primary vs. secondary category distinction. Therefore, in a rough approximation, grammaticalization involves categorial change of a linguistic form from a primary grammatical category (e.g. noun, verb, and adjective) to a secondary grammatical category (e.g. adposition,

conjunction, pronoun, TAM-marker, etc.). The primary vs. secondary grammatical category distinction is again closely related to the open vs. closed class distinction, where the members of the primary categories are the open class words and those of the secondary categories are the closed class words.

3.2 Adverbs

As we noted above, grammaticalization may proceed from primary to secondary grammatical category, or from open to closed class. There are innumerable instances that straightforwardly fit in this characterization, because most instances of grammaticalization involve concrete linguistic forms that changed their membership along such categorial or part-of-speech distinctions, i.e. the grammaticality exists in the linguistic form itself.

Then according to the traditional definition of 'grammaticalization', any movement from the lexical polar ending to the grammatical polar ending qualifies as an instance of grammaticalization. This claim, however, cannot be straight-forwardly applied to all cases, because the grammatical category 'adverb' has an interesting aspect as to its membership to these two categories. I.e., adverbs have more 'grammatical' properties (as evidenced by their non-basicality in derivation) even though they clearly have open-class properties in terms of their productivity and ease of new-word coinage. For instance, Jespersen (1924) places adverb in the category 'particle' along with preposition, conjunction, exclamative, etc., where the latter are clearly 'grammatical' rather than lexical categories. Furthermore, prepositions are often formally identical with the closely related category, i.e. prepositions (e.g. *aboard*, *across*, *within*, etc.).

However, it is true at the same time that prepositions are often formally identical with nouns (e.g. *yesterday*, *today*, etc.), or with adjectives (e.g. *early*, *daily*, *only*, etc.). It is for this reason of lexical

nature of adverbs that adverb formation is not readily accepted as an instance of grammaticalization. For instance, Rhee (2004) raises a concern that the formation of indefinite adverbs in Korean from rhetorical questions, e.g. *enceynka* ('some time' < 'when is it?'), *waynka* ('for some reason' < 'why is it?'), *etinka* ('somewhere' < 'where is it?') and *etilonka* ('to somewhere' < 'to where is it?'), may well be viewed as instances of lexicalization, which complicates the general picture because other question words participating in the identical word-formation process generates indefinite pronouns (e.g. *nwukwunka* 'someone' < 'who is it?'; *mwenka* 'something' < 'what is it?'; and *mwuenseynka* 'to something' < 'what is it at?'), a process clearly qualified to be grammaticalization (see Rhee 2004 for more detail).

As for this type of changes, e.g. those involving adverbs, it is proposed here that the formation of words that are grammatical in nature but lexical in productivity, the provenance should matter. I.e., if the source word is of more lexical origin, such as nouns, verbs, or adjectives, then such cases may constitute instances of grammaticalization. On the other hand, if the source was from the more grammatical categories, e.g. adpositions, pronouns, etc., such cases should be regarded as instances of lexicalization, and for that matter, instances of degrammaticalization. This is in line with the continuum of grammatical categories as proposed by Heine et al. (1991: 167).

(5) Lexical word > (Adverb) > Adposition > Case affix > zero

3.2 Structures

Another aspect of the controversy emerges when we consider the abstract structures in language, rather than concrete formatives of language such as words and phrases. For instance, word order change poses a problem because it falls outside the traditional concept of

grammaticalization, whereby less grammatical item becomes a more grammatical item, because no word order type can be said to be more grammatical than another. It is well known that in the history of English the OV word order changed into the VO word order. However, we cannot say that this change was or was not an instance of grammaticalization, since we do not see any change in the level of grammaticality in the word order change.

