



Interuniversity Attraction Poles (IAP) Phase VI

2007 – 2011

**ANNEX I
TO CONTRACT P6/44**

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS : SECTION I

Information on the network

Title of the project : Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification

Name of the coordinator : Johan van der Auwera

Institution : University of Antwerp

I. 1. NETWORK COMPOSITION

BELGIAN PARTNERS *

<u>Coordinator</u> : <u>Partner 1</u> (P1) Name : van der Auwera, Johan Institution : Universiteit Antwerpen Institution's abbreviation : UA	<u>Partner 8</u> (P8) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 2</u> (P2) Name : Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie Institution : Universiteit Gent Institution's abbreviation : UG	<u>Partner 9</u> (P9) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 3</u> (P3) Name : Cuyckens, Hubert Institution : Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Institution's abbreviation : KUL	<u>Partner 10</u> (P10) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 4</u> (P4) Name : Degand, Liesbeth Institution : Université catholique de Louvain Institution's abbreviation : UCL	<u>Partner 11</u> (P11) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 5</u> (P5) Name : Maniacky, Jacky Institution : Royal Museum for Central Africa Institution's abbreviation : RMCA	<u>Partner 12</u> (P12) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 6</u> (P6) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :	<u>Partner 13</u> (P13) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :
<u>Partner 7</u> (P7) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation :	

* Mention only one name per partner. The person listed here should be the one in charge of the operational aspects of the project. Indicate the full name (family name + first name) of the partner.

EUROPEAN PARTNERS * (if applicable)

<u>EU-Partner 1</u> (EU1) Name : Diewald, Gabriele Institution : University of Hannover Institution's abbreviation : UH Country : Germany	<u>EU-Partner 3</u> (EU3) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation : Country :
<u>EU-Partner 2</u> (EU2) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation : Country :	<u>EU-Partner 4</u> (EU4) Name : Institution : Institution's abbreviation : Country :

* Mention only one name per partner. The person listed here should be the one in charge of the operational aspects of the project. Indicate the full name (family name + first name) of the partner.

I. 2. TITLE AND SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

Indicate clearly and briefly the project's major objectives and provide a concise description of the project.

A. Title and summary in English (2 pages maximum)

Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification

The project aims to contribute to current research efforts dealing with (the interaction between) the processes of grammaticalization (in the structural domain) and (inter)subjectification (in the semantic domain) in language change. It will focus on three major issues:

- 1) The precise nature of the semantic changes in subjectification and in intersubjectification, and their relationship with the structural developments in grammaticalization.
- 2) The teleology of the processes: are grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification unidirectional or not?
- 3) The 'scope' of these processes: how do grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification relate to other mechanisms of language change, notably, to analogy?

These foci will be implemented in terms of 7 work packages, dealing with different semantic and/or grammatical domains in which these issues can be raised and investigated from different angles. These packages are:

- 1) Modality – with focus on grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification processes in both auxiliary and non-auxiliary (verbal, adverbial, and adjectival) means of expression.
- 2) Evidentiality – an exploration into how a range of devices available for expressing this semantic category has evolved.
- 3) Mood – an investigation into how the variety of forms and meanings of the imperative mood and their historical evolution, matches the dimensions of (inter)subjectification and grammaticalization.
- 4) Discourse particles – what does a detailed analysis of this formally and functionally highly complex category tell us about the process of intersubjectification and its correlation with grammaticalization?
- 5) Complementation – dealing with how the evolution in types of clause combining reflects on common assumptions about grammaticalization.
- 6) Nominal modification – dealing with the processes of (inter)subjectification and grammaticalization in the internal organization of nominal groups.

- 7) Theory – what is the wider import of the current findings, and of the literature on grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification, for linguistic theory?

In terms of methodology, the empirical issues in these packages will be addressed by combining an ‘in depth’ and an ‘in width’ approach: the ‘in depth’ approach involves a detailed study of phenomena in individual Germanic and Romance languages (also comparatively) on the basis of corpus data; the ‘in width’ approach concerns a typological analysis of phenomena in a representative sample of languages in the world and with a special focus on the Bantu languages.

B. Title and summary in Dutch (2 pages maximum)

Grammaticalisatie en (inter)subjectificatie

Dit project wil een bijdrage leveren tot het lopende internationale onderzoek naar (de interactie tussen) de processen van grammaticalisatie (op het structurele vlak) en van (inter)subjectificatie (op het semantische vlak) in taalverandering. De focus van het onderzoek ligt op drie centrale kwesties:

- 1) De precieze aard van de semantische veranderingen die optreden in de processen van subjectificatie en intersubjectificatie, en hun correlatie met de structurele veranderingen in het proces van grammaticalisatie.
- 2) De teleology van deze processen: zijn grammaticalisatie en (inter)subjectificatie unidirectioneel of niet?
- 3) Het 'bereik' van de processen: hoe verhouden grammaticalisatie en (inter)subjectificatie zich tot andere mechanismen van taalverandering, en meer bepaald tot het proces van 'analogie'?

Deze centrale thema's worden praktisch geïmplementeerd in de vorm van 7 werkpakketten, waarin verschillende semantische en/of grammaticale domeinen onder de loep worden genomen, en die toelaten de thema's vanuit verschillende invalshoeken te belichten. Het gaat om volgende werkpakketten:

- 1) Modaliteit – met focus op de processen van grammaticalisatie en (inter)subjectificatie in zowel hulpwerkwoordelijke als niet-hulpwerkwoordelijke (verbale, adverbiale en adjectivische) uitdrukkingvormen.
- 2) Evidentialiteit – een onderzoek naar het ontstaan van de waaier van uitdrukkingvormen voor deze semantische categorie.
- 3) Modus – een onderzoek naar of/hoe de waaier van vormen en betekenissen van de imperatieve modus, en hun diachrone ontwikkeling, overeenstemt met de gangbare visies op (inter)subjectificatie and grammaticalisatie.
- 4) Discours – wat kan een gedetailleerde analyse van de vormelijk en functioneel erg complexe categorie van de discursieve partikels ons leren over het proces van intersubjectificatie en de correlatie ervan met grammaticalisatie?
- 5) Complementatie – waarin nagegaan wordt wat de evolutie in types van zinsamenvoeging ons kan leren over de gangbare visies op grammaticalisatie.
- 6) Modificatie in het nominale domein – welke processen van (inter)subjectificatie en grammaticalisatie treden op in het domein van de interne organisatie van nominale groepen?
- 7) Theorie – wat zijn de bredere implicaties van de resultaten van dit project, en van de literatuur over grammaticalisatie en (inter)subjectificatie in het algemeen, voor de linguïstische theorievorming?

De empirische component van deze werkpakketten zal methodologisch op twee manieren benaderd worden: in de diepte en in de breedte. De benadering ‘in de diepte’ houdt een gedetailleerde studie in van de relevante fenomenen in individuele Germaanse en Romaanse talen (ook comparatief) op basis van corpusdata. De benadering ‘in de breedte’ betreft een typologische studie van de relevante fenomenen in een representatief staal van talen van de wereld, en met speciale aandacht voor de Bantu-talen.

C. Title and summary in French (2 pages maximum)

Grammaticalisation et (inter)subjectification

L'objectif du projet est d'apporter une contribution substantielle aux efforts de recherches actuels portant sur (les interactions entre) les processus de grammaticalisation (au niveau structurel) et d'(inter)subjectivation (au niveau sémantique) à l'œuvre dans le changement linguistique. Trois points majeurs seront étudiés :

- 1) La nature précise des changements sémantiques à l'œuvre lors de la subjectivation et l'intersubjectivation, et leurs relations avec les développements structurels de la grammaticalisation.
- 2) La téléologie des processus : la grammaticalisation et l'(inter)subjectivation sont-elles unidirectionnelles ou non ?
- 3) La 'portée' de ces processus : quelles relations la grammaticalisation et l'(inter)subjectivation entretiennent-elles avec les autres mécanismes de changement linguistique, en particulier l'analogie ?

Ces trois dimensions seront implémentées dans sept thématiques particulières traitant de différents domaines sémantiques et/ou grammaticaux dans lesquels ces questions seront abordées sous différents angles. Les thématiques sont :

- 1) La modalité – avec un accent particulier sur les processus de grammaticalisation et d'(inter)subjectivation à l'œuvre dans les constructions (verbales, adverbiales et adjectivales) auxiliaires et non auxiliaires.
- 2) L'évidentialité – exploration de la naissance et de l'évolution d'un éventail de moyens d'expression de cette catégorie sémantique.
- 3) Le mode – étude de la manière dont les différentes formes et significations du mode impératif ont évolué, avec en point de mire la question de savoir si ce développement diachronique est en phase ou non avec les dimensions de l'(inter)subjectivation et de la grammaticalisation.
- 4) Les marqueurs du discours – qu'est-ce que l'étude détaillée de cette catégorie fonctionnellement et formellement très complexe peut nous apprendre sur le processus de l'intersubjectivation et de sa corrélation avec la grammaticalisation.
- 5) La complémentation – traitant de la manière dont l'évolution des types de combinaisons clausales transparaît sur nos connaissances à propos de la nature des processus de grammaticalisation.
- 6) Modification nominale – traitant des processus d'(inter)subjectivation et de grammaticalisation au sein de l'organisation interne des groupes nominaux.
- 7) La théorie – quelles sont les implications plus larges des résultats de ce projet et de la littérature sur la grammaticalisation et l'(inter)subjectivation en général, sur la construction théorique linguistique ?

En termes de méthodologie, les questions empiriques abordées au sein de ces thématiques seront traitées en combinant des approches « détaillées » avec des approches « globalisantes » : l'approche détaillée comprend des études spécifiques de phénomènes linguistiques dans les langues romanes et germaniques particulières (également de manière contrastive) sur la base de données de corpus ; l'approche globalisante concerne l'analyse typologique d'un échantillon représentatif de langues du monde, avec un accent particulier sur les langues bantoues.

I. 3. OBJECTIVES, MOTIVATION AND STATE OF THE ART (5 PAGES MAXIMUM)

Describe the project's objectives and research goals.

Define the problems being addressed by positioning them in relation to the current state of knowledge.

State of the art: The notions of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification

The notion of *grammaticalization* essentially draws on the existence of two types of morphemes: full lexical morphemes, on the one hand, which function independently and which prototypically serve to make reference to elements of the 'objective' world; and grammatical morphemes, on the other hand, which are dependent on the appearance of independent lexical morphemes and essentially serve to mark their structural and/or semantic status (e.g. the definiteness of a noun, or the temporality of the event referred by the verb). One could also say that the latter category constitutes the 'grammar' of a language. The basic insight behind the notion of grammaticalization, then, is that these two prototypical categories of morphemes are neither sharply distinct nor invariably fixed. On the contrary, grammatical morphemes typically originate in full lexical morphemes (or in clusters of morphemes); and languages abound in morphemes which belong to neither prototype, but exhibit properties of both categories, to different degrees, and as such mark stages of transition from one prototypical category to the other. Thus the notion of grammaticalization basically refers to the process through which the speakers of a language (over time) 'make' their own grammar, and it reflects the basic idea that the grammar of a language is a constantly and dynamically evolving, open system.

