

hervorzuheben ist auch, daß der Band einen Personen- und Sachindex enthält, der die gezielte Informationssuche ermöglicht. Die Herausgeber wollen mit dem Sammelband folgendes erreichen:

We hope that the studies presented here are a further convincing testimony – if need there be – to the pervasiveness, great variety, richness and subtlety of verbal iconicity, and that the investigations collected in this volume may be instrumental in stimulating further research into the motivated sign in language and literature. (13)

Dieses Ziel ist nur teilweise erreicht worden: Während ein Teil der Aufsätze sehr interessante, schlüssige und weiterführende Untersuchungen zur Ikonizität bietet (z. B. der Beitrag von Nänny zur ikonischen Funktion langer und kurzer Zeilen oder Wolfs Aufsatz zur Ikonizität von Landschaftsbeschreibungen in englischen Romanen), gewinnt man bei anderen Beiträgen den Eindruck (z. B. bei Sadowskis Ausführungen zur Ikonizität englischer *gl*-Wörter oder Conradies Beitrag zum englischen S- und OF-Genitiv), daß das Ikonizitätskonzept willkürlich auf Phänomene angewendet wird, bei denen es fehl am Platz ist. "Saussures Dogma der Arbitrarität" (Jakobson 1960) wird durch die Beiträge dieses Sammelbandes jedenfalls nicht erschüttert.

PASSAU

RUDOLF EMONS und DANIELA WAWRA

New Reflections on Grammaticalization. Ed. Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diebold. Typological Studies in Language 49. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002, xiv + 435 pp., € 65,00.

This volume contains 24 selected papers from the first International Symposium "New Reflections on Grammaticalization" (NRG 1) organized by Ilse Wischer at Potsdam University in 1999. The goal of the conference was to bring together contributions from various languages and different orientations in the field of 'grammaticalization'. This term – apparently first used by Meillet in 1912 – has enjoyed a gigantic revival in the last decades, starting in the 1970s with Givón's "Today's morphology is yesterday's syntax". Grammaticalization in its traditional sense refers to the countless instances of language change whereby lexical elements lose their lexical status and come to be used as function words. With its recognition it has been expanded from diachronic to synchronic, typological and cognitive investigations of linguistic material, finding its more concrete conceptualization in studies which are now the standard works in the field: Lehmann 1982 [1995], Heine/Claudi/Hünemeyer 1991 and Hopper/Traugott 1995. These approaches are not always fully compatible, however, so that with its fame the concept of grammaticalization has become increasingly fuzzy and sometimes even lost its explanatory force. Some of these dilemmas are clearly evident in the present volume, but they also demonstrate the importance of such a conference, whose success is also attested by the fact that conferences on "New Reflec-

tions on Grammaticalization” are now held every three years: NRG 2 was hosted by the University of Amsterdam in 2002 (the proceedings are being published by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde and Harry Perridon) and the Department of English of the University of Santiago de Compostela is hosting NRG 3 in 2005 (17–20 July).

It is only recently, i. e. after the first NRG conference in 1999, that much has been done to streamline the term and concept of grammaticalization. Most importantly, Traugott, who had previously argued for an inclusion of the development of discourse markers into a theory of grammaticalization (cf. the well-known adverbial cline “clause-internal adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle”), now seeks to grasp her “semantic-pragmatic approach” to grammaticalization no longer as grammaticalization but as “regularity in semantic change” (Traugott and Dasher 2002). Grammaticalization proper is thus restricted to those morpho-syntactic phenomena which fulfill, e. g., the criteria of increased bonding or syntactic scope reduction (for a full list of criteria, see Lehmann 1982 [1995]). Therefore the articles on discourse particles, such as on English *though* (Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen; 345–361), on Portuguese *pois* (Pinto de Lima; 363–378), on German *denn* (Wegener; 379–394), on Finnish *hän* and Saami *sun* (Laitinen; 327–344) and on the development of honorific particles in Korean (Sohn; 309–325) would not qualify as cases of grammaticalization proper according to this new classification.