Furthermore, there are changes in word order which emerged as an alternative means of coding grammatical relations. For instance, English case concepts were encoded by means of case inflection early in history, as were in Latin. When case inflections are widely used, the word order is relatively free, because the syntactic relations are all explicitly indicated by means of case inflection. Likewise, when the case inflections ceased to function as case indicators, the function was largely taken up by the fixed word order and prepositions. Therefore, there arises a question: is the change from case inflection to fixed word order an instance of grammaticalization?

The replacement of case inflection by means of prepositions is easily solved with recourse to the notion of 'renewal' (Kahr 1976: 115; = 'renouvellement' Meillet 1912; 'renovation' Lehmann 1995[1982]). However, word order being increasingly fixed and becoming increasingly meaningful, from formerly free and functionally-vacuous states, may not be easily determined with respect to its status in grammaticalization. Furthermore, as indicated earlier, whether the word order change from OV to VO, or in any order in general, constitutes grammaticalization is a thorny problem.

With respect to such cases as word order, it is proposed that they have to be considered as grammaticalization, just because they are important devices in grammar, and the formation of such grammatical feature, even though it may only involve reorganization of the preexisting materials, must be considered as an instance of grammaticalization. Here, we need

to take note of the fact that the word order change does not involve any increase or decrease in grammaticality. This proposal is largely consonant with the idea advanced by Meillet (1912) that words are not the only sources of grammatical expression and word-order changes may also be among them, and thus included them among instances of grammaticalization. This idea is also consonant with Hopper and Traugott (2003[1993]), who suggested that even though word order changes are not unidirectional and thus fall outside the category of grammaticalization in the narrower sense, "given a broader definition of grammaticalization as the organization of grammatical, especially morphosyntactic material, they cannot be excluded from consideration" (p.60).

3.3 Spreading

Another type of change that does not neatly fit in is the non-directional change as, for instance, the case of Russian instrumental discussed in Nichols & Timberlake (1991). In Old Russian, the instrumental case was originally used with respect to changeable status/role, entering or continuing status. However, in later times it came to be used for status/role, quasi-status in durative. Therefore, the Russian instrumental shows the gradual extension of its use, with its usage being fixed in one domain and developing new usage in another, a process termed as 'retextualization' by the authors. This pattern may well be characterized as a case of spread. The question that arises from this situation is whether the spread phenomenon is an instance of grammaticalization, i.e. one of grammaticality increase or creation.

As for this type of change, the crucial element of this argument is whether spread *per se* of an innovated feature of grammar must be considered as grammaticalization. This is an interesting query because grammaticalization involves both innovation and spread.

There are two options as to this issue: accepting or rejecting it as an

instance of grammaticalization. If we are to accept it, it is tantamount to saying that spread (in contrast to innovation) is also grammaticalization. This leads to a problem because spread inevitably involves increase in use context and thus token frequency, and a natural consequence of this decision raises a question if frequency increase *per se* may be considered grammaticalization, and if not, how to effectively separate these two similar and closely related phenomena. Furthermore, there is no directionality involved, even though the change involved the coding of grammatical relationship, and thus the changes do not show stages that can be plotted on a grammaticalization cline (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 131).

On the other hand, if we are to reject it, this decision amounts to asserting that spread and grammaticalization are not identical. This apparently makes sense considering that spread presupposes an already innovated rule, whereas grammaticalization as 'change in grammar' is more a matter of innovation rather than spread. Furthermore, this type of change does not involve any change of a [less grammatical > more grammatical] directionality. However, this position is not problem-free. The decision as to whether a particular rule has already become an established rule, i.e., innovation, ready to spread to other contexts, is by no means easy. In other words, innovation and spread are not clearly separable as they might seem. This is particularly so if we are to subscribe to the idea of 'emergent grammar', i.e., that there is no *a priori* grammar; but rather the so-called grammar is only an aggregate sum of movement toward emerging patterns, then spread can be truly called a process whereby a linguistic form is moving toward these patterns. From this perspective, this movement toward the patterns, or formation of patterns, should be rightfully called grammar formation, i.e. grammaticalization.