The term 'grammaticalization' has been around since Meillet (1912), but it has come to the foreground only through Lehmann (1982). Since then there has been a wealth of monographs and articles on the subject, and it is now a central research concern, also in typology, and the topic furthermore draws the attention from linguists from various theoretical persuasions (standard reference works include Heine et al. 1991, Hopper & Traugott 1993/2003, Bybee et al. 1994). But it has also become clear that grammaticalization is a very complex process, featuring not only formal developments (phonological, morphological and syntactic), but also semantic ones.

In terms of the semantics, the original view was that grammaticalization involves 'desemantization' or 'semantic bleaching' or, in other words, that it involves a loss of meaning. It became clear though that while this view may be appropriate for some instances of grammaticalization (e.g. the development of the English verb *do* into an auxiliary used for negation and interrogation), for many other instances it is clearly inappropriate. For example, the semantic development of the present day Dutch auxiliary *kunnen* 'can, may' – expressing different types of modal meanings, including epistemic uncertainty – from a full verb meaning 'to have a mental capacity, to know something' cannot be characterized as a

'loss of meaning', but only as a 'change of meaning', or rather, as a 'change in meaning type' (cf. Traugott 1980, Sweetser 1988, Heine 1993). More specifically, it involves a change from a more concrete or specific to a more abstract or general meaning or, probably most accurately, from a meaning pertaining to the 'objective world' to a meaning pertaining to the speaker's assessment or attitude relative to this objective world. This assessment or attitude is subjective and the semantic process has thus been called '*subjectification*' (cf. Traugott 1989).

More recently, it has been stressed (most prominently in Traugott & Dasher 2002 and Traugott 2003) that meaning change involves more than subjectification alone: the process often goes beyond subjective meanings towards meanings concerned with the interaction between speaker and hearer, as involved in e.g. discourse particles and sentence connectors (coordinators, subordinators) – i.e., it also involves a process of *intersubjectification*. For instance, English *well* started out as an adverb meaning 'in a good manner' (*he sang well*), it later also got involved in expressing an 'epistemic' meaning, viz. in the modal collocation *may well*, but it also developed into a discourse marker, specifically into a hedging device used to make an expression more polite (*well, I am not sure I agree with you*).

It has also been recognized (e.g. in Traugott & Dasher 2002) that although there is a high degree of correlation between the structural process of grammaticalization and the semantic processes of subjectification and intersubjectification, they do not coincide. As already indicated, there are clear instances of grammaticalization processes which do not appear to involve (inter)subjectification – cf. the case of the auxiliarization of the verb *do*. And there are also clear instances of (inter)subjectification in which there are no clear signs of grammaticalization – e.g., the development of *to insist* from the meaning 'to stand on something' or 'to dwell upon something', to a deontic meaning as in *I insist that you leave immediately*, and even to something which comes close to an epistemic meaning, as in *I insist that my little boy has not thrown that ball through your window*.

Objectives

Although grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification are well established notions in the analysis of the dynamics of language change, several aspects of these processes remain controversial or insufficiently understood and thus deserve urgent attention. Several Belgian research teams are involved in this field and a major aim of the present project is to streamline and bundle the available expertise, strengthened with the input from a European partner, in order to make a major contribution on the international research front. Specifically, the present project aims to join forces on the following three interwoven research foci, all pertaining to crucial properties of the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification:

(i) *The semantics: The nature of (inter)subjectification and its relation to the structural developments.*

It is well known that grammaticalization proceeds along prototypical 'paths', i.e., trajectories which lexical material typically follows in its development from an independent to a grammatical status (e.g. full verb > auxiliary > verbal affix; noun > adverb(ial element) > pre/postposition > case marker). Subjectification involves developments from 'objective' meanings towards 'qualificational' meanings, and subsequently between 'qualificational' meanings – but there are many kinds of qualificational meanings, including aspect, time, types of modality, and evidentiality. The question is: Are there also preferential 'paths' in the process of subjectification (i.e., through the different meaning categories involved)? And how strong are they? Furthermore, the exact impact and properties of the process of inter-subjectification are far from established yet. To what extent is it a general one? Does it have to start from subjective meanings? And if it starts from subjective meanings, from which ones? And to what extent is it constitutive of grammaticalization as such? Quite generally, the degree of correlation between grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification, and the 'temporal' relation between the two processes (which comes first, or is there no strict order?) requires further attention.

(ii) *The teleology of the processes: Unidirectional or not?*

It is generally assumed that both grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification are normally unidirectional processes, i.e., linguistic form develops from less to more grammaticalized, and from objective to (inter)subjective, but not vice versa. Hardly anyone will dispute that this is the dominant situation. There is, however, a controversy (at least since Ramat 1992) on the strength of this unidirectionality (the discussion has so far mainly focused on grammaticalization though, less on (inter)subjectification). If developments do take place in the opposite direction, should they be considered as quirky exceptions or is there some systematicity as well?

(iii) *Scope: The relation of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification to other mechanisms of language change, notably, to analogy.*

Next to grammaticalization, analogical change has long been recognized as a major diachronic process. Until recently, it was often tacitly assumed that these two mechanisms are fundamentally different. But this is now being called into question: there are indications that elements may grammaticalize in groups, in which some elements follow others by analogy (e.g. Hoffmann 2004, 2005). The issue is far from established, however, and it calls for a detailed study into the role of analogy both within and outside of grammaticalization, and, of course, in relation to the process of (inter)subjectification.

The issue of the teleology of grammaticalization has been on the research agenda for some ten years, but it still remains a controversial issue and needs further exploration. The issue of subjectivity, and particularly intersubjectivity (and its teleology), and the issue of the

division of labor between grammaticalization and analogy (and the relationship with the semantics of (inter)subjectification), on the other hand, are likely to become major issues in the coming years.

In order to obtain a sufficiently diversified and broad picture of these different issues, the project aims to investigate them with respect to a wide 'sample' of linguistic form types – discourse markers and conjunctions, verbal and non-verbal modal expressions, nominal modifiers, and nominalization types – and featuring different crucial meaning categories such as modal, evidential, illocutionary and discursive ones.

Work packages defined along these lines will be investigated along two basic types of empirical approaches: in depth and in width. The in depth investigation will involve a detailed analysis of specific phenomena in the West Germanic and Romance languages. It will be conducted on the basis of synchronic and diachronic corpus investigation. The in width investigation will involve a scrutiny of a number of selected phenomena from a typological perspective, in a representative sample of the world's languages, on the one hand, and with a special focus on the Bantu languages, on the other hand.

All the teams have considerable internationally recognized expertise on and/or important research tools (data bases) that are essential for one or more components of the project. The teams at UA, UG, KUL, UCL and UH all have longstanding research experience in synchronic and/or diachronic corpus based analysis of the different expression types in the Germanic and Romance languages mentioned. UA has worked on modal and evidential expressions and on mood in both Germanic and Romance, UG on modal expressions and discourse markers in English, UCL on discourse markers in Dutch and French, KUL on nominal modifiers and on complementation patterns in English, and UH on modality and evidentiality and on discourse markers in German. Key publications include Diewald (1999), Nuyts (2001), Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg (2006), Davidse, Cuyckens & Vandelanotte (in press). The UA team also has longstanding typological expertise especially on modal expressions (e.g. van der Auwera & Plungian 1998), as well as experience with combining the in depth and in width perspectives as mentioned above. The UA team further possesses a very large typological database, which is ready for use for the purpose of the present project. The RMCA possesses a unique linguistic competence and archive relative to the 500 or so Bantu languages (Bostoen & Maniacky 2005). The various teams already have joint projects and publications and, as a symbol of its joint force, it may be remarked that the 3rd International Conference on Grammaticalization at Santiago de Compostela (July 2005) designated the UA, UG and KUL groups as the organizer of the 4th International Conference on Grammaticalization in 2008.

References

- Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenberg (eds., 2006). *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Bostoen, K. & J. Maniacky (eds, 2005). *Studies in African comparative linguistics with special focus on Bantu and Mande*. Tervuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa.
- Bybee, J., W. Pagliuca & R. Perkins (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Davidse, K., H. Cuyckens & L. Vandelanotte (eds., in press). *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Diewald, G. (1999). *Die Modalverben im Deutschen: Grammatikalisierung und Polyfunktionalität*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Heine, B. (1993). *Auxiliaries: Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi & F. Hünnemeyer (1991). *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffmann, S. (2004). Are low-frequency complex prepositions grammaticalized? On the limits of corpus data — and the importance of intuition. In: H. Lindquist, C. Mair (eds.), *Corpus approaches to grammaticalization in English 13*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 171-201.
- Hoffmann, S. (2005). *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions. A Corpus-Based Study*. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, P. & E. Traugott (1993¹/2003²). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, C. (1982). *Thoughts of grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch. Vol.1*. Köln: University. [Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekt 48]
- Meillet, A. (1912). L' evolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* 12 : 384-400.
- Nuyts, J. (2001). *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ramat, P. (1992). Thoughts on degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 30: 549-560.
- Sweetser, Eve (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E.C. (1980). Meaning-change in the development of grammatical markers. *Language Sciences* 2: 44-61.
- Traugott, E.C. (1989). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31-55.
- Traugott E.C. & R.B. Dasher (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: R. Hickey (ed.), *Motives for language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124-139.
- van der Auwera, J. & V. Plungian (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79-124.

I. 4. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT (15 pages minimum, 25 pages maximum)

- Submit a general description of the project as well as a description detailing each workpackage and indicate the partners involved in each workpackage.
 - Illustrate by means of a table or scheme the interaction between the partners within a workpackage and the interaction between the workpackages.
 - Describe and justify the methods and proposed approaches in relation to the state of the art.
 - Describe and justify how the contribution of the different partners will be integrated.
-

0. Introduction

The general description of the project has been provided above. The essence of the project can be grasped in terms of three major foci:

- 1) The nature of the semantic change: (Inter)subjectification and its relation to the structural developments.
- 2) The teleology of the processes: Unidirectional or not?
- 3) Scope: The relation of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification to other mechanisms of language change, notably, to analogy.

In order to obtain a sufficiently diversified and broad picture of these different issues, these research foci will be implemented in terms of seven work packages dealing with a range of crucial subject matters: modality, evidentiality, mood, discourse, complementation, nominal modification, and theoretical implications. For ease of presentation, in the description of the packages below examples will be provided from one or a few languages, usually English or Dutch. Given the competence and experience at the five partner institutions, the projects on modality, evidentiality, mood and discourse (1 to 4) will also cover other Germanic and Romance languages. And the modality, evidentiality and mood packages (1 to 3) will also be covered typologically, in general as well as with a specific focus on the Bantu languages.