Yet Traugott’s semantic-pragmatic approach, with its focus on pragmatic strengthening and increased subjectification, has been extremely popular in the study of the history of the English language (Hopper/Traugott 1993; Traugott 1995 [1997]; Brinton 1996). This does not come as a surprise, since English with its almost complete loss of inflexional endings is by no means a good test case for the morpho-syntactic approach to grammaticalization focusing on the origin of morphological affixes. This focus on semantics and pragmatics in English studies is evident in the two papers in the volume which are directly concerned with data from English. These two papers (Lorenz; Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen) stand out from the rest of the articles in at least two respects: they have a rather narrow diachronic perspective as they deal with what they perceive to be ongoing change in Present Day English and – in contrast to most of the other papers, which choose a more general approach – they employ a set of corpus data for their analyses.

In their evaluation of empirical data on the use of final *though* in present-day spoken English, Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen explicitly ask whether the development of final *though* can be considered “a case of grammaticalization?” (345–361) and – in anticipation and thus in accordance with the new restriction of the term by Traugott and Dasher 2002 – reject this attribution in their conclusions. They suggest ongoing change in the development of the concession conjunct *though* into a discourse marker, a topic shifter. This shift of *though* from the propositional to the textual level certainly exhibits a number of interesting parallels to the development of other discourse markers such as *now*, *anyway* and *well*. The allegedly new textual function of *though* is attested in a large number of cases (77 % in their corpus)

but one might wonder whether this textual function has not always been an inherent function of *though* and, for that matter, of every concession marker.

Similar problems arise in Lorenz's account of the "delexicalization and grammaticalization" of British English intensifiers (142–161). "Delexicalization" is certainly discernible in originally evaluative adverbs such as *terribly* or *horribly* or originally modal ones such as *certainly* or *very*. Lorenz suggests ongoing grammaticalization of British English *really* which is supposed to proceed along the same path as the prototypical case for this development, Present Day English *very* (from OF *verrai* 'true'). Since *really* as an intensifier of adjectives is mainly used by younger speakers in less formal contexts (cf. *British National Corpus* vs. *Corpus of London Teenage Language* data), the apparent time data seem to support this analysis. Because of his detailed analysis of corpus data, Lorenz is, however, able to show that real time-data (*Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus* [= LOB] vs. *Freiburg-LOB*) do not corroborate this, so that a more "grammaticalized" use of *really* as an adjective intensifier may be a fleeting fashion, and not a long-standing phenomenon of – a kind of – grammaticalization.

The other papers in the volume present examples and data from a large number of languages, mainly West-Germanic (Diewald, van der Auwera, Wegener, Heine) and Romance languages (Lehmann, Heine), but also Finnish, Korean, Mandarin and several African languages (Heine, Mithun). Some of the investigations concentrate on single linguistic features, but most of them also deal with more general questions, such as the relation between lexicalization and grammaticalization, instances of degrammaticalization, or they take a more detailed look into distinctive stages of the grammaticalization process. I will only summarize some of the main issues here.

In his "New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization" (1–18), Lehmann stresses the distinction between grammar and the lexicon: while "grammar is concerned with those signs which are formed regularly and which are handled analytically, the lexicon is concerned with those signs which are formed irregularly and which are handled holistically" (1). Both kinds of signs are commonly affected by reductive processes – grammaticalization and lexicalization – which constrain the freedom of the speaker in selecting and combining the constituents of a complex formation. Hence grammaticalization and lexicalization are to a certain extent parallel, but they are not mirror images. The inverse of lexicalization is not grammaticalization, but folk-etymology; the inverse of grammaticalization is not lexicalization, but degrammaticalization. Lehmann shows that lexicalization and grammaticalization are indeed more often successive steps: lexicalization may yield new prepositions and conjunctions (Spanish *con tal que* 'provided that', *porque* 'because'), which may, but need not be grammaticalized (and are actually only in a fraction of cases); alternatively, lexicalization and grammaticalization can occur jointly, such as in PDE *wanna* and *gonna*. In a similar approach, Mithun's paper highlights the role of lexicalization in the grammaticalization of causatives from verbal antecedents meaning 'make' (cf. PDE *-ify* ultimately from Latin *facere*) or from nouns designating 'hand' ("An invisible hand at the root of causation"; 237–257).