If all things considered, there is no solution that can solve all the problems that either option brings forth. This process might seem to be

better if considered as an instance of automatization or routinization through frequency increase, whereby the use context is extended, rather than as an instance of grammaticalization *per se*. This characterization notwithstanding, however, such spread phenomenon may be, in a broader sense, deemed as constituting grammaticalization, especially from the notion of 'emergent grammar'. There are two reasons as for this decision: one being that spread is an essential part of pattern formation, since patterns are formed through frequency increase; and the other being that when a function of a grammatical form spreads to other contexts, it can be said that in these new contexts this particular grammatical form has acquired grammaticality, thus fitting our description of grammaticalization.

3.4 Category-Internal Changes

Still another category that deserves our attention in determining the scope of grammaticalization is the type of change that occurs category-internally. Grammaticalization as a phenomenon of grammatical change is a complex procedure involving all levels of grammar from phonetics to discourse. There is a consensus as to the relation between levels of grammar and grammaticalization that as grammaticalization proceeds, the levels to which the grammatical form concerned belongs tend to become lower, as, e.g., from syntax to morphology (Givón 1971) (cf. 'downgrading' Newmeyer 1998). With this respect, a grammatical change that does not involve categorial change, (a process often referred to as 'decategorialization' *a la* Hopper 1991), is viewed with scepticism as to whether it is a grammaticalization phenomenon in its own right.

In this regard there are two major points to consider. First of all, the notion of 'categories' in grammar is by no means well-delineated. It has been often pointed out that there is considerable fluidity of 'categoriality' both category-internally and across categories (Heine 1997, Rhee 1998). Therefore, a particular semantic change that does not involve categorial

change, as e.g. from the temporal sense of English conjunction *while*, into the adversative/contrastive sense, albeit the change does not involve category change from conjunction, is often discussed in grammaticalization studies.

Secondly, grammatical change phenomena that occur at the earlier stages of the grammaticalization tend to be straight-forwardly decategorialization process, thus qualifying such descriptions as ones relating to grammaticalization. On the other hand, the changes that occur at the later stages tend to be less so. This is due to the inherent nature of the so-called grammatical categories. Since the lexemes at the end of the grammaticality scale are very susceptible to change, due to the fact that the forms at this highly-grammatical stage are largely vacant of meaning and cannot resist contextual forces constantly imposed on them, and active and diverse changes overcrowd this category at the polar extreme. Since these categories around the end of the grammaticality continuum are the locus of active and abundant grammatical changes, exclusion of these changes from the scope of grammaticalization studies will make the framework academically uninteresting.

For these reasons, it is proposed here that we include in grammaticalization any significant changes in grammar, be they semantic, syntactic or otherwise, if only the linguistic forms involved belong to a grammatical category (i.e. any change of a form that is already grammatical, or of a form that becomes grammatical), and unless the change does not violate the unidirectionality principle (i.e. unless the change does not proceed from more grammatical to less grammatical categories).

3.5 Changes across Non-Orderable Categories

Still another class of changes that merit a discussion involves the categories that cannot be plotted along the continuum of grammaticality of

grammatical categories. This type subsumes the category-internal changes addressed above in that the categories involved, i.e. source category and the result/target category, cannot be ordered with respect to the differential degree of grammaticality, which is also true when there is only one category involved.

Among such cases is the change attested in Newari as reported by Genetti (1991). Genetti (1991) presents the grammatical change from case postposition to adverbial subordinator in Newari, a language with a high level of postposition-subordinator syncretism. This developmental pattern, enabled by the reanalysis of originally nominal morphology as verbal morphology, is found in many Bodic languages. Apparently, the source items, i.e. postpositions, do not have traceable lexical sources in the primary category such as nouns or verbs. Subordinators and postpositions were not formally distinct in Classical Newari, but most of them have become distinct in modern Kathmandu Newari (except for Concessive and Purpose). Therefore, the pattern suggests that the former postpositions have become subordinators as a distinct category. Then, whether or not they have lexical sources, this particular segment of development from postposition to subordinator naturally presents a question if this is grammaticalization.