§1 describes the seven work packages, §2 is devoted to the methodology, and §3 documents the interactive dimension of the project.

1. Work packages

WP1: Modality

Modality is one of the traditional domains of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification research (cf. Traugott 1989), and the modal auxiliaries in particular count as a prime example of both processes. Consequently, the formal and semantic development of the modals has been investigated fairly thoroughly, typologically (Heine 1993, Bybee et al.

1994), and in several individual languages, including English and German (e.g. Diewald 1999a; but not in Dutch for instance). The domain does deserve further attention, however.

First of all, in the range of the modal auxiliaries, there are numerous developments which pose interesting new questions for our current views on the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification. Here are a few examples, all from Dutch (similar problems exist for other Germanic and Romance languages):

- A diachronic pilot study of Dutch *kunnen* ‘can, may’ (Van Ostaeyen & Nuyts 2004) shows there to be a (limited) ‘re-autonomization’, viz. a use without an implied main predicate, particularly in the deontic meaning – cf. *dat kan niet* meaning ‘we cannot accept this’, but literally ‘that cannot’. Some other modals in Dutch appear to have a similar use, also with a qualificational meaning – cf. *dat mag niet van mama* ‘mam does not allow this’, *moet dat nu echt?* ‘is this really necessary?’. Dutch *mogen* ‘may’ moreover features a clearly non-auxiliary use with a non-qualificational meaning – cf. *ik mag geen soep* ‘I don't like soup’ (literally ‘I may no soup’). This raises interesting questions, such as: How did these autonomous uses arise? Is there a system behind them, and can it be attested cross-linguistically? These questions primarily concern the issues of unidirectionality and of the relation between the semantic and the structural developments in grammaticalization and subjectification.
- The same pilot study of *kunnen* suggests that there has not been a linear development from the dynamic via the deontic to the epistemic meaning, but a parallel evolution from dynamic to deontic and from dynamic to epistemic. The same has been observed for other languages, e.g. for *must* in English – e.g. van der Auwera & Plungian (1998). The question is whether other modals show the same path of semantic change. These problems concern the precise nature of (the ‘paths’ in) the semantic evolution in subjectification.
- How does the temporal (future) meaning of Dutch *zullen* ‘shall’ fit into the development of its modal meanings? It used to have a deontic meaning in Middle Dutch, only marginally present now, and it now also has an epistemic and an evidential (hearsay) meaning. (Note that English and German use completely different auxiliaries for the future tense: modal *will* and non-modal *werden*.) Why is *zullen* different from the other Dutch modals in having developed this temporal meaning? (There are indications that in Middle Dutch other modals showed a tendency towards becoming a future marker, including at least *moeten* ‘must’, but this process was not carried through.) Why did other languages choose other forms for this? What does all of this (specifically, the temporal meaning vis-à-vis the modal meanings) tell us about the subjectification process?
- Some Dutch modals have evolved into markers of special sentence types, e.g. *mogen* ‘may’ as a concessive marker, *mogen* and *moeten* ‘must’ as markers of conditionality – i.e., they have apparently developed into (strongly grammatical, fossilized) markers of discursive

functions, in other words, they have developed towards intersubjective uses. (Similar processes have taken place in e.g. English and German.) How did these uses emerge? How does this process fit the views on intersubjectification and grammaticalization (and the correspondences between them)?

Secondly, quite generally, there has been much less concern with the role of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification in the diachronic development of types of modal expressions other than the modal auxiliaries, i.e., adverbs, adjectives and full predicates. Yet one may wonder what light these other expression types can throw on the processes under investigation. Consider the following examples, again drawn from Dutch:

- The Dutch modal adverbs and/or adjectives *misschien* ‘maybe’, *mogelijk* ‘possible/possibly’ and *waarschijnlijk* ‘probable/probably’ have all evolved from word groups with a modal or a related auxiliary-like form as its core (*mogen* ‘may’, *schijnen* ‘seem, appear’). Interesting questions here are: which structural and meaning developments did this actually involve, and how should one characterize them in terms of the processes mentioned? This again touches the issue of unidirectionality and of the relations between formal and semantic developments in grammaticalization and subjectification.
- The Dutch mental state predicate *denken* ‘think’ remains diachronically unexplored (it has been investigated synchronically, Nuyts 2001a, just like its English equivalent, e.g. Thompson & Mulac 1991, Aijmer 1997). This verb – which also has an ‘objective’ use as a normal full verb – is often used as an epistemic marker, and in this use it shows a very complex grammatical and functional behavior (cf. parenthetical and semi-parenthetical next to complementing uses, raising and raising-like phenomena, etc.). The question is how these formal characteristics have emerged and are evolving and how they relate with the semantic development.
- Dutch *denken* (like English *think*) has also developed beyond epistemic uses towards intersubjective, modal particle uses. Some epistemic adverbs are also developing intersubjective uses – e.g. *misschien* ‘maybe’ and *zeker* ‘certainly’ as speech act markers in interrogative contexts (cf. e.g. Nuyts 2001a, Byloo et al. in press). How do these intersubjective uses emerge? Moreover, in these uses these forms are syntactically much more flexible than the intersubjective uses of the modals. How is this to be explained, what does it tell us about the relations between the semantic developments and the process of grammaticalization? (This issue also relates to work package 4 below.)

Issues in this work package will be addressed through an in depth analysis on the basis of diachronic and synchronic corpus data. There will also be a substantial in width component, checking the expression of modal categories in the Bantu languages. Though Bantu languages have already proved to be very fertile ground for grammaticalization (e.g. Heine

& Reh 1994), the application to modality is virtually (even if not entirely – see Louwrens 1990) unexplored.

WP2: Evidentiality

Next to modality, time and aspect, evidentiality is an important semantic domain in language. Evidentiality is concerned with ‘reasons, indications, evidence’ speakers have for expressing statements (Willett 1988). Thus evidential expressions encode information on the source of knowledge and belief the speaker has for making his or her statement. In numerous languages evidential meanings are realized within the grammatical system, i.e., evidential markers form grammatical paradigms, they interact with other grammatical categories (notably mood and aspect) and show a diachronic development along the lines of known, category specific channels of grammaticalization (Chafe & Nichols 1986, Johanson & Utas 2000, Nuyts 2001a, Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003, Aikhenvald 2004).

Though the modern Indo-European languages spoken in Western Europe do not display full-fledged grammaticalized evidential systems, they do have various periphrastic constructions expressing evidential meanings, which lately have been recognized by scholars as instances of grammaticalization (e.g. Cornillie 2004, Dendale & Tasmowski 2001, Diewald 2004, Mortelmans 2000, Plungian 2001). Typical evidential constructions are given in the sentences in (1). These sentences are not exact translational equivalents but they do all express that the speaker lacks secure knowledge, but derives his/her conclusion from some evidence s/he has for making the assertion.

- (1) a. Sie *scheint* ihren Schirm im Büro gelassen zu haben. [German]
b. Ze *schijnt* haar paraplu in het bureau te hebben gelaten. [Dutch]
c. She *seems* to have left her umbrella in the office. [English]
d. *Parece* haber dejado su paraguas en el despacho. [Spanish]

As evidentiality did not figure among the traditional grammatical categories, the development of evidential constructions passed unnoticed for a long time, we are only now (partially in the wake of Aikhenvald 2004) starting the systematic investigation from the perspective of grammaticalization.

The project aims at filling this gap and providing a survey and comparison of evidential constructions and their diachronic development in the languages to be selected for an in-depth study (a list which will include Dutch, English, German, French, and Spanish). It is suggested that the development of evidential constructions is a complex grammaticalization process, which interacts, at least in the languages chosen, with the development of modal constructions (see work package 1). The study investigates the degree of grammaticalization of the relevant constructions, the make-up of the present-day linguistic systems as well as the diachronic

stages that led to the present state. It thus combines research into the language-specific distinction of a long neglected category with the modeling of cross-linguistically relevant grammaticalization paths for evidentials.

Encoding the speaker's sources of knowledge, the expression of evidential meaning clearly is an instance of subjectivity in the sense used in the project. Furthermore, the rise of evidential markers is an excellent and novel testing ground for hypotheses on grammaticalization paths and on the impact of analogical processes, because evidential markers seem to be relatively late developments and would thus follow the model of other periphrastic verbal constructions, in particular modal verb construction, but also – in their early stages – verbal constructions carrying aspectual meaning, e.g. the Old High German ingressive constructions. There are not, to the best of our knowledge, any instances of developments in evidentials that might be considered to involve degrammaticalization, but given that evidentiality research is not that advanced, this may tell more about the research than about the facts.

The project will focus strongly on semantic analysis and on diachronic corpus linguistics. As with modality, there will also be a Bantuist component. For Africa and thus also for Bantu, the expression of evidentiality is essentially *terra incognita*, although there is relevant work on quotatives by Güldemann (2002), and there is at least one specific evidentiality study for the Bantu language Lega (Botne 1995).

WP3: Mood

The imperative mood or, if one prefers, the 'imperative illocutionary type' is a strongly intersubjective construction. If one may compare it to the declarative illocution or to the indicative mood, with an imperative the hearer is not merely supposed to understand the utterance, (s)he is also supposed to undertake the action described in the imperative clause. When the speaker utters the imperative *Sing!*, (s)he typically launches a direct appeal to the hearer: there is a desired state of affairs, and the hearer is supposed to make it true. It is clear that the domain of imperatives is fertile soil for the study of grammaticalization. Here are three examples.

- First, in Tepetotutla Chinanteco, the negative imperative is historically derived from an indicative progressive. The two forms are still very close, but the negative imperative is formally simpler in that it lacks the progressive 2nd person marker. (2) illustrates the progressive use and the glottal stop (represented by ?) marks the second person: deletion of the glottal stop gives the negative imperative reading.

(2) Tepetotutla Chinanteco (Oto-Manguan, Mexico, Westley 1991: 90)

is added to a form that is already marked for plural. It is not clear how this construction arose. It could have grammaticalized as a univerbation involving a 'vocatively' used free second person plural pronoun *nyena*. This is no doubt what happened in the case of the second plural in (c),

- c. Rêka-ng!
buy-IMP.2PL
'Buy!'

In the case of the first person plural imperative in (4b), the *-ng* could be arisen in the same way, and then we would be dealing with grammaticalization, too, but it could have spread from the pattern in (4c), and we would rather be dealing with analogy then.

The present subproject aims at a detailed study of imperatives, both in width and in depth. In depth: we plan detailed corpus-based work on the development of imperative markers and strategies in German, Dutch, and English, languages that are over-all very similar, yet ended up with different imperative systems. We will also focus on the competition between imperatives and deontic modality strategies (WP1), expanding on work by Nuyts et al. (2005, in press), and on the imperative uses of modal particles (WP 4), currently being addressed by e.g. Diwald & Ferraresi (2005). In width, we first plan typological work based on a partially completed database documenting a more or less representative sample of 500 languages – groundwork already in van der Auwera et al. (2005a) and van der Auwera (2006). We aim to describe and explain the relevant parameters of variation in the world's imperative systems, their development, genetic and areal issues, and we will pay particular attention to the development of negative imperatives. There will also be a substantial Bantu contribution. The project plans detailed historical and areal work, unraveling puzzles like the one illustrated with example (4), with particular attention also to the subjunctive, which often appears to do imperative work, and the interaction of imperative and subjunctive with tense and aspect.

