7 Grammaticalization: A General Critique
Brian D. Joseph

1 Introduction

I start this contribution with a personal note: it is no secret that I have expressed critical views on the whole enterprise of grammaticalization, grammaticalization theory, and grammaticalization studies, as Joseph (2001; 2003; 2004; and 2006) make abundantly clear.   At the same time, though, I readily recognize that this enterprise has revealed some real aspects of language development that deserve attention. To be perfectly clear, I believe that there is a *phenomenon* that can be called "grammaticalization", and that one-time lexical material can certainly come to serve grammatical functions and to change regarding their lexical (content) vs. grammatical (function) status, and that such changes can correlate with changes in morphological status (e.g. word versus affix).   Nonetheless, I do *not* believe all claims in the literature about this phenomenon.   Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to address some issues I have with grammaticalization, in the spirit of intellectual inquiry.

> Here are the major themes that inform this critique:
(1)   a.   Grammaticalization as process or result (and terminology more generally)
>   b.   Privileging one cluster of developments over others
>   c.   Alternative outcomes/results
>   d.   Unidirectionality
>   e.   Grammaticalization in language contact

In what follows, I take these themes up one by one, and elaborate on each one.

2 Process vs. result and terminology

This first theme centers on the very nature of grammaticalization, and whether it is a process/mechanism[1] of change, parallel to sound change, analogy, borrowing, reanalysis, and metaphorical extension, to name a few well-known and universally recognized ways in which change in language is effected. There are actually several questions here: first, is grammaticalization a process/mechanism, separate and distinct from other independently needed processes, or is it instead a label for the result of such processes? Second, if one adopts a process view, is grammaticalization a single process or are there several grammaticalization processes? The literature offers many ambiguous remarks on these points (see Campbell and Janda 2001 and the discussion in, e.g., Janda (2001) and Joseph (2001).

Clarifying these issues is practical if all scholars could show uniformity in talking about grammaticalization. However, there is a deeper reason why they matter: it is hard to see how one can generalize about "grammaticalization" if there are many processes of "grammaticalization", all the more so if the over-arching phenomenon is nothing more than the name for a particular kind of outcome of the operation of other processes are involved, rather than being a process/mechanism of change itself (see Janda 2001, Joseph 2001, Newmeyer 2001, and Fischer 2009, this volume).

But even if one grants that the involvement of several processes does not preclude grammaticalization being its own process/mechanism of change (as opposed to a name for a

---

[1] I am using these terms interchangeably, inasmuch as dictionary definitions (e.g. in the OED) treat them as quite similar (*process* as 'action or succession of actions occurring or performed in a definite manner, and having a particular result', *mechanism* as 'a means by which an effect or result is produced'); both definitions focus on the step or steps leading to a result, and thus treat those steps as distinct from the endpoint, the result itself.

result), there is a further problem. In some views, e.g. that of Lehmann ([1982]1995), grammaticalization is determined by the clustering together of several processes/mechanisms, (e.g. semantic bleaching, phonetic reduction, etc.). This raises the question of how this clustering is accomplished by the speakers engaging in the particular changes, and how these various processes come to be coordinated. This is especially problematic since all interested parties accept that each of these effects can occur independently; that is, phonetic reduction can occur without any concomitant semantic effect, as in numerous instances of reductive sound changes (e.g. Old Latin *stlocus* 'place' > Romanian *loc,* ancient Greek *ommation* 'eye' > Modern Greek *mati,* Old English *scīrgerēfa* 'shire-reeve' > Modern English *sheriff*), and conversely, semantic bleaching, and shift from lexical/content meaning to grammatical/function meaning, can occur without phonetic reduction, as in:

(2)   a. Russian *davaj(te)* 'let's ….' (hortative, from 2SG(PL) imperative of 'give' (possibly: 'permit' in Old Russian))
        b. English *let us* (hortative)[2]
        c. English *concerning* (marking topic, etymologically a participle, but apparently a preposition now, no longer syntactically participle-like in not controlling an understood subject (cf. *Concerning the exam, you needn't take it,* with no "controlled subject" with *concerning*, vs. *Ø Leaving the exam, you should take your belongings*, where *you* as the understood subject of *leaving*)
        d. Medieval Greek *thelō* 'FUTURE' (a functional shift from a lexical verb meaning 'want' with, at first, no reduction; as shown below in §3, there ultimately is reduction but the grammatical use of *thelō* occurs independently of the later reduction)
        e. English *kind of / sort of* (originally *(a) kind/sort of*, a noun + preposition modifier, originally with other nouns (e.g., *John is (a) kind/sort of a fool*), but now with all kinds of words, e.g. *I only kind of (sort of) believe you;* importantly, even though reduced forms *kinda/sorta* occur, the more grammatical use occurs with the unreduced form (*kind of/sort of*) and the reduced form, so reduction does not correlate directly with grammatical use).

To some extent, this objection boils down to why one might decide to even call a phenomenon "grammaticalization", thus touching on theme (1b) – see §2 -- but also speaking to matters of terminology. It is therefore appropriate to address some concerns in this realm before treating the next theme. Of course, harping on terminology is perhaps the least productive kind of criticism, since, following Saussure, labels for concepts are arbitrary. Nonetheless, terminology is important; it assures consistency of interpretation across different authors, and terms *do* have meanings, invoking for readers and users certain images and notions, despite Saussurean arbitrariness. And, some grammaticalization-related terminology has problematic aspects.

First, there is the very term "grammaticalization". Some linguists seem to use it very broadly almost as a synonym of "change", as Fischer (2009, this Volume) notes, yet surely not all changes are instances of grammaticalization; sound change, for instance, could hardly qualify.

Even more telling, the term is sometimes used in characterizing developments that have nothing to do with grammar. An extreme case of this sort is *phonogenesis*, a term Hopper (1994: 31) developed to characterize the addition of "phonological bulk" to originally polymorphemic words through the elimination of concrete meaning for constituent morphemes, as in OE *hand-*

---

[2] That there is phonetic reduction in the contracted form *let's* is irrelevant here since both the full form *let us* and the reduced form *let's* can serve a hortative function; thus the grammatical use is independent of the reduction.

geweorc 'collection of works done by hand', where *ge-* is a collective prefix, becoming *hand-iwork*, where, he says, the *–i-* has no concrete function but is simply there. Hopper calls phonogenesis to be an "advanced stage of grammaticalization", but since he posits the complete effacement of morphemic status in such cases, it seems rather that such developments instantiate movement of an element totally *out* of grammar (see Joseph 2003). Subsuming them under a rubric of "grammaticalization" seems to extend the term's sense term beyond utility. So too with cases where an element passes into discourse usage, as with English *say* coming to show equivocation, in that in many conceptions, discourse is not a part of grammar per se; discourse may well have a "grammar" and it may feed into grammar *sensu stricto*, but those are different issues from saying that discourse *is* grammar.

Furthermore, there are presuppositions to confront underlying the use of the term "grammaticalization". For instance, if a linguist claims one adposition (A) is "more grammaticalized" than another (B), based on one, say, showing more nominal traits (e.g. occurring with a possessive), is that a neutral statement? Maybe, if "more grammaticalized" simply means having fewer nominal characteristics. But, by the process interpretation of grammaticalization, "more grammaticalized" implies that A has moved further along the cline of grammaticalization than B has, i.e. that A has diverged from B by becoming less nominal. However, in principle, B could have diverged from A by becoming more nominal in nature.

One might say here that such an interpretation goes against unidirectionality, a topic discussed in §4, but one should recognize that this statement is only as neutral as it is free of assumptions about grammaticalization as a process and about unidirectionality on the cline of grammatical status. Most advocates of grammaticalization surely would look at the situation described here and assume the nominal type reflects the older state of affairs.[3] I would advocate a more neutral labelling, e.g. "adposition A is more grammatical (not: 'more grammaticalized') than B".