Genetti (1991), points out that this change lies outside the traditional notion of grammaticalization since the forms concerned did not start out from lexical items but from bound postpositions already, thus only constituting a category shift. She further notes that despite the fact that the change is not that of the traditional [lexical > grammatical] change, it exhibits certain features characteristic of grammaticalization, i.e. it observes unidirectionality, exhibits layering, and follows the three semantic-pragmatic tendencies as proposed by Traugott and König (1991).

Since grammaticalization is not conceived of as a change that necessarily starts out from a lexical category in the current grammaticalization scholarship, the fact that Newari subordinators did not come from lexical

words does not concern us. More importantly, the question that concerns us is between subordinators and postpositions which of the two is more grammatical. The grammaticality distinction is not readily available in the traditional proposals, since they are not fine-grained enough to differentiate them: most of them employ dichotomy (primary vs. secondary; superordinated vs. subordinated; major vs. minor; overt vs. covert; open vs. closed) and place both parts-of-speech in the secondary categories. For a non-binary classification, Hopper and Traugott (2003[1993]: 107) present a cline of categoricity with reference to grammaticalization as the following:

(6) major category (> intermediate category) > minor category

In this model the major category constitutes nouns and verbs; adjectives and adverbs belong to the optional intermediate category; and finally to the minor category belong many categories such as prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, pronouns and demonstratives. Even from this model the postposition-subordinator distinction cannot be drawn.

As shown in the preceding discussion, if we are to remain faithful to the principles that characterize grammaticalization, such as the unidirectionality principle and the decategorialization principle, *inter alia*, the changes across the categories that cannot be effectively ordered with respect to their relative degree of grammaticality cannot be determined if they constitute grammaticalization.

If we are to reject the grammaticalization status for the cases described here, we run into a problem that a wide range of instances of 'grammatical' change that have been analyzed from the grammaticalization perspective should be disqualified as such. Grammatical categories with high grammaticality are relatively small in number as compared with those with high lexicality. This states of affairs are well captured in the paradigmaticization principle (Lehmann 1995[1982]), which suggests that the paradigms with low paradigmaticity (i.e. more lexical paradigms) are

bigger in size as opposed to those with high paradigmaticity (i.e. more grammatical paradigms). As indicated earlier, linguistic forms toward the end of the grammaticality continuum are relatively empty in semantics, unsubstantive in phonological volume, low in conceptual salience, which altogether contribute to their vulnerability to change. Therefore, highly grammaticalized forms are very susceptible to diverse changes. As noted earlier, if these changes should be eliminated from the scope of grammaticalization studies, grammaticalization theory as a theoretical framework should lose its explanatory power in grammar and become uninteresting to linguistic scientists. For these reasons it is proposed here that we include such changes with non-orderable source-target categories in the scope of grammaticalization studies.

3.6. Theoretical Implications

We advanced a proposal that changes of grammatical construct either in a linguistic form or in structure that are grammatically significant (either by creating grammaticality through acquiring a new grammatical function, or by increasing grammaticality of an already grammaticalized form) should be under the consideration of grammaticalization, unless the developmental path violates unidirectionality. In other words, what matters is not observance of unidirectionality but absence of violation of unidirectionality. One serious consequence of this position is that unidirectionality, though still important, is not considered a necessary and sufficient condition of grammaticalization. In other words, not all changes that observe unidirectionality are necessarily instances of grammaticalization, and conversely, not all grammaticalizing forms need to move along the unidirectional paths.