WP4: Discourse

Empirical and theoretical research on discourse markers has exploded in the last 20 years. Seminal books in this area include Schiffrin (1987), Jucker & Ziv (1998), Lenk (1998), Hansen (1998), Andersen & Fretheim (2000), Fischer (2000, 2006), and Aijmer (2002). Nevertheless, there are still major theoretical and descriptive challenges in this field of research. First, we need synchronic monolingual studies to deepen our insight into the multifunctionality of individual discourse markers in order to arrive at a satisfactory account of meaning relations on the semantic and pragmatic levels. Second, we also need more cross-linguistic studies to see to what extent similar discourse functions are expressed in the languages of the world (see also Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg 2006), and what are

the major linguistic means (lexical, grammatical, syntactic) to express those functions in individual languages. Third, we want to know more about the way discourse markers develop. The present project specifically addresses the third, diachronic challenge, but as there is no diachrony without synchrony, the synchronic challenges will also be met.

Various studies of individual discourse markers have shown that they develop from lexical words and gradually acquire a basically pragmatic function. Such new meanings arise through the conventionalization of pragmatic inferences (see e.g. Schwenter & Traugott 2000). An example is the word *indeed*, which originated as a prepositional phrase in which the noun had full lexical content and which then developed into an adverb and discourse marker via different implicatures. Such changes have been shown to typically involve grammatical shifts (changes of syntactic position) as well as semantic ones (from concrete to more abstract, from propositional to textual and interpersonal meanings). An essential factor in the development is the rhetorical use of the words. A characteristic of pragmatic markers is their polysemy and multifunctionality, and *indeed* is a case in point.

There are several issues to be addressed with respect to the grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers. One is the question whether or to what extent 'grammaticalization' is an appropriate term to characterize these changes. That such words undergo changes in their meaning (type) is obvious, and so is the relevance of the concept (inter)subjectification. But it is less obvious that we can in always speak of grammaticalization. The usual parameters and criteria need to be examined closely in general and in individual cases. The study of discourse particles will thus directly focus on the relations between the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification (cf. Diewald 2006, Diewald in press).

A second issue is to what extent the same processes take place in words with similar functions in different languages, i.e., the question of cross-linguistically valid grammaticalization channels (if the term is appropriate) for discourse markers, leading from definable sets of source items via comparable stages of development to similar, more grammatical target items. In order to answer this question it is useful to look at a semantic or functional field and study cross-linguistic equivalents. Within the domain of causal connectives, it has indeed already been shown that often cross-linguistic equivalents do *not* show a similar synchronic semantic distribution (Degand & Pander Maat 2003, Degand 2004, 2005, Willems & Demol 2006, Simon & Degand in press). The question remains however to what extent these semantic divergences are the result of different stages of development.

One semantic field which is rich in discourse markers is that of 'expectation'. This field is furthermore at the cross-roads with evidentiality and modality (WP1 and WP2; cf. Chafe 1986, Delancey 1997, Nuyts 2001b). In the terms of Chafe (1986), these markers reflect the speaker's view on the match between his or her own knowledge and that of the addressee.

Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg (2004) propose to refine Chafe's knowledge-based framework into a more rhetorically oriented one (White 2003), in which the focus is on how speakers position their utterances for various rhetorical purposes vis-à-vis other utterances. By studying translations of three English expectation markers (*in fact*, *actually* and *really*) into Dutch and Swedish, cross-linguistic data were instrumental for enlarging the semantic field as well as for gaining insight into the multifunctionality of the individual markers. In this work package we want to extend this research to include more markers and more languages. We will focus on words which emphasize the common ground as well as those which express the speaker's awareness that the common ground has been fractured – this will not only include such 'obviously' related words as *in actual fact*, *as a matter of fact*, *in truth*, but also corrective items such as *or rather*, particularizing ones such as *in particular*, *especially*, dismissive ones such as *anyway* and distractive ones such as *by the way*, *incidentally*.

A second semantic or functional field that will be targeted in the project concerns the so-called 'modal particles' of German and Dutch, i.e., items like *ja* in (5).

- (5) Es soll *ja* auch schwimmen.
'It is of course meant to float'

The modal particles of German are known to have undergone a far-reaching process of grammaticalization since Old High German (Hentschel 1986, Diewald 1999b, Autenrieth 2000, Diewald & Ferraresi 2005), which more or less follows the known semantic and structural regularities of the development of discourse markers. However, the distribution of modal particles differs markedly from that of discourse markers such as turn-final *ja* in (6), which asks for agreement and initiates transition of the turn to the hearer.

- (6) Und dann kommt der Tisch, *ja*?
'And the table comes next, right?'

Only the modal particles are syntactically integrated into the sentence and subject to the restriction of occurring only in the middle field. Discourse markers like *ja* in (6) are not syntactically integrated, not restricted by syntactic rules, and may appear in any position in a turn. While one might assume at first sight that the modal particles of at least German are simply the equivalents of discourse markers in other languages, this turns out to be wrong: German has discourse markers too, some of which have developed from items which had modal particle functions before (e.g. *ja*, *aber*). The hypothesis underlying the investigation is that the modal particles of German cover an intermediate domain between the functions of what could be called 'text-connecting' elements such as conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs, on the one hand, and 'discourse-structuring' elements such as turn signals, hesitation markers, etc. on the other. Taking into account that languages like English, which have been the object of extensive research about discourse marking devices, do not have a

functional class comparable to the modal particles in German, the study of these particles will provide important clues for our understanding of the interrelations between 'text-connecting' and 'discourse-marking' elements.

A third functional field that will be covered is that of clausal connectives. We will focus on causals, temporals and contrastives in Dutch, French, English, and German. There has already been extensive research on these connectives, but to our knowledge, no systematic, cross-linguistic studies exist on the way these connectives grammaticalized. For one thing, it remains to be investigated whether (i) the hypothesis that meanings go from objective to subjective holds for all types of connectives, (ii) in more than one language, and, (iii) whether there are restrictions to this process of subjectification. The relevance of these questions has been documented in Stukker (2005). She argues that in their connective functions Dutch *dus* 'so' and *daarom* 'that's why' seem to go against the subjectification hypothesis: modern Dutch *daarom* appears to show a tendency toward 'objectification', and for *dus* subjective and objective uses seem to have arisen simultaneously. A related issue concerns Traugott's (1995) grammaticalization cline for discourse markers: clause-internal adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle (of which discourse markers are a subtype). With respect to this, it is interesting to observe that within the domain of causal connectives some of them have already acquired the status of discourse marker: *dus* and *donc* 'so' in Dutch and French, respectively (Evers-Vermeul 2005, Hybertie 1996), while others clearly have not, like *daarom*, *daardoor*, *want*, *omdat*, *aangezien* in Dutch or *de ce fait*, *c'est pourquoi*, *dès lors*, *car* or *parce que* in French. The issue at stake is to investigate whether these connectives are 'somewhere' on this 'discourse marker cline', in which case we should assume that this cline describes the inescapable general development for connectives, or whether some of these connectives will 'forever' resist such development. In this respect, an interesting line of investigation is to take spoken language into account. If we accept the idea that speech is a better indicator of language development than writing, an initial synchronic intra-linguistic but cross-modal investigation of a given linguistic structure should give us indications of the stage of development a linguistic construction is involved in. In other words, if a linguistic item, say the French causal connective *parce que*, shows significant semantic divergence in the spoken and the written mode, this cross-modal divergence could be interpreted as an indicator of ongoing change. The latter would then be expected to be in agreement with the 'discourse marker cline'. Work supporting the relevance and the feasibility of this type of work includes Simon & Degand (in press) on *parce que* 'because' vs. *car* 'for'. In addition, of course, diachronic data will be taken into consideration in order to confirm or disconfirm the cline of semantic evolution.

WP5: Complementation

Traditionally, grammaticalization is defined in terms of developments of (clusters of) morphemes, but even Meillet (1912) already hinted at a broader use of the term, also encompassing the development of grammatical structures in general. The latter issue has

generally received much less attention than the former, however. As Hopper & Traugott (2003: 176) point out, an important area of study within the broader definition of grammaticalization is clause combining (cf. also Givón 1980). In particular, they provide examples of the development of complex sentence structures, showing that a sequence of clauses may develop from juxtaposition to relatively loose adjoining to embedding (2003: 190). In a number of respects, this cline can be regarded as a grammaticalization cline. For one, complement structures at the tighter end of the cline show increased coalescence or bondedness (one of the Lehmann (1982) grammaticalization criteria). Moreover, when in this development from loose to tight bonding, finite clauses are replaced by non-finite ones, this replacement can be viewed as an instance of decategorialization (and in particular, desententialization, cf. Lehmann 1988). Note that replacement can either be understood as one structure being supplanted by another, or when there is a choice of structures, an increase in the relative proportion of non-finite (more bonded) structures to finite-structures (from the point of view of the matrix, this process is obligatorification).

In this work package we will focus on the changing variation in English between finite *that*-clauses and non-finite *to*-infinitive clauses and gerund clauses. In particular, we will examine whether, in the history of English, finite *that*-clauses are gradually replaced by non-finite clauses (as is indicated by Denison 1998), thus testifying to an overall replacement of loosely bonded to more tightly bonded complements, and hence to a change from less to more grammatical. This research question will be investigated with a special focus on the grammaticalization of complementation patterns with matrixes containing 'suasive verbs' (Quirk et al. 1985: 1182) such as *ask*, *order*, *request*, *recommend* (a semantically homogeneous set) and with *It is ADJ to/that* matrix patterns comprising adjectives of volition such as *essential*, *important*, *vital*, which are semantically similar to the suasive verbs. The choice of these constructions has a double motivation: First, these verbs lexicalize components of the imperative speech act, which is the focus of WP 2 (and which also relates to the topic of deontic modality, WP1). Second, these verbs and adjectives are especially interesting because, in spite of their semantic homogeneity, they show, over time, a varying distribution of the less bonded finite-complementation (*that*-clause) and more bonded non-finite complementation patterns (*to*-infinitive). Importantly (for the purposes of this research), this shifting distribution does not show a straightforward development from less to more grammaticalized (i.e., whereby *that*-clauses are gradually superseded by *to*-infinitives).