In accordance with most of the other contributors, Lehmann also stresses that lexicalization and grammaticalization are “constant processes of ordinary language activity”, while their mirror images – folk etymology and degrammaticalization – are “by magnitudes rarer” (14, 15). Some of these rare but notorious cases of “degrammaticalization” which question the unidirectionality hypothesis postulated for grammaticalization are approached in the contributions by van der Auwera (“More thoughts on degrammaticalization”; 19–29), Norde (“The final stages of grammaticalization: Affixhood and beyond”; 45–65), and Doyle (“Yesterday’s affixes are today’s clitics”; 67–81). Van der Auwera argues more generally for a study of degrammaticalization “in its own right, not as a quirky, accidental exception to grammaticalization” and asks for a classification of all [sic!] types of degrammaticalization (26). In an account of the development of Irish *muid* from a personal ending into a clitic, Doyle argues that it is the drive towards greater transparency which is capable of interrupting the grammaticalization cycle, or even reversing it (78–79).

“Systemstörung” may be another factor disturbing unidirectionality: when Germanic languages lose their inflexional endings and therefore grammatical categories such as case, the old grammatical endings can be used as derivational ones. This would explain the use of former inflexional suffixes as clitics as in the development from inflexional suffix to phrase-final determiner in the *s*-genitive in English, Danish, Bokmål Norwegian and Swedish (van der Auwera/Norde). Norde (53–56) additionally shows that inflexional suffixes may – after the breakdown of inflectional categories – even develop into derivational suffixes, e. g. the Swedish adjectival suffix *-er* (nom. sg. masc.) which is no longer used in the adjectival declension but used to form derogatory nouns from adjectives (*en dummer/slarver* ‘a stupid one/a careless one’).

Morphological and structural aspects and paradigmatic relations are likewise highlighted by Diewald (103–120), who stresses the importance of changes in related linguistic categories and subsystems. Thus the rise of the so-called “critical context” for the German modals is due to the restructuring of the German verbal system, in particular the syncretism of temporal and modal values in the dental suffix. Diewald uses the development of German modals, such as *können*, *müssen* etc., as a paradigm case for a distinction of three successive stages in grammaticalization linked to three types of linguistic contexts. After the “untypical contexts” have formed the preconditions of grammaticalization, the “critical context” triggers the grammaticalization process. Its closing stages can be seen in the “isolating contexts”: a new grammatical meaning is isolated as a distinct meaning from the older (more lexical) meaning. In this, Diewald differs from Heine’s model (“On the role of context in grammaticalization”; 83–102), which concentrates solely on semantic changes and their affinity to certain contexts (“initial stage – bridging context – switch context – conventionalization”). Thus, the assumed stages in these two models do not exactly match, but both articles shed important new light on as yet under-researched intermediate stages in an item’s progress on its way from A to B.

These progress stages will certainly feature prominently in future studies on grammaticalization. More importantly, however, many of the articles collected here clearly reveal that instead of concentrating on long-term developments of single linguistic items or on rather abstract cognitive accounts, modern-day research on grammaticalization should highlight the synchronic grammatical contexts in the process stages of grammaticalization, i. e. structural and typological aspects and paradigmatic relations (see, e. g., the very lucid account in Fischer *et al.* 2000: 284–319). It will also be interesting to see how the new streamlined concept of grammaticalization (Traugott/Dasher 2002) combined with such a more integrated approach, which considers not only more general patterns of linguistic change but also the relevant synchronic grammars of an individual language system, will yield new insights into the nature of grammaticalization. NRG 2 and 3 will certainly provide the highly welcome platform for such a discussion and many generations of linguists will be grateful to Ilse Wischer for instigating this forum at Potsdam in 1999.

Works Cited

- Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Topics in English Linguistics 19. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd, U. Claudi, F. Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*, Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Hopper, Paul, Elizabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1982 (= 1995). *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Unterschleißheim: LINCOM Europa. [originally published as: *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A Programmatic Sketch*, vol. I. University of Cologne: Arbeiten des Kölner Universalienprojekts.]
- Traugott, Elizabeth 1995 (= 1997). “The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization”. Paper presented at ICHL XII; Manchester, 1995; version of 11/1997 (online).
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

MÜNCHEN

URSULA LENKER