This seemingly drastic proposal is not in fact novel. Unlike Lehmann (1991) who proposed that the grammaticalization of a unit is directed toward subjecting that unit more to the rules of grammar, Hopper (1987)

asserts that since all parts of grammar are at all times undergoing change, all grammatical phenomena are to be thought of as under grammaticalization (as cited in Genetti 1991: 248). In fact, Hopper (1991), in his seminal paper on the principles of grammaticalization, characterizes his principles as only 'heuristic', and states that if grammaticalization is not already a given, the principles do not in fact identify it unambiguously, illustrating the observances of those principles with the examples of *mistress*, *miss*, *mrs*, and *ms* (pp. 32-33).

If we are to accept the view that proposed grammaticalization principles are not diagnostic tools, the grammaticalization framework becomes a more versatile, more widely applicable tool with strong explanatory power. We are now in position to discuss what then does not constitute grammar.

4. Further Issues: Non-Grammaticalization

There are classes of linguistic change that may not be labeled as grammaticalization, even if we espouse a very liberal view of grammaticalization. We will discuss lexicalization, degrammaticalization, downgrading across levels of grammar, and univerbation.

4.1 Lexicalization and Degrammaticalization

Despite the need for an extended grammaticalization research scope, there are cases that may have to remain outside the scope of grammaticalization studies. The most salient case is that of lexicalization and/or degrammaticalization.

Lexicalization basically refers to a process whereby any linguistic operation creates a lexical item as its final product. There are several subtypes of lexicalization (examples taken from Hopper & Traugott 2003: 58, 134; Heine 2004; Ramat 1992, 2001 and elsewhere):

(7) Minor Category > Verb

You can *off* anybody you don't like.

to *out* someone

to *up* the scale

to *up* the ante

duzen (< pronoun *du* (Ger.))

tutoyer (< pronoun *tu* (Fr.))

(8) Minor Category > Noun

the *ups* and *downs* of life

It's an *out*.

That was a *downer*!

His *uppers* need dental work.

the *ifs* and *buts*

(9) Derivational Affix > Noun

I dislike her use of *isms*.

Her *ex* is a monster.

(10) Quasi-form > Noun

an *ade*

the cheese-*burger*

the *teens*

All the examples given above are those of forming verbs or nouns (i.e. the primary, lexical categories). These are cases of typical lexicalization. Even though it is true that there is a point at which grammaticalization and lexicalization may intersect (Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993]: 135), lexicalization is distinct from grammaticalization in that its final product is a lexical item, and thus may enrich the lexicon but does not affect the grammatical system as grammaticalization does.

In addition to the types of examples cited above, Heine (2004) further presents in this context certain euphemistic uses of language. For example, Swahili (Bantu, Niger-Congo language) has a common strategy of euphemisms referring to sexual organs such as 'penis' or 'vagina' in terms of spatial concepts (i.e. closed-class items) such as '(the thing) in front', '(the one) below' (also in Heine et al. 1991: 50). These are undoubtedly instances of lexicalization.¹⁾

Another type of changes also falls into this lexicalization and/or degrammaticalization category: those that gained autonomy from previously bound states. For example, Matsumoto (1988) presents Japanese free connectives that were bound forms in history as exemplified by *ga* 'but', *kedo/keredomo/kedomo* 'even though', *tokorode* 'by the way', *tokoroga* 'but', *to* 'just then', *daga* 'but', *dakedo/dakedomo* 'but', *dakara* 'therefore', and *nononi* 'in spite of it'. These cases clearly go against the expected directionality in grammaticalization. Rhee (1996) also shows that Korean exhibits similar states of affairs involving the light-verb, *ha-*, e.g. *hana*, *haciman*, *hataka*, *hantey*, *hani*, *haye*, etc. These cases clearly violate the unidirectionality, and thus are disqualified for grammaticalization.

In a similar vein Ko (1970) shows that some of the formally bound forms as defective nouns acquired relative autonomy, e.g. *ppwun*, *tes*, *cuum*, *kyem*, *calak*, *thi*, *thwusengi*, *kkili*, *kong*, *kwun*, *sayngwen*, *sepang*, *nim*, *cangi*, etc. As was the case with the Japanese and Korean adverbial formation in the previous discussion, these nouns that acquired autonomy, albeit minimal, are disqualified for grammaticalization.