3. Privileging one cluster of changes
Thus, in classic cases of grammaticalization as discussed in the literature, several different effects generally line up to give a particular result, even though it can be that only some of these characteristic effects occur, e.g. phonetic reduction without semantic bleaching, or vice versa. One interpretation that such cases invite is a recognition that there is much more besides grammatical change to worry about in historical linguistics. Indeed, a glance at the program for a conference on historical linguistics or the table of contents of a historical linguistics journal makes it clear that historical linguists are concerned with sound change, spread of innovation, language relationships, rate of change, etc. One has to wonder, therefore, even restricting attention to just changes affecting or involving grammar, why one particular grouping of changes (semantic shifts of a certain type + phonetic reductions + extension of usage into novel realms, etc.) should be treated as special, deserving its own label, conferences, textbooks and other compendia, and not just an accidental confluence of factors.

To take one concrete example, is the development of *thelō hina X* 'I want that X' at one stage of Greek to *thelō hina X* 'I will X' at a later stage, without any reduction, any more or less interesting than later developments of *thelō hina X* to *thelei ina X* 'it will that X' to *thel na X* to *thenna X* to *thana X* to *than X* to *tha X*, some by regular sound change, some by analogy, some perhaps with other motivations? Are each of these several developments instances of "grammaticalization", even though some, e.g. the degemination in *thenna > thena*, are fully regular and widely instantiated outside of this collocation? Or is the whole set of developments

---

[3]   As it often is; my point here is that if the reverse sort of development can occur, then the use of a characterization like "more grammaticalized" implies a greater understanding of the historical facts than might be warranted.

taken together a single instance of "grammaticalization"? If so, since languages can stop at any point, here is nothing deterministic about this particular sequence of changes -- Greek got along just fine for several decades (or more) with unreduced *thelō hina* for future, and with unreduced *theli na*, etc. Since nothing impels the collocation on to the next stage, how would we know when a suitable endpoint has been reached that justifies the label "grammaticalization"? In fact, in a certain sense, as suggested in (2), it is the first development, by which *thelō hina X* with lexical meaning ('want that X') came to be employed -- with no change in form – as a future, with grammatical meaning ('will X'), that was the grammaticalization, representing the entry of a lexical form into the grammatical realm, whereas the remaining developments did not alter the status of the collocation as a grammatical functor.[4]

    To pick up further on the theme in §2, just as there can be a shift in grammatical status without phonetic reduction, importantly also, there can be phonetic augmentation of grammatical material, even where that grammatical material has a lexical source. The expansion in form of *m(i)ente* in Old Spanish, from the Latin ablative of *ment-* 'mind' and used in forming manner adverbials, is such a case, since beside *miente*, there is also *mientre* in this use. The extra *–r-*, following Dyer (1972), is due to the influence of other adverbials, e.g. those in *–ter* or from *dum interim*.[5]

    I call this intense interest in grammaticalization the "privileging of one cluster of changes over others" because it gives undue attention to what even the grammaticalization literature recognizes as just one type of development. Traugott (1994: 1481), e.g., says: "From the diachronic perspective, grammaticalization is usually thought of as that subset of linguistic changes whereby a grammatical item becomes more grammatical;" the key word here is "subset", presupposing that there is more to change than grammaticalization. In that case, it seems fair to ask why this subset should command such attention among linguists. This is not to say that it should be ignored, but only to query the intensity of the interest, as measured by conferences on the topic, textbooks, etc.

4 Alternative outcomes/results

A focus on just one cluster of changes means that other outcomes of change may not always be considered, or may not be accorded particular interest. Yet, it should be obvious that much more goes on in language change than just the oft-cited movement of *lexical/somewhat-grammatical* to *(more) grammatical* that characterizes grammaticalization. For instance, to consider just a subset of changes involving grammar, there are four logical possibilities for developments involving movement between derivational and inflectional morphology, specified in (3).

(3)   a.   derivational morphology => inflectional morphology
        b.   derivational morphology => derivational morphology
        c.   inflectional morphology => inflectional morphology
        d.   inflectional morphology => derivational morphology

---

[4]   Admittedly, there might be a difference here between some of the stages in terms of the word-to-affix cline, so in that sense, these developments could be reckoned as some sort of grammaticalization.

[5]   Such augmentation may counter the claim in Kiparsky (to appear) that "grammaticalization is often accompanied by phonological *weakening* of the grammaticalized element, and never, it seems, by strengthening". However, for Kiparsky, this would probably not be a case of grammaticalization as it involves both existing grammatical material and an analogical model (whence the *–r-*). He rejects defining grammaticalization as movement towards (greater) grammatical function and sees it instead as "non-exemplar-based analogical change [that] establish[es] new patterns in the language". Still, if the introduction of *–r-* occurred as *miente* was becoming established as a new manner adverbial marker, then the augmentation would have cooccurred with the grammaticalization, even if only an ephemeral effect.

All of these are attested types of grammatical change, yet in measuring (3) against usual characterizations of "grammaticalization", only (3a) would be "classical" grammaticalization, involving movement from less grammatical (derivational) to more grammatical (inflectional), whereas the other outcomes would not fall under most notions of grammaticalization, even though they involve grammatical change. In particular, (3b) and (3c) involve no movement on the cline of grammaticalization (thus "lateral movement" (Joseph 2006), and (3d) would be counter-directional movement, from more grammatical to less grammatical.

Yet, examples of each occur. Regarding (3a), there is the case of the High German –er plural (as in *Buch* 'book' / *Bücher* 'books') from a reanalysis of a Proto-Indo-European (and Proto-Germanic) neuter stem-forming suffix *-es- (Proto-Germanic *-iz-). The lateral shifts on the cline, with no alteration of grammatical status, are exemplified in the first instance, (3b), by the accretion of derivational suffixes to form larger suffixes via resegmentation or erasure of morpheme boundaries, e.g. Latin –ānus from the 1st declension noun suffix –ā + adjectival *-no- suffix, or English –ness from –n- of an adjectival suffix + the noun suffixes *-ot- + *-tu-, cf. Gothic *ibnassus* / Old Saxon *eƀnissi* / Old English *efnes* 'equality', based on a *-no- stem adjective, cf. Modern English *even*. For the second type of lateral shift, (3c), a good example is the remaking in Greek of verb endings based on other endings: the 3PL nonactive past imperfective –ondusan became –ondustan, with a –t- taken from the 1PL/2PL endings -mastan/-sastan and 2SG nonactive past imperfective -sun resulted from earlier –so, augmented with material from the 1SG ending –mun (cf. Joseph 2006). These endings are equally inflectional -- and equally grammatical, as to function and morphological status – before and after the augmentation.

Finally, (3d), where inflectional material develops into derivational material, is exemplified by the so-called Watkins' Law (WL) developments (see Arlotto 1972; Collinge 1985). In these developments, an inflectional ending, usually 3SG (prototypically functionally unmarked in a paradigm), is reanalyzed as part of the verbal stem; an example is the passage from early Greek end-stressed present tense forms to forms marked with the stem-stressed endings, with the old 3SG form as the new stem:

(4)	1SG	rot-ó	'I ask'	=>	rotá-o	(cf. 1SG *kán-o* 'I do')
	2	rot-ás	'you ask'	=>	rotá-is	(cf. 2SG *kán-is* 'you do')
	3	rot-á	'(s)he asks'	=>	rotá-i	(cf. 3SG *kán-i* '(s)he does')

Interestingly, although the new present (imperfective) stem is *rotá-*, the perfective stem is *rot-is-*, e.g. aorist *rót-is-a* 'I asked', so that even *rotá-* should be segmented as *rot-á-*, with the –a- as a stem formative, i.e. a derivational element.[6]

Since derivational material is generally considered less grammatical than inflectional material, (3d) raises the spectre of unidirectionality, the claim that grammaticalization changes always proceed from less grammatical to more grammatical.[7] This somewhat controversial claim is taken up in the next section.

5. Unidirectionality reconsidered
As implied in the WL example, counterdirectional movement along clines of grammatical form

---

[6]   Other cases of WL may be similarly analyzable; Modern Persian 1SG *hast-am* 'am' and 3SG *hast-Ø*, with a stem from earlier 3SG *as-ti*, may have –t- as a segmentable stem-deriving element, since there is an enclitic 3SG form with the shape [s].   I thank Kevin Gabbard for help here (though he bears no blame if my analysis is wrong).