An important issue in this investigation, then, will be the unidirectionality hypothesis. In a strict/narrow interpretation of the latter, one would expect, if not a complete, at least a significant replacement over time of *that*-clauses by *to*-infinitives. In a less strict (less teleological) interpretation, one would expect that when one complement type (e.g., *to*-infinitive) supersedes another (e.g., *that*-clause), the changing pattern of distribution of the complement types at least observes the stratification of Givón's (1980) binding scale, i.e., that complement patterns with lower-level binding are replaced by patterns with higher-level

binding, and not vice versa. A first goal of this work package, then, is to investigate to what extent the development of complement patterns with suasive verbs and adjectives of volition follows a development from less to more grammaticalized. It has been shown by Los (2005) that from Early Middle English onwards, a number of suasive verbs which patterned with a finite *that* + *subjunctive* complement were gradually replaced by a non-finite *to*-infinitive complement. As the variation between *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives in Present-Day English shows (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1182), this replacement did not occur across the board: some verbs now exclusively pattern with *to*-infinitives (e.g., *want*), some show variation (e.g., *order*, *recommend*), some still exclusively pattern with *that*-clauses (e.g., *insist*). This indicates that with suasive verbs, complement patterns do not show a clear grammaticalization path from less bondedness to more bondedness. In a similar vein, from pilot research on complementation patterns with adjectives of volition (Van linden et al. 2005a), it appears that these adjectives have always shown variation between finite and non-finite patterns, and that there is no clear tendency towards more grammaticalized (bonded) complement patterns. Indeed, it appears that a good number of non-frequent adjectives such as *vital*, *desirable* continue to prefer the finite *that*-complementation pattern to the non-finite *to*-infinitive, and that, over time, there is no gradual replacing of the *that*-clause by the *to*-infinitive. In all, it would appear, then, – but this needs investigating – that at least in its strict interpretation and possibly also in its looser interpretation, the directionality hypothesis cannot be upheld.

It will also have to be investigated, what factors have detracted from the unidirectional path. One possible factor is the importance of contact with French during the Middle English period. This factor could have played an important role with regard to the complementation pattern with adjectives, most of which are of Romance origin (i.e., the presence of English *that*-patterns could have been influenced by the presence of *que*-complementation in French). A second factor relates to the issue of analogy (research focus 3). Specifically, it needs to be investigated whether a particular development of complementation patterns with a particular set of matrixes (be they adjectives or verbs) can be explained by analogy with the development of complementation patterns with semantically similar matrixes. For instance, the fact that suasive matrix verbs (such as *decree*, *stipulate*) are semantically close to verbs that are positioned low on Givón's binding scale (such as *say*) may simply keep these verbs from being supplanted by more bonded variants. Crucially, the effect of frequency (and 'entrenchment'; cf. Krug 2003) will have to be factored in here as well: the fact that a structure such as *say that*, situated low on Givón's binding scale, occurs frequently might compound the resistance of semantically similar, low-frequency verbs such as *decree*, *stipulate* to being supplanted by a more bonded variant – compare Bybee's (2001) research results in phonology on the conservative effect of frequency on analogical change. (Note that frequency may not only have a conservative, but also a stimulating effect on change: for instance, the occurrence of *to*-infinitive with frequently occurring verbs such as *want* might have a stimulating effect on other 'suasive' verbs, which will then take the same

complementation type.) Finally, the effects of possibly other detracting factors (e.g., register) will also be considered.

With regard to the issue of analogy as well, it might be the case that the development of complementation with suasive matrix verbs as a whole affects the development of complementation patterns with the set of – semantically similar – adjectives of volition (or vice versa) (cf. pilot research in Van linden et al. 2005b).

In semantic terms, finally, it would appear that the adjectives of volition, as matrixes, develop intersubjective meanings (with the speaker giving a piece of advice, a polite command or order to the hearer) from its objective meanings, without there being a separate subjective stage. For instance, the intersubjective use of an adjective of volition (e.g., *essential*) in matrix patterns such as *it is essential to be aware of that* derives directly from objective usages in which *essential* can be paraphrased as ‘indispensable’, as in *this is essential to the survival of the species*.

WP6: Nominal modification

The left-right order in which premodifiers and head occur in the English NP has long been accepted to incorporate a general continuum from subjective to objective meanings (Halliday & Hasan 1976, Hetzron 1978, Seiler 1978, Dixon 1982, Quirk et al. 1985, Vandelanotte 2002). This subjective-objective cline starts at the left end with the speech event-related meanings of the determiner zone, then moves into the evaluative meanings of intensifiers and subjective attributes, and finishes with objective meanings at the right end of NP-structure, viz. objective attributes and classifiers preceding the categorization expressed by the lexical head. This subjectivity ordering in the NP has more recently led to subjectification and grammaticalization hypotheses, which posit paths of semantic change and category shift for constituent elements of the NP. Most notably, the leftward movement of adjectives in premodifier structure has generally been correlated with increased subjectification (Paradis 2000, Athanasiadou in press). Specific case studies of subjectification and grammaticalization have focused on (a) the shift from objective attribute over subjective attribute to intensifier for adjectives such as *lovely* (Adamson 2000), *very* (Adamson & González-Díaz 2005), *pretty*, *fair* (Nevalainen & Rissanen 2002) and *pure* (Vandewinkel et al. 2006); and (b) the shift from objective uses to postdeterminer and quantifier uses for adjectives such as *other*, *different* (Davidse & Breban 2006), *various*, *several* (Denison 2006, Breban 2006). The present work package will build further upon this research. Specifically, it will explore two of the central research questions of the overall project.

First of all, in terms of the cline of (inter)subjectification, Traugott’s (2003) hypothesis predicts that elements in the English NP will change meaning and shift category in a

systematic right-to-left movement, from the objective over the subjective to the intersubjective zone in the English NP. As suggested by Breban (in press), (post)determiner meanings of adjectives are probably best regarded as ‘intersubjective’ because they are devices by which the speaker introduces referents into the discourse or inserts them into cohesive relations in such a way that they can be processed by the hearer, taking into account the latter’s (contextual) knowledge. However, there is some preliminary research suggesting that elements of the NP may develop intersubjective postdeterminer meanings straight from objective uses, and move on to subjective uses after those, for instance:

- According to Denison (2002: 2-3), the postdeterminer use of ‘type’ nouns *kind*, *type* and *sort*, as in *I suppose it’s ... a sort of holiday*, predates the emergence of their qualifying use, as in *I don’t associate you with ... these sort of skills like driving*.
- Preliminary investigation by Breban & Davidse (2005) suggests that the postdeterminer use of *complete* may have predated its emphasizing use, as in *a complete idiot*. The question about the exact chronology of postdeterminer and emphasizing/intensifying uses generally applies to adjectives such as *complete*, *whole*, *total* and *very*, *true*, *real*.

Secondly, we will address the issue of analogy. At first sight, the grammaticalization of low frequency small size nouns appears as a straightforward instance of Hoffmann’s (2004, 2005) principle that low frequency lexical items may grammaticalize by analogy with a very frequent structurally similar sequence. Infrequent nouns such as *jot* and *skerrick* that shift from describing a small entity to indicating a small quantity seem to have simply followed the analogic pull of highly frequent *a bit of*, which has almost fully grammaticalized into a quantifier in Present-day English. However, more fine-grained semantic and pragmatic analysis of small size noun data offers support for Noël’s (2005) criticism of Hoffmann that grammaticalization is enabled by more specific and ‘substantive’ contexts than the highly schematic meanings of constructions as such. According to Traugott (2005), small size nouns divide into two groups occurring primarily in positive versus negative polarity contexts. The corpus study by Brems et al. (2006) put *a measure/hint/breath/whiff/shade/vestige of* into the first group, and *(not/without/etc.) a trace/shred/scrap/jot/scintilla/sinew of* into the second. The former tend to be used in a downtoning way, while the latter emphasize zero-attestation, e.g. a person *without a trace of pomposity* (Israël 2004, Traugott 2005). In view of this, it has to be investigated whether it is not a mix of (lexico-)syntactic, pragmatic and discoursal factors – and if so, what type of mix – that drives the grammaticalization by analogy of infrequent items such as small size nouns.

The study envisaged in this work package will be an in depth diachronic and synchronic corpus study of English. As it focuses on grammaticalization/subjectification paths associated with deixis and determination in the broad sense in the noun phrase, it will prove to be an interesting testing ground for hypotheses on mood, modality, and evidentiality,

which are associated with the VP, and it should feed into the more fundamental question about the definition of intersubjectivity itself, viz. whether these speech event-related intersubjective uses really form one coherent whole with the hearer-directed (e.g. face-saving) uses of discourse particles discussed by Traugott (2005).

WP7: Theoretical implications

A major question pertaining to the observations and facts about grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification is: what are their wider, theoretical implications? Specifically, what do they mean for current theories of language, and of grammar more in particular? Although these processes have drawn the attention of linguists from all kinds of theoretical persuasions, they have predominantly been the territory of scholars working in traditional functional linguistic frameworks, and more recently also of scholars working in (some of) the frameworks sailing under the flag of 'cognitive linguistics'. Yet, few explicit attempts have been made to draw implications from the facts about grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification for these theoretical frameworks. How can these processes be handled in them? Do they cause problems for the theories, and if so, can they be solved? What does this mean for the (plausibility of the) theories? And conversely, how can our understanding of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification be profitably informed by the tenet/principles characterizing the theoretical frameworks? More generally, the question arises what the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification imply for our understanding of language as a cognitive system for communication. Clearly, these processes (and their interrelations) do not just concern superficial or marginal aspects of language, but they go right to the heart of the question how the human language faculty 'works', and how it fits into the workings of human perception, conceptualization, and behavior in general.

Here are a few examples of specific questions:

- It would seem that the process of grammaticalization offers a challenge for grammar theories which posit a more or less sharp divide between lexicon and grammar – including many traditional functionalist models, such as Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997, Van Valin 2005) and Functional Grammar (Dik 1997), but this is also the prevalent view in psycholinguistic and language psychological models (cf. Levelt 1989) – and it would appear much more easily reconcilable with models which integrate lexical and grammatical knowledge – such as different types of construction grammars (e.g. Fillmore et al. 1988, Goldberg 1995, 2006, Croft 2001), Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987/1991), or Systemic Grammar (Halliday 1994). The question is to what extent this initial perception is correct, and what the issue implies in more detail for our conception of a grammar in these terms. Related to this, the question also arises whether the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification, and the relations between them, hold implications for the current

distinction between models which adopt a process concept of grammar (which includes most traditional functionalist grammars, and also psycholinguistic models), and those which adopt a construction network concept of grammar (see Croft 2001, Croft & Cruse 2004 on this distinction; this distinction partly overlaps with that between models with versus without a divide between lexicon and grammar).