Likewise, Hopper and Traugott (2003[1993]: 59, 137) presents a peculiar development of an Estonian affirmative adverb *ep* developed from

1) In this context, we need to note that even though lexicalization is distinct from grammaticalization, it does not constitute counterexamples to unidirectionality since they are not mirror images (Lehmann 2002: 15, as cited in Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993]: 135). As for counterexamples, Hopper and Traugott (2003[1993]) present the development of *wotte* (preterit subjunctive 'would') to a main verb 'wish, desire' in Pennsylvania German, and the development of affirmative adverb (thus autonomous) *ep* from the former emphatic clitic (thus bound) **-pa* (see discussions below).

the bound clitic **-pa*. Acquisition of autonomy in this case is counter-directional as compared with grammaticalization, and thus makes it clear that it falls outside the scope of grammaticalization studies.

4.2 Levels of Grammar

The next category is the change that involves certain changes that resemble grammaticalization, but that should best not be considered as instances of grammaticalization. These are the cases that involve one aspect of grammar, but not accompanying critical changes that are characteristic of grammaticalization, creation of or increase in grammaticality.

It is not infrequent to witness the claims that certain semantic change, specifically semantic abstraction, is grammaticalization. This in fact is a wide-spread misconception. In other words, the change of [concrete meaning > abstract meaning] cannot be equated with grammaticalization. It is very common that a lexical item changes its meaning without changing grammatical categories, from concrete to abstract domains, often as a result of metaphorization. The Ewe noun *megbé* 'back', as illustrated in Heine et al. (1991: 65ff, 222ff), is an excellent example. This lexeme has undergone a series of semantic designation: [back of body > back part > place behind > time after > behind > after > retarded], an extensive change characterizable as 'abstraction'. However, the grammatical category largely remains unchanged: it is a noun (except for the last designation) and an adjective in the last three designations. Despite its exemplary semantic change of abstraction, it is by no means grammaticalization because it does not involve either creation of or increase in grammaticality; and it does not involve any grammatical category (for its being either a noun or an adjective) either as a source or a target.²⁾

2) This type of abstraction process is closely related to, though not identical with,

Likewise, the cases involving movements of [discourse > syntax] or of [syntax > morphology] *per se* cannot be equated with grammaticalization, even though grammaticalization often exhibit such directionality, and syntacticization and morphologization often involve creation of or increase of grammaticality, thus being processes of erstwhile grammaticalization.

Furthermore, the changes involving the reduction of phonological volume as [high phonetic substance > low phonetic substance] cannot be considered grammaticalization, either, even though grammaticalization typically involves such reductive change (cf. however, Rhee 2006). In other words, most phonological changes tend to involve reduction rather than supplementation of phonetic volume, but they may not involve creation or increase of grammaticality. They are simply independent parameters.

4.3 Non-Directional Changes

Another category that lies outside the scope of grammaticalization is those that do not exhibit any particular directionality. There are numerous instances of such changes (such as most phonological changes, analogical changes, etc.), but this description limits its scope only to those that may be misconstrued as instances of grammaticalization. The first group of such cases are acronymization as shown in the following:

- (11) UNESCO < United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural
Organization
radar < radio detection and ranging
scuba < self-contained underwater breathing apparatus

Another case involves those that are commonly called 'univerbation' (Lehmann 1995[1982], Lipka 1990, Rhee 1998, Koo 2005, Lee 2002), as

subjectification, as proposed by Traugott (1982, 1995) and Traugott and Dasher (2002).

exemplified below, where the final product may belong either to major class or minor class:³⁾

(12) English

- a. garlic < gar 'spear' + leac 'leak'
- b. halibut < halig 'holy' + butte 'flatfish'
- c. arise < on + rise .
- d. already < all + ready
- e. hafta < have + to
- f. notwithstanding (< not with standing)
- g. nevertheless < never the less
- h. nonetheless < none the less
- i. insofar as < in so far as
- j. forevermore < for ever more