[7] The claim is often made that counterexamples to unidirectionality are unsystematic and unpatterned, but since there are numerous instances of WL in the literature, this sort of development seems to represent a fairly systematic case of counterdirectional movement.

and function, with more grammatical elements becoming less grammatical, grammatical elements becoming lexical, and/or bound affixes becoming free(r) forms, is not envisioned as typical or, in some formulations, even possible, as far as grammaticalization is concerned. This principle of unidirectionality is generally viewed as foundational for grammaticalization (see, e.g., Hopper and Traugott 1993/2003 (Chapter 5), Haspelmath 1999; 2004; Traugott 2001; 2002; Ziegeler 2003; 2004, *inter alios*).

There is reason to be dubious, however, about the empirical content of this claim. Newmeyer (1998), Lass (2000), Janda (2001), and others, note that unidirectionality is built in most definitions of grammaticalization, and so is not a testable hypothesis; if grammaticalization is defined as movement in one direction, then any apparent counterdirectional movement would not constitute a case of grammaticalization, and would thus not be counterexample.[8] Moreover, a given change can only move in one direction at a time, so that finding examples showing movement towards greater grammatical status does not constitute a valid test of a principle of unidirectionality.

One solution to this definitional trap is redefine grammaticalization and to take a stronger and more directly testable position. Haspelmath, for instance, has recast grammaticalization as "a diachronic change by which the parts of a constructional schema come to have stronger internal dependencies" (2004: 26) and states also (2002) that "there is no degrammaticalization". While Kiparsky (To appear) feels that this recharacterization does not eliminate the trap, it does allow for testing in that boundaries are well recognized analytic units in linguistics with different types of boundaries, usually characterized as being of different "strengths" (e.g. morpheme versus word boundary), typically posited. That is, one can see if there are changes involving grammar that loosen rather than tighten "internal dependencies"; such changes would constitute counterexamples to Haspelmath's view of grammaticalization.

Viewed this way, unidirectionality has numerous counterexamples. Kiparsky cites several, and Haspelmath himself acknowledges seven cases.[9] In actuality, there are many more: Norde (2009) gives several, though perhaps not all are equally compelling, and in (5), I list cases not previously discussed in the literature, with some annotation, as needed.

(5) a. Standard (and earlier) English *The baby is hiccoughing* => colloquial American English *The baby is hicking up,* reanalyzing *hiccough* (phonetically [hɪkəp]) as a Verb+Particle combination, thus with a *weaker* (less fused) internal dependency, so that [əp] can move to phrase-final position

   b. Colloquial American English *a whole nother area* (vs. Standard *another entire area*) with *another* resegmented so as to have weaker internal dependency, moving from a single (albeit polymorphemic) word to a discontinuous syntactic combination involving a closed class (grammatical) element, the indefinite article, as a separate word, and thus with less fusion rather than more

   c. Various reanalyses, such as, from the Ohio State University campus, *Mendenhall Laboratories* called *Menden*, as if "Menden Hall", i.e., re-parsed in the direction of *weaker* internal dependency (since originally a proper name would be monomorphemic,

---

even if perceivable as having internal structure)
   d. Reversal, in acquisition, of *kinda/sorta* to fuller *kind of / sort of*; i.e., children are more likely to learn the reduced forms first, since reduced *kinda/sorta* are commoner in conversation and thus represent more likely input to early language acquisition than *kind of/sort of.* But once children realize that reduced forms have these equivalent fuller forms, possibly through exposure to written English through formal education, and connect the fuller and reduced forms, they are counter-directionally "rebuilding" structure, reversing the putative unidirectional reduction.

Admittedly, if one rejects Haspelmath's characterization of grammaticalization,[10] then perhaps examples (5cd) are problematic since they do not involve grammar per se. However, these examples all show that speaker behavior resulting in counterdirectional outcomes is possible, and thus that speakers can loosen dependencies between fused elements by some means. In that sense they seem highly relevant to any discussion about putative unidirectionality and grammaticalization, even though there is certainly more to say on the matter.[11] Still, the discussion here shows where some of the potential problems with the notion lie.[12]

6. Grammaticalization and Language Contact
It has become common to see grammaticalization extended into situations involving not language-internal developments (as with all cases discussed so far) but rather language contact; Heine & Kuteva (2005, 2006) offer good examples of this extension of grammaticalization to externally motivated change. In this brief critique, I focus on just two aspects of this extension: degrammaticalization in language contact situations and Heine and Kuteva's notion of "grammaticalization contact zones".
      Just as there are language-internal *lexical* developments that counter claims about unidirectionality, so too borrowings can show such developments. For instance, Klima and Bellugi (1979: 274) write: "To our knowledge there are no intrinsic segmental affixes in A[merican]S[ign]L[anguage]. Four such affixes are listed among the 2500 signs of the DASL [Dictionary of American Sign Language, 1965] but these are clearly loan translations from English and their usage in communication between deaf native signers has so evolved that they now have the status of independent lexical items". Thus contact with English has led ASL to develop lexical forms from once-affixal material. While such "lexicalizations" may not be problematic for unidirectionality if they are judged to be different in nature from the grammatical developments governed by grammaticalization,[13] the parallels are interesting. Similarly, Cypriot Greek *mishi mu* (where *mu* is a possessive pronoun) is a sentence adverb or discourse element

---

[10] I note though that Norde (2009: 6) accepts it as one of the current prevailing definitions available.
[11]   See Joseph 2006, for instance, for one way of giving substance to unidirectionality, via the evidence of "lateral shifts" (see §4). For Kiparsky, those lateral shifts would not instantiate grammaticalization, being based on preexisting analogical models (see footnotes 6 and 10).
[12] Kiparsky (to appear), following an entirely different approach (see also footnote 3), covers relevant cases of grammaticalization and claims to derive unidirectionality naturally. I find this approach intriguing, even compelling, but wonder about instances of univerbation that do not involve grammatical material, e.g. the oft-cited case of Old High German *hiu tage* '(on) this day' giving modern *heute* 'today' or the erasure of boundaries in original compounds, e.g. preverb + verb combinations that in Sanskrit typically had the prefixal past-tense marker (the "augment") occurring between the preverb and the verb (e.g. *sam-a-gacchan* 'they came together') but which sporadically positioned the augment outside the original preverb, e.g. *a-samgacchan* (Whitney 1889). Perhaps for Kiparsky such cases would indicate the independent need for recognizing movement towards single-word status for nongrammatical once-complex combinations, a process he then employs in his approach to grammaticalization.
[13]   Not all linguists dismiss "lexicalization" so readily as a problem for grammaticalization; see e.g. Newmeyer 2001 and Janda 2001.

marking evidentiality, as in *en' plusios mishi mu* 'he-is rich so-they-say', but appears to be from the Turkish suffix *-mIş-* marking unwitnessed/unconfirmed events.[14]

Moreover, borrowings themselves can serve to loosen tight bonds among elements in a word or phrase, countering Haspelmath's claims of unidirectional movement towards ever-stronger internal dependencies. Spanish *mente* adverbial formations, e.g. *claramente* 'clearly', offer a good example. *claramente* was etymologically phrasal, *clara # mente* 'with a clear mind' (=> manner adverb 'clearly'), and note the free word *mente* 'mind' in Spanish. The adverbial use of the bound form is linked with the lexical use of the free form in a natural way, consistent actually with unidirectionality. As indicated in §3, Old Spanish has not just phrases like *clara mente*, but also *clara miente*, *clara mientre*, among other variants. The diphthongal forms show the regular outcome in later Spanish from Latin *mente*; compare modern Spanish *pienso* 'I think from earlier *pens-*. These Old Spanish facts mean that the *ment-* form, in the free word and the adverb, is not the straight-line development out of Latin *ment-*. Rather, *ment-* must represent a learnéd borrowing from Latin into Spanish that replaced the regularly developing form *(-)miente* (cf. Posner 1996; Karlsson 1981). Importantly, this means that the learnéd borrowing was re-introduced into the adverbial, and thus interrupted the "flow" from the phrasal combination of Latin to the Spanish adverbial form; this reintroduction would have loosened the tightening bond between the adjectival base and the adverbializer, making the formation more like a phrase once again, and not a base + affix single word (note that the corresponding adverbial *-ment* in French is best taken as a suffix, there being no free noun **ment* in the language). In a sense this re-started the devolution from word to affix, via phrase, in the Middle Spanish period. Since Latin influence was responsible, this loosening of the internal bond, and the subsequent re-starting of the development of the adverbial, would not have occurred but for the language contact that led to a Latinism entering Spanish secondarily; it thus fits the definition in Thomason (2001) of "contact-induced change", since contact set the wheels of the loosening change in motion.

This argument about contact-induced loosening of internal bonds moves one step further when one considers code-switching, a shift by a speaker at certain points in an utterance to a different language shared with a conversational partner. A key question in code-switching research is the determination of the points where the switch can occur. Some linguists (e.g. Poplack 1980, with her "Free Morpheme Constraint") have proposed that switches occur only at major breaks in constituency, which, interpreted in Haspelmath's terms, would mean only at points of *weaker* internal dependency among elements (assuming that words that form a phrase give a stronger internal dependency to the component parts of the phrase). Therefore, if code-switching occurs at points other than major boundaries, simply triggered perhaps, as Clyne (1967) has suggested, by similar-sounding *forms* ("homophonous diamorphs") in the two languages, then language contact as realized in this form (code-switching) will have caused a relaxing of tight dependencies, since one can move into an entirely different *grammar*, even. And, there are such cases. Janse (2009) argues that some Cappadocian Greek forms show word-internal switching, citing forms such as (Semendere village) *cé-tun-misti-c* 'we were' with both a Greek ending (1PL *-misti*) and a Turkish ending (1PL *-k*), and he suggests that the similarity ("diamorphic homophony") between Greek *-misti* and Turkish past tense morphemes *-miş-ti-*, which occur together in the pluperfect tense, triggered a Clyne-ian code-switch, even though word-internally.

As for grammaticalization contact zones, Heine and Kuteva (2005; 2006) claim that there are "zones" where parallel grammaticalizations occur due to language contact. The Balkans are an interesting test case, since there are numerous parallel grammatical features across Bulgarian,

---

Macedonian, Greek, Albanian, and Romanian, among other coterritorial languages. All, for instance, share a future tense formation with an element based on a verb of volition (as in Greek (§2-3)). In almost all such Balkan formations, there has been reduction from a fuller, inflected form of the verb of volition to a particle-like, possibly affixal, element (e.g. Greek *tha*, above, but also Macedonian *ḱe*, Romanian *o*, etc.). To the extent that reduction correlates with grammaticalization, this feature would thus appear to define a Balkan grammaticalization zone.

However, when one reviews the steps and processes needed to actually make this claim work, it is hard to maintain it as a meaningful account of what happened with the Balkan future. In particular, the use of WANT for the future could be calqued, i.e. imported into the various languages from one language (not necessarily the same language in each case), and the reduction to invariance of the future marker could be an internal set of developments in each language (as suggested for Greek above). In that case, in what sense is this a "grammaticalization contact zone"? It is certainly a "zone", and contact is involved, but the putative grammaticalization and the steps leading to the full embedding of the future marker in the grammar crucially do not involve contact. Alternatively, the use of WANT for the future was calqued, but the availability of reduced forms was calqued too (so that Romanian variation between a full form *va* and reduced *o* would have been calqued on, e.g. Greek *thel'na* / *than*, assuming both were competing in Greek in a way salient to non-Greeks learning/speaking Greek, even though different parts are reduced in each language). If so, then, one can again ask in what sense is this a "grammaticalization contact zone". In particular, the sort of "grammaticalization" that passed from language to language then crucially is not a *process* of reduction but rather a *model* of reduction, i.e., a *result* of processes of reduction within individual languages; this therefore recalls the discussion in §2 about the very nature of grammaticalization. Thus, to invoke grammaticalization in contact situations, one must be prepared to call it a result and not a process, as suggested earlier on independent grounds.

7 Conclusion

This wide-ranging critique has of necessity cut corners here and there, and it may well be that a fuller account of all that is discussed here would put grammaticalization in a better light. Still, even with my critical stance, I maintain my earlier stated view that our understanding of language and language change has been enriched by the consideration of grammaticalization over the past thirty years or so, despite those aspects of the enterprise that strike me as flawed. Insight can come from anywhere and in different shapes; one just needs to be open to the possibility of gaining it, wherever it might emanate from.

References

Arlotto, Anthony 1972. *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Boston: Houghton.

Campbell, Lyle & Richard D. Janda. 2001. Introduction: conceptions of grammaticalization and their problems. *Language Sciences* (Special Issue — Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment, ed. by L. Campbell) 23, 2-3: 93-112.

Clyne, Michael 1967. *Transference and Triggering*. The Hague: Mouton.

Collinge, Neville. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dyer, Nancy Joe 1972. A study of the Old Spanish adverb in –*mente*. *Hispanic Review* 40: 303-08.

Fischer, Olga 2009. Grammaticalization as analogically driven change? *VIEW[Z]. Vienna English Working Papers* 18, 2: 3-23.

Haspelmath, Martin 1999. Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics* 37: 1043-68.

Haspelmath, Martin 2002. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization". MS. [cited in Kiparsky (To appear)].

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Directionality in language change, with special reference to unidirectionality in grammaticalization. *Up and down the Cline*, ed. by O. Fischer, M. Norde, & H. Perridon, 17-44. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Traugott. 1993/2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press (1ˢᵗ edn., 1993).

Hopper, Paul. 1994. Phonogenesis. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization,* ed. by W. Pagliuca, 29-45. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Janda, Richard D. 2001. Beyond "pathways"and "unidirectionality": On the discontinuity of transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* 23: 265-340.

Janse, Mark. 2009. Watkins' Law and the development of agglutinative inflections in Asia Minor Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9: 93-109.

Joseph, Brian D. 2001. Is there such a thing as "grammaticalization"? *Language Sciences* (Special Issue — Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment, ed. by L. Campbell) 23, 2-3: 163-86.

Joseph, Brian D. 2003. Morphologization from syntax. *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, ed. by B. Joseph & R. Janda, 472-492. Oxford: Blackwell.

Joseph, Brian D. 2004. Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization "theory". *Up and Down the Cline - The Nature of Grammaticalization*, ed. by O. Fischer, M. Norde, & H. Perridon, 44-71. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Joseph, Brian D. 2006. How accommodating of change is grammaticalization? The case of "lateral shifts". *Logos and Language: Journal of General Linguistics and Language Theory* 6, 2: 1-7.

Karlsson, Keith. 1981. *Syntax and Affixation: The Evolution of* mente *in Latin and Romance*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kiparsky, Paul. (To appear) Grammaticalization as optimization. Paper presented at Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference (DIGS 9), Yale University, 2005.

Klima, Edward & Ursula Bellugi. 1979. *The Signs of Language*.   Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lass, Roger 2000. Remarks on (uni)directionality. *Pathways of Change*, ed. by O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach, & D. Stein, 207-27. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lehman, Christian. [1982]1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom.Europa (revision of Lehmann 1982: *Thoughts on grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch*, 1 (Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts, 49)).

Newmeyer, Frederick. 1998. *Language Form and Language Function*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick. 2001. Deconstructing grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* (Special Issue — Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment, ed. by Lyle Campbell) 23, 2-3: 187-230.

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poplack, Shana 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.

Posner, Rebecca. 1996. *The Romance Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1994. Grammaticalization and lexicalization. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3, ed. by R. Asher & J. Simpson, 1481-86. Oxford: Pergamon.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 2001. Legitimate counterexamples to unidirectionality. Paper presented at Freiburg University (http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/Freiburg.Unidirect.pdf).

Traugott, Elizabeth. 2002. Regrammaticalization, exaptation and legitimate counterexamples to grammaticalization. Paper presented at conference on Global Perspectives on Human Language: Scientific Studies in Honor of Joseph H. Greenberg (April 25-27, 2002), Stanford University.

Whitney, William D. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ziegeler, Deborah 2003. Redefining unidirectionality: Insights from demodalisation? *Folia Linguistica Historica* 24.1-2.225ff.

Ziegeler, Deborah   2004. Redefining unidirectionality: Is there life after modality? *Up and down the Cline*, ed. by O. Fischer, M. Norde, & H. Perridon, 115-35. Amsterdam: Benjamins.