- ‘Tense-aspect-modality’ (TAM) marking – or the ‘qualification’ of states of affairs – is a hot topic in many branches of functionalist linguistics. There is growing evidence that the semantic categories involved stand in a hierarchical relationship, defined in terms of their relative extension of scope, and reflected in many ways in the grammatical behavior of linguistic devices used for expressing them. This has resulted in a few proposals to implement a hierarchical system in a grammar (in Role and Reference Grammar and Functional Grammar, references given above). Other scholars have argued, however, that such a system is a fundamental property of human conceptualization (Nuyts 2001a, 2005a, in press). The process of subjectification obviously taps into these very semantic dimensions: it involves meaning developments from objective meanings into these qualificational categories, and further developments among these qualificational categories. The question is, then: how do the concepts of subjectification and of the hierarchical organization of qualificational dimensions relate precisely, and what does one imply for the other? This question applies at a micro-level: what can our insights from subjectification processes teach us about the analysis of semantic categories such as different types of modality, evidentiality, etc.? (Cf. Nuyts 2005b, 2006.) It also applies at a macro-level: what does the process of subjectification mean for our understanding of a hierarchical analysis of TAM-categories, and for the position of such a system in human cognition? And what do the relations between the subjectification process and the grammaticalization process mean for our understanding of the relations between the semantic hierarchy of qualifications and the linguistic system of devices for expressing them? (This, of course, takes us back to the process versus construction concept of a grammar, formulated above.)

- The step from subjectification to intersubjectification raises the complex question of what it implies for our understanding of the relations in grammar and cognition between ‘conceptual’ categories such as qualifications of states of affairs, and ‘communicative’ dimensions relating to illocutionary goals of a speaker, and for our understanding of the status of expressive devices in grammar pertaining to these two dimensions. There are ‘natural’ connections between a (conceptual) qualificational category such as deontic modality and an (illocutionary) mood category such as the imperative (see WP3 above), or between epistemic modality and interrogatives – can the facts of (inter)subjectification tell us more about these kinds of relations, and about how to handle them in our theories of language?

2. Methodology

The empirical work will proceed along two interrelated lines: depth vs. width. The ‘in-depth’ investigation – to be used in all work packages – will invariably involve corpus work. For each of the languages involved state of art electronic corpora will be investigated, both synchronic and diachronic, but extra data sets will be compiled whenever needed (especially, in some cases, for diachronically older stages of languages). Depending on whether or not the in-depth work will itself already be contrastive, we will also access parallel corpora. Thus, to give just one example, for English we will work with existing electronic corpora, predominantly the standard ones, including (to name only the most important ones) the Toronto Corpus (Old English Corpus), The Helsinki Corpus of English texts, The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English, the Penn-Helsinki parsed corpus of Middle English, Middle English texts from the Middle English Compendium, [the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts](#), the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English, the British National Corpus, the COBUILD Corpus. Similar but fewer materials exist for the other ‘in depth’ languages, and all the partners have corpus experience. It may also be added that some of the electronic corpora to be used have actually been developed by partners in the present project: e.g. the Hannover corpus of Old High German, which is currently being expanded to cover the entire history of the language. The corpus work will be performed by the teams of UA, UG, KUL, UCL and UH.

The ‘in width’ investigation – to be applied especially in work packages 1-3 – will be conducted with along two lines. The first is the typological one: with meaning or function as the *tertium comparationis*, the research literature and, to a lesser extent, native speakers will be consulted on the nature of the formal strategies the language uses for any one meaning or function. It will also, crucially, make use of existing data bases and archives. Thus, at UA a sampling procedure and data collection established in earlier projects have yielded data for about 500 languages. Some of these data are still fairly raw though, and deserve further quality checking. The second stream concerns the Bantu languages. The methods, however, are identical, except that the language choice is restricted to one language family. For the Bantu work, we can rely on the archives at RMCA. This team has a unique access to materials, often unpublished, collected from the days of the Belgian colonization. This typological research will be performed by the UA and RMCA teams, and to a lesser extent also by the KUL team

The deep and the wide lines of research are furthermore intended to cross-fertilize one another. Claims about what is special about one language and/or one construction type are to be checked against what relevant hypotheses partners make on other languages or constructions. This double level approach has been a strength of the UA center (as manifested in e.g. the typology-*cum*-corpus study of van der Auwera et al. 2005b, one of the results of a 4 year (so-called) ‘concerted research action’ project, which tried out the double level approach.

3. Interaction and coherence between the work packages

Interaction links can be posited on various levels. First, there is a thematic dimension. Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification affect the verb phrase, the noun phrase, and variously categorizable linking categories (sentence adverbs, particles, conjunctions). The focus in the seven work packages is schematized in Table 1. The number of check marks reflects the importance of the category to the work package. WP7 on 'Theoretical implications' is a special case, and will not be tabulated.

	Verb phrase	Noun phrase	Linking categories
WP1 Modality	●●●	●	●
WP2 Evidentiality	●●●	●	●
WP3 Mood	●●●		●
WP4 Discourse			●●●
WP5 Complementation	●●	●●●	
WP6 Nominal modification		●●●	

Table 1. Work packages - VP, NP, and Linking

We thus see that most attention will go the verb phrase, but also that this is never studied in isolation from the other categories. Thus it is an explicit goal of the modality project not to limit itself to modal auxiliaries but to include adverbs and adjectives. Similarly, the study of verbal mood will pay special attention to the role of adverbs or particles. Or a third example: the matrix verbs chosen for the study of complementation are precisely the ones that lexicalize the imperative mood.

Table 2 sketches the extent to which each of the packages addresses the cross-cutting foci of (i) semantics, (ii) teleology, and (iii) scope.

	Semantics	Teleology	Scope
WP1 Modality	●●●	●●●	●
WP2 Evidentiality	●●●	●	●●
WP3 Mood	●●●	●●●	●●●
WP4 Discourse	●●●	●●	●
WP5 Complementation	●	●●●	●
WP6 Nominal modification	●●●		●●●

Table 2. Work packages - Semantics, Teleology and Scope

Here the strongest unifying research concern is the one concerning the semantics of the process, more particularly, the hypothesized development from objective to subjective and

then to intersubjective. In 1.3., this research interest was described as having the potential of new research. The teleology issue is fairly important, too: we said in 1.3. that this concern has been strong for at least 10 years; the time has come to try to round off the debate. The issue concerning scope, i.e., the relation between grammaticalization and analogy, was also predicted to be a new hot topic. We thus hope that the present project will allow us to play a major role in the development of the field.

A third table describes the involvement of the five partners (this table will reappear in a different format further below).

	UA	UG	KUL	UCL	RMCA	UH
WP1 Modality	●●●	●	●		●●●	●
WP2 Evidentiality	●		●	●	●	●●●
WP3 Mood	●●●		●		●●●	●
WP4 Discourse		●●●		●●●		●●
WP5 Complementation		●	●●●			
WP6 Nominal modification			●●●			
WP7 Theoretical implications	●●●	●	●	●		●

Table 3. Work packages and partners

A fourth cross-tabulation relates the empirical packages (i.e., excluding WP7) and the partners to the depth vs. width parameters.

	UA	UG	KUL	UCL	RMCA	UH
WP1 Modality	deep	deep	wide		wide	deep
WP2 Evidentiality	deep		wide	deep	wide	deep
WP3 Mood	deep/wide		wide		wide	deep
WP4 Discourse		deep		deep		deep
WP5 Complementation		deep	deep			
WP6 Nominal modification			deep			

Table 4. Work packages and depth vs. width

(See below for information on the work plan and time schedule.)

References

(publications marked with a * have authors that are involved in the present project)

Adamson, S. (2000). A lovely little example: Word order options and category shift in the premodifying string. In: O. Fischer et al. (eds.), *Pathways of change: Grammaticalization in English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 39-66.

- Adamson, S. & V. González-Díaz (2005). 'And I were your very very Rosalind': The role of hyperbole in the grammaticalization of intensifiers. Paper presented at the Conference on Conference "From ideational to interpersonal: Perspectives from Grammaticalization", Leuven.
- Aijmer, K. (1997). I think: An English modal particle. In: T. Swan, O.J. Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic languages: Historical and comparative perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1-47.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- *Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenberg (2004). A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: The semantic field of expectation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1781-1805.
- *Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenberg (eds., 2006). *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Aikhenvald, A. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, A. & R.M.W. Dixon (eds., 2003). *Studies in evidentiality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Andersen, G. & T. Fretheim (eds, 2000). *Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Athanasiadou, A. (in press). Adjectives and subjectivity. In: A. Athanasiadou, C. Canakis, B. Cornillie (eds.) *Subjectification: Various paths to subjectivity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Autenrieth, T. (2002). *Heterosemie und Grammatikalisierung bei Modalpartikeln: Eine synchrone und diachrone Studie anhand von eben, halt, e(cher)t, einfach, schlicht und glatt*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Botne, R. (1995).).The pronominal origin of an evidential. *Diachronica* 12: 201-221.
- *Breban, T. (2006). The grammaticalization and subjectification of English adjectives expressing difference into plurality/distributivity markers and quantifiers. Preprint n° 251, Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven.
- *Breban, T. (in press). Grammaticalization and subjectification of the English adjectives of general comparison. In: A. Athanasiadou, C. Canakis, B. Cornillie (eds.) *Subjectification: Various paths to subjectivity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- *Breban, T. & K. Davidse (2005). The development of postdeterminer uses of adjectives: Grammaticalization and semantic shift. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English (ICAME) and the 6th Annual Conference of the American Association of Applied Corpus Linguistics (AAACL), Ann Arbor.
- *Brems, L., C. Bicler, J. Boonen & R. Pertz (2006). The grammaticalization of small size nouns. Paper presented at ICAME 27, Helsinki.
- Bybee, J. (2001). *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, J., W. Pagliuca & R. Perkins (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- *Byloo, P, R. Kastein & J. Nuyts (in press). On *certainly* and *zeker*. In: M. Hannay, G. Steen (eds.), *Studies in English grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In: W. Chafe, J. Nichols (eds.), 261-72.
- Chafe, W. & J. Nichols (eds., 1986). *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Cole, D. (1975). *An introduction to Tswana grammar*. Cape Town: Longman.
- *Cornillie, B. (2004). *Evidentiality and epistemic modality in Spanish (semi-)auxiliaries: A functional-pragmatic and cognitive-linguistic account*. PhD Dissertation, K.U.Leuven. (To be published by Mouton de Gruyter.)
- Croft, W. (2001). *Radical construction grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, W. & A. Cruse (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- *Davidse, K. & T. Breban (2006). The deictification of adjectives: The development of postdeterminer meanings. Preprint n° 250, Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven.
- *Degand, L. (2004). Contrastive analyses, translation and speaker involvement: The case of *puisque* and *aangezien*. In: M. Achard, S. Kemmer (eds.) *Language, culture and mind*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 251-270.
- *Degand, L. (2005). De l'analyse contrastive à la traduction: Le cas de la paire *puisque* – *aangezien*. In : G. Williams (ed.), *La linguistique de corpus*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 155-168.

- *Degand, L. & H. Pander Maat (2003). A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the Speaker Involvement Scale. In A. Verhagen, J. van de Weijer (eds.), *Usage based approaches to Dutch*. Utrecht: LOT, 175-199.
- DeLancey, S. (1997). Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33-52.
- *Dendale, P. & L. Tasmowski (eds., 2001) On evidentiality. Special Issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33/3.
- Denison, D. (1998). Syntax. In: R. Hogg (ed.), *Cambridge history of the English language, volume 4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92-329.
- Denison, D. (2002). History of the *sort of* construction family. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Construction Grammar, Helsinki.
- Denison, D. (2006). Category change and gradience in the determiner system. In: A. van Kemenade, B. Los (eds.), *Handbook on the history of English*. Blackwell: Oxford, 279-304.
- *Diewald, G. (1999a). *Die Modalverben im Deutschen: Grammatikalisierung und Polyfunktionalität*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- *Diewald, G. (1999b). Die Entwicklung der Modalpartikel *aber*. Ein typischer Grammatikalisierungsweg der Modalpartikeln. In: H. Spillmann, I. Warnke (eds.), *Internationale Tendenzen der Syntaktik, Semantik und Pragmatik*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 83-91.
- *Diewald, G. (2004). Faktizität und Evidentialität: Semantische Differenzierungen bei den Modal- und Modalitätsverben im Deutschen. In: O. Leirbukt (ed.), *Tempus/Temporalität und Modus/Modalität im Deutschen, auch in kontrastiver Perspektive*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 231-258.
- *Diewald, G. (2006). Discourse particles and modal particles as grammatical elements. In: K. Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 403-425.
- *Diewald, G. (in press). Abtönungspartikel. In: L. Hoffmann (ed.), *Handbuch der deutschen Wortarten*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- *Diewald, G. & G. Ferraresi (2005). Semantic, syntactic and constructional restrictions in the diachronic rise of modal particles in German: A corpus-based study on the formation of a grammaticalization channel. Paper presented at the Conference on New Reflections on Grammaticalization 3, Santiago de Compostela.
- Dik, S. (1997). *The theory of functional grammar*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1982). *Where have all the adjectives gone? And other essays in semantics and syntax*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Evers-Vermeul, J. (2005). *The development of Dutch connectives: Change and acquisition as windows on form-function relations*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Fillmore, C., P. Kay & M. O'Connor (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical construction: The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64: 501-538.
- Fischer, K. (2000). *From cognitive semantics to lexical pragmatics: The functional polysemy of discourse particles*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Fischer, K. (ed., 2006). *Approaches to discourse particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Fortuin, E. (2000). *Polysemy or monosemy: Interpretation of the imperative and the dative-infinitive construction in Russian*. Amsterdam: Institute for Logic, Language, and Computation.
- Givón, T. (1980). The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4: 333-377.
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Güldemann, T. (2002). *Quotativkonstruktionen in afrikanischen Sprachen: Ein synchroner und diachroner Überblick*. Habilitationsschrift, Univ. Leipzig.
- Halliday, M.A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hansen Mosegaard, M.-B. (1998). *The function of discourse particles. A study with special reference to spoken standard French*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heine, B. (1993). *Auxiliaries: Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B. & M. Reh (1984) *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*. Hamburg: H. Buske.

- Hentschel, E. (1986). *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln: Ja, doch, halt und eben*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hetzron, R. (1978). On the relative order of adjectives. In: H. Seiler (ed.), *Language universals*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 165-184.
- Hoffmann, S. (2004). Are low-frequency complex prepositions grammaticalized? On the limits of corpus data — and the importance of intuition. In: H. Lindquist, C. Mair (eds.), *Corpus approaches to grammaticalization in English 13*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 171-201.
- Hoffmann, S. (2005). *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions. A Corpus-Based Study*. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, P. & E. Traugott (2003). *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hybertie, C. (1996). *La consequence en français*. Paris : Ophrys.
- Israël, M. (2004). The pragmatics of polarity. In: L. Horn, G. Ward (eds), *The handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 701-723.
- Johanson, L. & B. Utas (eds., 2000). *Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jucker, A. & Y. Ziv (eds., 1998). *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Krug, M. (2003). Frequency as a determinant in grammatical variation and change. In: G. Rohdenburg, B. Mondorf (eds), *Determinants of grammatical variation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 7-67.
- Langacker, R. (1987/1991). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. 2 volumes. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lehmann, C. (1982). *Thoughts of grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch. Vol.1*. Köln: University. [Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekt 48]
- Lehmann, C. (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: J. Haiman, S. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 181-225.
- Lenk, U. (1998). *Marking discourse coherence: Functions of discourse markers in spoken English*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.
- Levelt, W. (1989). *Speaking*. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Los, B. (2005). *The rise of the to-infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Louwrens, L. (1990). Mood and modality in Northern Sotho. *South African Journal of African Languages* 10: 1-10.
- Meillet, A. (1912). L' evolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* 12 : 384-400. Also in: A. Meillet (1958), *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Champion, 130-148.
- *Mortelmans, T. (2000). On the evidential nature of the epistemic use of the German modals *müssen* and *sollen*. In: J. van der Auwera, P. Dendale (eds.), *Modal verbs in Germanic and Romance languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 131-148.
- Nevalainen, T. & M. Rissanen (2002). Fairly pretty fair or pretty fair? On the development and grammaticalization of English downtoners. *Language Sciences* 24: 359-80.
- Noël, D. (2005). The productivity of a 'source of information' construction: Or, where grammaticalization and construction grammar meet. Paper presented at the Conference on Conference "From ideational to interpersonal: Perspectives from Grammaticalization", Leuven
- *Nuyts, J. (2001a). *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- *Nuyts, J. (2001b). Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 383-400.
- *Nuyts, J. (2005a). Brothers in arms? On the relations between cognitive and functional linguistics. In: F.Ruiz de Mendoza, S.Peña (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics: Internal dynamics and interdisciplinary interaction*. Berlin: Mouton, 69-100.
- *Nuyts, J. (2005b). The modal confusion: On terminology and the concepts behind it. In: A.Klinge, H.Müller (eds.), *Modality: Studies in form and function*. London: Equinox, 5-38.
- *Nuyts, J. (2006). Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. In: W.Frawley (ed.), *The expression of modality*. Berlin: Mouton, 1-26.

- *Nuyts, J. (in press). The 'one-commitment-per-clause' principle and the cognitive status of modality. *Linguistics*.
- *Nuyts, J., P.Byloo & J.Diepeveen (2005). On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: A case study of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*. *Antwerp Papers in Linguistics* 110: 1-56.
- *Nuyts, J., P.Byloo & J.Diepeveen (in press). *Mogen* en *moeten* en de relaties tussen deontische modaliteit en modus. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*.
- Paradis, C. (2000). Reinforcing adjectives: A cognitive semantic perspective on grammaticalisation. In: R. Bermúdez-Otero, D. Denison, R.M. Hogg, C.B. McCully (eds.), *Generative theory and corpus linguistics: A dialogue from 10 ICEHL*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 233-258.
- Plungian, V. A. (2001). The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. In: Dendale, Tasmowski (eds.), 349-357.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwenter, S. & E. Traugott (2000). Invoking scalarity: The development of *in fact*. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1: 7-25.
- Seiler, H. (1978). Determination: A functional dimension for interlanguage comparison. In: H. Seiler (ed.), *Language universals*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 301-328.
- *Simon, A. & L. Degand (in press). Connecteurs de causalité, implication du locuteur et profils prosodiques : Le cas de *car* et de *parce que*. *Journal of French Language Studies*.
- Stukker, N. (2005). *Causality marking across levels of language structure: A cognitive semantic analysis of causal verbs and causal connectives in Dutch*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Thompson, S. & A. Mulac (1991). A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In: E. Traugott, B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, vol. 2, 313-329.
- Traugott, E. (1989). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31-55.
- Traugott, E. (1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the International Conference of Historical Linguistics XII, Manchester. (see <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf>)
- Traugott, E. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: R. Hickey (ed.), *Motives for language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124-139.
- Traugott, E. (2005). From ideational to interpersonal: a reassessment. Plenary lecture at FITIGRA, Leuven.
- *Vandelanotte, L. (2002). Prenominal adjectives in English: Structures and ordering. *Folia Linguistica* 36: 219-259.
- *van der Auwera, J. (2006). Why languages prefer prohibitives. *Journal of Foreign Languages* 1, 1-25.
- *van der Auwera, J., L. Lejeune, V.Goussev & P. Umarani (2005a) The morphological imperative, The prohibitive", In: M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, D. Gil & B. Comrie (eds.), *World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 286-289, 290-293.
- *van der Auwera, J., E. Schalley & J. Nuyts (2005b). Epistemic possibility in a Slavonic parallel corpus: a pilot study. In: B. Hansen & P. Karlik (eds.), *Modality in the Slavonic languages: New perspectives*. München: Sagner, 201-217.
- *van der Auwera, J. & V. Plungian (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79-124.
- *Vandewinkel, S., K. Davidse & L. Vandelanotte (2006). 'Emphasizer' use of adjectives and category shift in the NP: The case of *pure*. Paper presented at DELs, Manchester.
- *Van linden, A., H. Cuyckens. & J.-C. Verstraete (2005a). The distribution of complementation patterns with adjectives of volition. Paper presented at the ICAME 2005 Conference, Ann Arbor, MI.
- *Van linden, A., H. Cuyckens & J.-C. Verstraete. 2005b. Adjectival and verbal complementation compared in the history of English. Paper presented at the XVIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, Wisconsin.
- *Van Ostaejen, G. & J. Nuyts (2004). De diachronie van *kunnen*. *Antwerp Papers in Linguistics* 109: 1-186.

- Van Valin, R. (2005). *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, R. & R. LaPolla (1997). *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westley, D. (1991). *Tepetotutla Chinantec syntax*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- White, P. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23: 259-284.
- *Willems, D. & A. Demol (2006). *Vraiment* and *really* in contrast: When truth and reality meet. In: K. Aijmer, A.-M Simon-Vandenberg (eds), 215-235.
- Willett, T. (1988). A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51-97.

I. 5. PARTICIPATION OF THE PARTNERS IN THE DIFFERENT WORKPACKAGES

Tick off in the table the participation of the different partners in the different workpackages (delete not used rows and columns in the table). Mention for each partner his/her name and the institution's abbreviation.

	PARTNER	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7
P1	Name : van der Auwera Institution : UA	•••	•	•••				•••
P2	Name : Vandenberghe Institution : UG	•			•••	•		•
P3	Name : Cuyckens Institution : KUL	•	•	•		•••	•••	•
P4	Name : Degand Institution : UCL		•		•••			•
P5	Name : Maniacky Institution : RMCA	•••	•	•••				
EU1	Name : Diewald Institution : UH	•	•••	•	••			•

I. 6. MAIN SKILLS OF THE PARTNERS

Describe the main skills of each of the partners in relation to the project (15 lines maximum per partner).

Delete not used lines.

- P1 - Name : van der Auwera, Johan
Institution : UA
Main Skills : grammatical semantics, in particular, the synchrony and diachrony of mood, modality and negation, in English and (from a typological perspective) the languages of Europe and of the world
- P2 - Name : Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie
Institution : UG
Main Skills : contrastive linguistics; discourse markers; modality; English in contrast with Dutch, Swedish, German, French
- P3 - Name : Cuyckens, Hubert
Institution : KUL
Main Skills : works within a functional-cognitive linguistic framework; recent work (including supervision of doctorates and projects) has focused on the diachronic development of verb- and adjective complementation in English and on grammaticalization in English (discourse markers, prepositions)
- P4 - Name : Degand, Liesbeth
Institution : UCL
Main Skills : specialised in the contrastive, synchronic study of discourse markers (especially) connectives in Dutch and French, both in speech and writing, and in L1 and L2, with a special emphasis on the role of connectives as discourse structuring devices
- P5 - Name : Maniacky, Jacky
Institution : RMCA
Main Skills : Bantu grammatical description (Ngangela, South-West Bantu, Angola/ Namibia; Bembe, West-Coastal Bantu, Congo), tonology, historical Bantu linguistics, comparative lexical and cultural studies, computation of Bantu lexicon and grammar
- EU1 - Name : Diewald, Gabriele
Institution : UH
Main Skills : grammaticalization, language change, evidentiality, discourse, mood and modality; diachronic stages of German; development of a diachronic research corpus of the German language from the Old High German period; languages: German, English, French

I. 7. NETWORK ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT (4 pages maximum)

Describe the network's organisation and the practical terms governing collaboration and interaction between the partners (meetings, newsletters, doctoral school, ...).

In each of the participating centers the partners are already working on the subprojects described, in environments that also employ or have employed young researchers, both at the predoctoral and the junior postdoctoral level. To the extent that we can now plan, the present project will also recruit at least half of the staff at the junior postdoctoral level, thereby increasing the chances of relatively fast high quality output. The project should therefore be said to enter the research themes *in medias res*, most strongly so for the research centers at UA, UG, KUL and UH. For UCL and RMCA, grammaticalization theory is a new perspective. For UCL, the project will be built on a solid tradition of Dutch-French contrastive pragmatic analysis of discourse particles. For RMCA, the background is one of Bantu historical morphosyntax, not so much for the benefit of grammaticalization theory, but for the internal classification of Bantu. For this team, the project is *the* opportunity for connecting its resources and potential to the wider Belgian linguistic context. This process will also be strengthened by the UA's intention to hire an Africanist with typological interests, as part of the strategy to fulfil the typological and Bantuist wide scale goals

Most teams already know each other quite well, and have collaborated/are collaborating already. For example: KUL-UA in Cuyckens et al. (2004) and in having cofinanced a postdoc (B. Cornillie) working on modality and evidentiality between 2004 and 2006; UA-UH with Smirnova & Mortelmans (2006); KUL-UG in a 'scientific research community' project funded by the National Science Fund – Flanders (2000-2004) on 'interpersonal and ideational grammar' and in the organization of the international conference 'From ideational to interpersonal: Perspectives from grammaticalization' (FITIGRA), 10-12 February 2005; UA-KUL-UH in the organization of a workshop on evidentiality at the 2006 Conference of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea* in Bremen; UA-KUL-UG in co-teaching several courses in the Flemish inter-university 'post-initial' research master program for linguistics and in the 2008 International Conference on Grammaticalization. Given the IAP opportunities, the overlapping packages and the shared interest in the cross-cutting general foci, this collaboration will easily intensify.

This intensification will take the following shape:

- Twice a year there will be a meeting of all of the project members, starting with the 'kick-off' meeting at the beginning of the first year. The point will be to present and plan on-going research. At most or all meetings guests from other research units (not part of the IAP-project) will also be invited. We envisage these meetings to be thematic but they will have room for the discussion of other relevant work as well. The three central foci of the project

will be the major themes of the meetings of the 2010-2011 period. They will also be central in the planning of the 2011 international conference.

- Given the geographical proximity of the Belgian partners and the positive experience of having shared a postdoc between the KUL and UA teams, we will institutionalize that each contracted researcher will spend at least one term (six months) at the institute of a relevant partner.
- The first major international action to be undertaken and already planned is the organization of the fourth International Conference on Grammaticalization in 2008. Already in 2005, the organization was entrusted to a consortium of the UA, KUL and UG partners.

Everyday communication between the partners will be maintained through the project's website, which will feature an information and news section (cf. the 'newsletter') and an online discussion forum. The web site will be set up immediately at the start of the project in 2007.

In terms of training, predoctoral collaborators will have to follow a number of selected courses. Nationally, they will have to enrol in a selection of advanced courses offered in the context of the Flemish inter-university 'post-initial' research master program for linguistics (taught in English). The actual choice of courses will depend on the specific tasks each individual researcher will have to perform in the context of the project. Most courses with immediate relevance for the project are actually taught by the promoters and some researchers involved in this project, including Cuyckens, De Mulder and Mortelmans on '*Usage-based approaches to language change*', Nuyts et al. on '*Comparing cognitive and functional theories*', and van der Auwera on '*Typology*'. Internationally, depending on the needs, they will be sent out to Summer or Winter Schools offering relevant courses (e.g. the Summer School of the Linguistic Society of America).

Otherwise, the predoctoral candidates follow normal initiation and maturation trajectories. By way of example, we sketch the 4 year trajectory of the predoctoral investigator to be contracted for WP6. *Mutatis mutandis*, comparable trajectories apply for personnel in the other work packages.

2007	01/2007-03/2007: <i>Literature survey</i> : focusing on the GRAMIS-questions within the domain of the English NP. Identify promising starting points and hypotheses as well as gaps. 4/2007-12/2007: <i>Case study 1</i> : (Inter-)subjectification and the grammaticalization of 'true'- and 'complete'-adjectives. In depth analysis of diachronic and synchronic corpus extractions on 'true'- and 'complete'-adjectives: compilation of representative samples of the various historical stages and the current usage of these adjectives; descriptive categorization and relative quantification of lexical versus grammaticalized/subjectified uses; reconstruction of specific mechanisms of change and hypotheses about general paths with reference to the (inter-)subjectification issue. Writing of two substantial
------	---

	articles on (diachronic/synchronic) aspects of this study to be submitted to internationally refereed journals.
2008	<i>Case study 2:</i> (Inter-)subjectification and the grammaticalization of type nouns within the English NP. In depth analysis of diachronic and synchronic corpus extractions on main type nouns: compilation of representative samples of the various historical stages and the current usage of these nouns; descriptive categorization of lexical versus grammaticalized/subjectified uses (which will include settling the descriptive issue of the postdeterminer use of type nouns, which has remained undecided so far); relative quantification of these uses in all the stages; reconstruction of specific mechanisms of change and hypotheses about general paths with reference to the (inter-)subjectification issue. Writing of two substantial articles on (diachronic/synchronic) aspects of this study to be submitted to internationally refereed journals.
2009	<i>Case study 3:</i> Analogy and the grammaticalization of small size nouns. In depth analysis of diachronic corpus extractions on small size nouns: compilation of representative samples of the various historical stages; descriptive categorization and relative quantification of lexical versus grammaticalized/subjectified uses; confrontation with synchronic study by Brems et al (e.g. 2006) and formulation/verification of hypotheses about grammaticalization paths with reference to the issues of frequency and analogy. Writing of one substantial article on (mainly diachronic) aspects of this study to be submitted to an internationally refereed journal. 07/2009-12/2009: Taking stock of the patterns emerging from the three case studies. Blocking out general structure and start writing doctoral dissertation.
2010	Addressing remaining descriptive issues (including possible additional analyses), continuing and completing writing of dissertation.
2011	Defence of doctoral dissertation. Preparing the thesis for publication. Embark on spin-off topics.

The network coordinator, Johan van der Auwera, can be trusted with sufficient scientific management experience. To support this claim the following elements of his CV may be highlighted:

Most important project management experience:

- He was involved in the planning of the EURO TYP project ('Typology of the languages of Europe'), funded by the European Science Foundation (1990-1995). He was a member of the core group of the full project, and he was responsible for one of the ten working groups. The latter involved the collaboration of at least 50 linguists, at various levels of intensity, and its most important direct and collaborative result is the nearly 900 page 1998 volume *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe* (van der Auwera 1988).
- From 2001 to 2003 he was the Flemish coordinator of the Flemish Dutch dialect syntax project, which involved the collaboration of some 20 linguists, again at various levels of involvement. The most important direct collaborative publication is a 2 volume Atlas set, appearing in both Dutch and English, published by Amsterdam University Press (Barbiers 2005).
- Together with J. Nuyts and T. Mortelmans he was responsible for a 'concerted research action', a four year project (2002-2006) funded by the research council of the University of Antwerp, focussing on modality and mood and involving one postdoctoral and 2 predoctoral researchers.

Most important other managerial experience:

- He is the founding secretary-treasurer (later elected) of the Association for Linguistic Typology (since 1994).
- He has been the President of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea* (2005) and is currently the Vice-President.
- He is editor in chief of *Linguistics* since 2005.
- Since 2000 he is a member of the Flemish expert committee on language and literature (chair since 2006) of the National Science Fund – Flanders, and a member of the Flemish-Dutch expert committee on Dutch language, literature and history (vice-chair for 2007).

References

- Barbiers, S. et al. (2005). *Syntactische atlas of the Dutch dialects, Volume 1*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Brems, L., C. Bicler, J. Boonen & R. Pertz (2006). The grammaticalization of small size nouns. Paper presented at ICAME 27, Helsinki.
- Cuykens, H., W. De Mulder & T. Mortelmans (eds., 2005). *Adpositions of movement*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Smirnova, E. & T. Mortelmans (2006). The status of *würde* + infinitive as a grounding predication. Paper presented at the 2006 spring meeting of Belgian Linguistics Association,
- van der Auwera, J. with D. P. Ó Baoill (ed., 1998). *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

I. 8. RE-ORGANISATION OF THE PROJECT (maximum 3 pages)

To be completed only if the initial proposal has to be adapted as a result of the selection outcome. If this implies changes in the composition of the network and/or the budget, it may be that it is not longer possible to pursue (achieve) the originally proposed objectives.

In this case, describe and clarify the re-organisation of the project compared to the initial proposal.

I. 9. BUDGET (global distribution per partner for the 5 years)

(in EURO, without decimals)

The detailed distribution per partner is given in Section II

	Name Partner	Institution	Budget
P1	van der Auwera, Johan	UA	805.000
P2	Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie	UG	400.000
P3	Cuyckens, Hubert	KUL	400.000
P4	Degand, Liesbeth	UCL	400.000
P5	Maniacky, Jacky	RMCA	400.000
P6			
P7			
P8			
P9			
P10			
P11			
P12			
P13			
EU1*	Diewald, Gabriele	UH	97.250
EU2*			
EU3*			
EU4*			
TOTAL BUDGET			2.502.250

* The budget for the EU-partner is the budget attributed by the IAP-programme only (without the 50% contribution of the EU-partner)

I. 10. PREVIOUS IAP-PHASES

To be completed only if the present network was funded during earlier phases of the IAP programme.

Mention the earlier phases of the IAP programme (I, II, III, IV, or V) and the titles of projects in which the partners of the present network has participated.