(13) Korean

- a. eccaysstun 'anyway' < ecci hayesstun 'whatever (you) have done'
- b. kwichanhta 'be bothersome' < kwihaci anihata 'be not precious'
- c. cemcanhta 'be gentle' < celmci anihata 'be not young'
- d. phyenchanhta 'be ill' < phyenhaci anihata 'be not comfortable'
- e. pyenpyenchanhta 'be insignificant' < pyenpyenhaci anihata 'be not useful'
- f. kathcanhta 'be contemptible' < kathci anihata 'be not like (it)'
- g. siwenchanhta 'be unsatisfactory' < siwenhaci anihata 'be not cool'

All the examples given above are instances of phrases becoming a single unit. Even though it is true that grammaticalization typically involves a process whereby morpho-syntactically, phonologically, or even

3) It is to be noted that according to Lehmann's (1995[1982]) idea of univerbation, the final product does not have to be orthographically a single word. As long as it behaves as a single unit, even a phrase may be considered as a product of univerbation, e.g. French *bon marché* 'cheap'.

semantically complex forms become simpler and more general, these instances of 'unitization' cannot qualify as grammaticalization, simply because there is no grammaticality creation or increase involved.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This paper intended to identify the types of changes that may be considered as research topics in grammaticalization studies and those that may not. Following the traditional notion of grammaticalization it showed that the concepts of 'grammar' and 'grammaticality' play an important role with this regard. However, this paper proposes that we need to adopt a less rigid view of grammaticalization in order to allow for grammatically significant changes in the scope of research. Instances that may qualify for the label grammaticalization may be listed as follows:

(14) Conditions:

- a. The linguistic form must not violate the unidirectionality principle.
- b. The change must involve a grammatical form either as a source or as a result/target.

(15) Specific Instances:

- a. Increase in grammaticality: change from less grammatical to more grammatical
 - (i) Categorial downgrading, i.e. major category > minor category; e.g. noun > adposition; verb > TAM marker
 - (ii) Spreading, i.e. single domain > multiple domains; e.g. instrumental case marking changeable status > instrumental case marking durative status
 - (iii) Category-internal change, i.e. single grammatical function > multiple grammatical functions within a category; e.g.

temporal connective *while* > adversative connective *while*; spatial preposition *before* > temporal preposition *before*; oppositive preposition *with* > cooperative preposition *with*

- b. Creation of grammaticality: change from non-grammatical to grammatical.
- (i) Word order change, e.g. OV > VO; free word order > fixed word order
 - (ii) Spreading, i.e. spread into a previously non-grammatical domain; e.g. resultative aspect marker > past tense marker in a previously tenseless language
 - (iii) Concatenated phrase > Grammatical morpheme; e.g. compositional phrase > complex preposition

What is noteworthy is that according to this position the unidirectionality and many other principles are not diagnostic criteria for the grammaticalization vs. non-grammaticalization. They are simply heuristic principles. As Hopper (1991: 33) well pointed out, grammaticalization is always a question of degree, not an absolute. Those principles should be used as instruments to facilitate the description of grammatical change, not as instruments to identify grammaticalization.

Despite the leniency of the view of grammaticalization, however, this paper also showed that the instances of lexicalization and degrammaticalization, changes that resemble grammaticalization in only local level(s), and non-directional changes such as acronymization and univerbation do not qualify for grammaticalization.

There remain certain problems and issues that need more attention. For instance, in the case of "local level" changes, the questions as to how many different levels should be involved, which level is more crucial than others, etc., in order to be qualified as grammaticalization

have yet to be answered.

References

- Bybee, Joan L. 2001. Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency. *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. R. Janda, and B. Joseph (eds.). 602-623. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bybee, Joan L. 2007. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere D. Perkins. 1994. *Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cumming, Susanna 1995. A posting at Funknet Oct 27, 1995. [<https://mailman.rice.edu/pipermail/funknet/1995-October/000004.html>]
- Givón, Talmy. 1971. Historical Syntax and Synchronic Morphology: An Archaeologist's Field Trip. *CLS* 7: 394-415.
- Genetti, Carol. 1991. From Postposition to Subordination in Newari. Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 volumes. Vol. 2: 257-310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geurts, Bart. 2000. Explaining Grammaticalization (the Standard Way) *Linguistics* 38.4: 781-788.
- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2004. On the Nature of the Unidirectionality Principle in Grammaticalization. Special lecture at Language Research Institute, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. October 22, 2004, Seoul.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Frederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Mechthild Reh. 1984. *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 1992. *Grammaticalization and Grammar*. (Arbeitspapier 16 NF). Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1987. Emergent grammar. *BLS* 13. 139-157. Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On Some Principles of Grammaticization. Elizabeth Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. vol. 1: 17-35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003[1993] *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Ko, Young Keun. 1970. Hyentaykwukeuy cwuncaliphyengsikey tayhan yenkwu [A study on semi-autonomous forms in modern Korean]. *Language Research*. 6.1.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 2005. At the Crossroad of Negative and Affirmative: Strategic Uses of Negation in Korean. Paper presented at SECOL-72 Conference, April 7-9, 2005, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC. U.S.A.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1965. The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. Eugenio Coseriu (ed.). *Esquisses Linguistiques II*. Munich: Fink. 38-54.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 2002. Grammaticalization, Lexicalization, and Unidirectionality: With Reference to the Development of Some Adjectives in Korean. Paper presented at NRG-2, April 3-6, 2002. University of Amsterdam. The Netherlands.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982] *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2002. New Reflections on Grammaticalization

- and Lexicalization. Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization: Proceedings from the International Symposium on Grammaticalization, 17-19 June 1999, Potsdam, Germany*. 1-18. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lessau, Donald A. 1994. *A Dictionary of Grammaticalization*. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Lipka, Leonhard. 1990. *An Outline of English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-Formation*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1988. From Bound Grammatical Markers to Free Discourse Markers: History of Some Japanese Connectives. *BLS* 14: 340-351.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* (Rivista di Scienza) 12, 26.6. Reprinted in Meillet 1958: *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. 130-148. Paris. Champion.
- Nichols, Johanna, and Alan Timberlake. 1991. Grammaticalization as Retextualization. Elizabeth Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. vol. 1: 129-146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ramat, Paolo. 1992. Thought on Degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 30: 549-560.
- Ramat, Paolo. 2001. Degrammaticalization or Transcategorization? Chris Schaner-Wolles, John Rennison, & Friedrich Neubarth (eds.) *Naturally! Linguistic Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler Presented on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, 393-401. Turin: Rosenbach and Sellier.
- Rhee, Seongha. 1996. *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization*. Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin. Seoul: Hankuk Publisher.
- Rhee, Seongha. 1998. Semantic Changes of English Preposition *against*: A Grammaticalization Perspective. *Language Research* 38.2: 563-583.

- Rhee, Seongha. 2004. From Discourse to Grammar: Grammaticalization and Lexicalization of Rhetorical Questions in Korean. *The LACUS Forum* 30: 413-423.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2006. Formal Variation and Colloquiality in Korean: Implications on the Grammaticalization Theory. Paper presented at 33rd LACUS Conference, July 31-August 4, 2006, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. Winfred P. Lehmann & Yakov Malkiel. (eds.) *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in Grammaticalization. Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.) *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation in Language*. 31-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Ekkehard König. 1991. The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited. Elizabeth Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. vol. 1: 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Department of English Linguistics
 College of English
 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
 270 Imun-dong Dongdaemun-gu Seoul
 130-791 Korea
 Telephone: +82-2-2173-3171
 E-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Received:

Revised version: