

**IAP Phase VI****Project Nr P6/44****Report for 2007****Table of contents**

0. Preliminary remark	1
1. Description of the research	1
WP1: Modality	2
WP2: Evidentiality	6
WP3: Mood	8
WP4: Discourse	9
WP5: Complementation	13
WP6: Nominal modification	15
WP7: Theoretical implications	18
Appendix	20
Publications submitted	20
Preprints	21
Co-publications submitted	21
2. Network organization and operation	21
3. Publications	25
a. Publications by team	25
b. Co-publications	27

0. Preliminary remark

GRAMIS unites forces of teams from the Universities of Antwerp ('UA'), Ghent ('UG'), Leuven, Louvain-la-Neuve ('UCL' for 'Université Catholique de Louvain'), Hanover and the Africa Museum of Tervuren. In 2007 the project was launched. Each partner took special care to advertise the project and to select the investigators. The latter entered the project at different times, many of them during the second part of the year (and some only in 2008). For this reason the report cannot present a full year's worth of scientific research and it focuses more on the work of the promoters and the associated linguists than of the people that were contracted. Some of this work obviously continues earlier, pre-IAP research, and it also announces work to be completed in 2009. Another consequence is that there are as yet few co-publications.

1. Description of the research

The project has seven work packages: modality, evidentiality, mood, discourse, complementation, nominal modification, and theoretical implications. There are also three cross-cutting foci: semantics, teleology and scope.

Bibliographical references concern both publications (listed in §3) and submitted work (listed in an appendix to §1).

WP1: Modality

Partners:	Antwerp:	Bex, Byloo, De Mulder, Fiuk, Gbegble, Harmes, Mortelmans, Nuyts, van der Auwera
	Ghent:	Simon-Vandenbergen
	Hanover:	Smirnova
	Leuven:	Cornillie, Van Linden
	Tervuren:	Devos, Maniacky

Typological:

Van der Auwera, Kehayov & Vittrant (in press) is a study of a grammaticalization process that is typical of the Circum-Baltic area as well as for Mainland Southeast Asia. It concerns the development of both possibility and necessity readings, non-epistemic as well as epistemic, for verbs that originally mean ‘get, acquire’. The modality is therefore called ‘acquisitive modality’. To a minor extent the phenomenon can be witnessed in English. To report on a permission, a speaker of English may choose the modals *can* and *may*, but there is also the verb *get* (e.g. *I get to watch TV tonight*, instead of *I can/may watch TV tonight*). The paper mentioned studies this phenomenon in some detail, both for languages of the Circum-Baltic (North Germanic, Finnic, Baltic) and for Southeast Asia (Indo-Aryan, Sino-Tibetan, Mon-Khmer, Hmong-Mien, Tai-Kadai). Of particular interest is the IAP focus of teleology. The reason is that the development of acquisitive modals puts into the question the generally accepted hypothesis that within non-epistemic modality, when a marker has both participant-external and participant-internal meanings, the former develop from the latter (or, what very nearly also amounts to saying, in a different terminology, that when a marker has both deontic meanings and non-circumstantial dynamic ones, the former develop from the latter). Van der Auwera, Kehayov & Vittrant (in press) argue that the data warrant a revision of this hypothesis.

Within Bantu linguistics modality has hitherto not been a very popular research topic. The impression one gets from specialized literature as well as from more general typological studies is that the subjunctive plays a predominant role in the expression of modality in Bantu languages. An onomasiological study of the meanings of the subjunctive in Eastern Bantu languages has been embarked upon by M. Devos, a member of the Tervuren team, in the abstract ‘Optative or Subjunctive in Swahili?’, submitted to the Swahili Colloquium in Bayreuth (May 2008). It is assumed that the subjunctive in these languages has not generalized as a marker of subordination. The goal of the study is to link the different uses of the subjunctive in a grammaticalization chain and examine the processes that may relate one use to another. Of particular interest are the IAP foci of semantics and teleology. Regarding the latter, some preliminary observations question the generally accepted evolution from dynamic to deontic modality.

A possible grammaticalization process involving an auxiliary verb has been investigated by Jacky Maniacky. The functional dynamics of how postfinal pronominals came to encode such different functions as subject, cross-reference, relative clause status, or negation still remains largely unexplored. Focusing on negative structures, J. Maniacky showed (in a paper presented at the 2007 Conference on Bantu Languages in Göteborg) that although the use of the postfinal pronominal element is common in Bantu on the whole, several zones lack it.

This concerns mainly zones H, K and L. A reconstruction of these elements in Proto-Bantu would not be justified. Therefore Maniacky suggests that we should begin by mapping the use of the so-called 'negative postfinal' in Bantu languages (Carter, H. 1974 'Negative Structures in the Syntactic Tone-Phrasing System of Kongo'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 37, 29-40). The languages involved should be divided in at least two groups: (1) languages where the negative postfinal is an unbound morpheme equivalent to the anaphoric negative marker, and (2) languages using a different morpheme as negative postfinal. For the second group, he used examples found in languages of zone H to show that the postfinal morphemes may derive from a verb. His current research mainly concentrates on the anaphoric negative marker.

In depth:

On the language specific track, a group of researchers at UA has embarked upon a systematic empirical analysis of the diachronic evolution of a series of modal expressions in Dutch, in some cases also contrastively with comparable forms in other Germanic languages. The work concerns all three of IAP foci. More particularly, the purpose is to see to what extent the assumptions in the literature about the processes of (formal) grammaticalization and (semantic) (inter)subjectification can/should be supported, refined or modified in the light of the developmental patterns found in a (considerable part of a) complete modal system in one language (rather than in one or a few single forms of a language, as has been the common approach in the literature on the subject matter). There is a special focus on the (uni)directionality claim in both processes, as well as on the question of the correlation between both processes. The forms considered in the investigation are the modal auxiliaries *kunnen* 'can', *mogen* 'may' and *moeten* 'must', the past tense form of *zullen* (*zou*) 'shall (should)', a series of adverbial and/or adjectival forms (including *misschien* 'maybe', *waarschijnlijk* 'probably' and *zeker* 'certainly', as well as a few obsolete forms, and the full predicate *denken* 'think'. For each of these forms an in depth analysis is made of its structural and semantic properties, in 4 stages of Dutch, viz. Present-day Dutch, Early New Dutch, Early Middle Dutch and Old Dutch. This is done on the basis of a representative sample of instances (usually 200 per time slot per form; for Present-day Dutch often 400 instances are considered, 200 spoken and 200 written) drawn (according to various selection criteria such as geographical distribution, variation in text types, etc.) from texts (corpora) from each period. The previous year was mainly dedicated to the compilation of the corpora, the selection of the instances for further analysis, and the definition of the analytical categories. For some of the modal forms we have already started the actual analyses. A considerable part of this investigation will take the form of three PhD theses, supervised by J. Nuyts), and we have hired/attracted 3 young scholars for that purpose with hardly any experience in the fields of modality and of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification, hence these junior researchers have also spent a considerable part of last year getting acquainted with the literature on these matters.

This diachronic part of the research predominantly involves, next to supervisor Jan Nuyts, PhD researchers Ewa Fiuk and Liesbeth Bex, both full time employed at UA. In the course of 2007 this team has been joined by a PhD researcher from the University of Münster (employed by the latter, but also enrolled as a PhD student in Antwerp), Ingeborg Harmes, whose PhD project (co-supervised by A. Berteloot from Münster and J. Nuyts at Antwerp) is entirely situated within this part of the IAP research. One publication pertaining to this part of the project so far is Nuyts (in press a).

The UA team has also addressed a series of specific problematic aspects of modal meanings and their expressions, usually on the basis of Present-day Dutch corpus data only,

but in some cases also contrastively with other Germanic and Romance languages, in order to clarify the status of those meanings (relative to other modal and non-modal meanings), among others in terms of the ‘cline’ of (inter)subjectification. This includes:

- An analysis of the status of deontic modality, in relation to mood categories such as the imperative, among others on the basis of an investigation of the Dutch modals *moeten* ‘must’ and *mogen* ‘may’. Relevant publications are Nuyts, Byloo & Diepeveen (2007, subm.) and Nuyts (subm. c) - also with an eye towards a 2008 presentation in Paris (CNRS).
- A contrastive investigation of the strong epistemic adverbs *zeker* ‘certainly’ and *certainly*, which appear to have semantic properties which differ considerably from those of weaker adverbs, and which are potentially interesting for issues in the (inter)subjectification debates. See Byloo, Kastein & Nuyts (2007).
- The status of the notion of volition, on the basis of an investigation of the Dutch main verbs *hopen* ‘hope’ and *vrezen* ‘fear’. See Nuyts, Diepeveen & Byloo (2007), Nuyts (subm. c).
- A thorough corpus based investigation of the role of negation in the semantic domains of epistemic and deontic modality, and of its effects on the structural properties of a range of expressions of these categories in Dutch, English and French, including adjectival and adverbial *zeker* ‘certain(ly)’ and the adverb *certainement* ‘certainly’, the adverb *misschien* ‘maybe’, the mental state predicate *denken* ‘think’, the auxiliaries *moeten* ‘must’ and *devoir* ‘must’, adverbial *gelukkig* ‘fortunately’ and adjectival *goed* ‘good’. This is the subject of the PhD project of P. Byloo, supervised by J. Nuyts.

Mortelmans, Boye & van der Auwera (subm.) is a study which tries to establish the degree of grammaticalization of the ‘core’ modal verbs in four Germanic languages, German, Dutch, Danish and Norwegian, in comparison to the English modal verbs. Lehmann’s parameters of grammaticalization proved to be a helpful tool; at the same time, however, some of the differences found had to be traced back to individual properties of the languages themselves, rather than to general differences in the degree of grammaticalization as such.

Some work also involved English. Van der Auwera & Taeymans (subm) is a study of the development of both the polarity and the auxiliarity of the English *need* modals. In modern English these two properties are related. *Need* has both an auxiliary and a lexical verb use: the auxiliary has negative polarity, the lexical verb is polarity neutral. Based on corpus study, the main claims of the paper are that the lexical verb used to be negatively polar as well, and that it may now be ousting the auxiliary *need*. The issues concern two of the IAP foci, teleology and scope. Teleology is at stake, for the increasing frequency of lexical *need* vs. auxiliary *need* may be construed as degrammaticalization. The phenomenon also relates to the general IAP focus of scope, for the increasing frequency of lexical *need* is argued to crucially involve analogy as much as grammaticalization (the rise of lexical *need* is claimed to be happening ‘in analogy’ with the rise of the new class of so-called ‘emerging modals’).

A project also belonging to the 'in depth' component performed at UA, but with a clear typological bias, involves a systematic study of modal and evidential expressions in Ewe, and the patterns of semantic development and of grammaticalization in them. This is the subject of a separate PhD project (supervised by J. Nuyts), by the Ghanaese PhD student Nada Gbegble (full time employed at her home institution, the University of Winneba, but enrolled as a PhD student in Antwerp and full time present in the UA research group, for the entire duration of the IAP project). This researcher has only just started (in October 2007), and has so far spent most of her time getting acquainted with the international literature on the matter (there is none in/on Ewe so far), and starting the compilation of a corpus of data to be used in her investigation.

The development of modal adjectives is a concern of the Leuven team, where the adjectives *essential*, *crucial*, *important*, *proper*, *appropriate*, *fitting* are being investigated from the unidirectionality perspective. The study of the shift from lexical to grammatical usages of these adjectives is combined with the study of their grammaticalization patterns (cf. WP5) (see the conference presentation of Van Linden).

The UG team engaged in diachronic and contrastive research. Preceding research, e.g. by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (e.g. 2004, A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: The semantic field of expectation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1781-1805.) explained that certain discourse contexts can be seen as 'heteroglossically diverse' (White, P.R.R. 2003: Beyond modality and hedging: a dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23 (2). 259-284). Markers of (f)actuality indicate that, according to this framework, the speaker's stance either agrees or disagrees with the hearer's expectations, and can also explain the rhetorical, (inter)subjective uses that pragmatic markers fulfil. In this sense, a diachronic and contrastive study of the semantic-pragmatic development of various adverbs and markers of (f)actuality (e.g. *in fact*; *actually*; *en fait*, *de fait*, *au fait*; *actuellement*) offers a bridge between modality and discourse interpretation. A thorough mapping of different semantic-pragmatic features is therefore placed against the background of intersubjective positioning: Modal adverbs and pragmatic markers are interpreted as 'options' that can be applied in different rhetorical contexts.

Through diachronic research, the UG component set out to trace a set of selected markers in English and their cognates in French back to their historical origins. As a result, these markers could be placed on the actuality ~ factuality axis. In their respective evolutions, their initial sense of reality or truth was found to shift from (f)actuality and an emphasis on a semantic reference to reality, to a pragmatic means to indicate the speaker's conviction with regard to the reality or truth of his/her utterance.

Collaborative work united Hanover and Antwerp in Smirnova & Mortelmans (listed under presentations in §2) and Leuven and Antwerp in Cornillie, De Mulder, Van Hecke & Vermandere (subm.). The first paper presents a general overview of the division of labor between the different moods in German and the modal verbs. Also, special attention is paid to the question of how the semantic and pragmatic differences between German moods and modal verbs reflect different degrees of grounding. The second paper discusses the degree of grammaticalization of 'must' in Spanish, Italian, French and Romanian.

WP2: Evidentiality

Partners:	Antwerp:	Dendale, Gbegble
	Hanover:	Diewald, Jäger, Smirnova
	Leuven:	Cornillie
	Tervuren:	Devos

Typological

Evidentiality was an important element in the work of the Tervuren team. In the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (2005, Oxford University Press), Lega (D25) is mentioned as the only Bantu language with an evidential system, having both direct (visual) and indirect markers of evidentiality. Preliminary research by Maud Devos shows that the number of Bantu languages with indirect evidentials might actually be considerably higher. For example, Shangaci (P30) makes a distinction between a quotative marker and a marker of hearsay. Both evidentials are derived from a verb meaning ‘to say’.

In depth:

The Hanover team has been working on evidential markers in German since 2006 as part of the research project *Evidentialitätsmarker im Deutschen* (evidential markers in German) funded by Fritz Thyssen Stiftung. In the course of this project, which is primarily concerned with the empirical investigation of German verbal evidential periphrases, a diachronic corpus (KALI) of German is currently being compiled. At the moment the corpus contains texts from the Old High German and the Middle High German periods, which have been digitized, coded and morphologically annotated. Once completed, the digital corpus will cover all historical periods of the German language, allowing us not only to make quantitative assessments of given linguistic forms and structures, but also to interpret the texts qualitatively in certain linguistic contexts. The corpus design enables researchers and students alike to conduct empirical investigations of different processes of language change and grammaticalization and offers additional material for the study of WPs 1-4 to the IAP teams. Although still in the process of construction, the corpus is already available online (at <http://kali.uni-hannover.de>). Since the data compiled for and provided by KALI are needed for Hanover research on evidentiality, some Hanoverian researchers’ efforts still go into the corpus construction. T. Lehmberg, who is writing his PhD dissertation on semantic networks in diachronic corpora, has been involved in the technical aspects of this endeavor.

Hanover work also includes in depth analyses of the German evidential constructions *scheinen* ‘seem’, *drohen* ‘threaten’, *versprechen* ‘promise’, all followed by *zu* ‘to’ and the infinitive and of evidential *werden* ‘become’ followed by the infinitive. These studies are concerned both with the description of the present-day evidential system as a grammatical category in German and its diachronic development. This includes (among others) research into grammaticalization paths, relevant contexts, source constructions and questions of subjectification.

Diewald & Smirnova (in press) focuses on the development of the evidential readings of *drohen* ‘threaten’ and *versprechen* ‘promise’ in order to delineate the shape of the evidential paradigm as it is developing in German. In the course of the paper, Diewald & Smirnova (in press) propose that the four evidential constructions build a paradigm in Present-day German and represent different semantic values within the domain of indirect inferential evidentiality. Furthermore, it is suggested that there are two basic source constructions from which these inferential evidential meanings arise diachronically, one representing a successive relationship

between two events (mapped on a syntagmatic axis) and the other coding a simultaneous relationship between two events (mapped on a paradigmatic axis). This leads to the proposal of a schema which shows the relevant semantics of the source constructions for German inferential evidentials and sketches their common developmental path. Three successive diachronic stages in the grammaticalization of the German evidential verbal periphrasis are identified: from their lexical source via the intermediate stage of a construction with textually relational meaning towards the expression of inferential evidentiality. Thereby it is demonstrated that a common grammaticalization path with analogous stages for the German evidential constructions can be established.

One of the aims of language specific studies is the contrastive analysis of grammaticalization channels of evidential markers in various languages. To this end, several different approaches need to be taken. The German construction *werden* 'become' + infinitive and its equivalents in languages lacking a verb or linguistic unit comparable to German *werden* are of special evidential value in this regard. The compilation and comparison of results from the various languages researched by the different IAP teams will go a long way towards reaching the goal of identifying and analyzing cross-language grammaticalization channels of evidential markers.

Among the studies that take place with this purpose is the PhD project of Anne Jäger, who joined the Hanover team in October 2007. A. Jäger wrote her MA thesis (defended in September 2007) under supervision of Gabriele Diewald on infinitive constructions in Notker's writings with an emphasis on modals and tense and their characteristics in Old High German and Middle High German. A. Jäger has also been involved in the annotation and glossing of KALI texts from the start. Her PhD project (supervised by G. Diewald) is dedicated to the study of the grammaticalization of German non-finite and periphrastic constructions pertaining to the expression of evidentiality and will focus on semantic repercussions, thus contributing further to in depth research on WP2.

As a whole, the Hanover research into evidentiality often reaches into the realms of modality and mood. Therefore, it contributes not only to WP2, but also to WPs 1 and 3.

The research on evidentiality has also involved the Antwerp team. First, there is the work by N. Gbegble, reported in relation to WP1 (see above). Her work involves both modality and evidentiality. Second, evidentiality is also studied by Patrick Dendale. Thus, Dendale & Van Bogaert (in press) is an in depth investigation of several French lexical evidential and evidential-like markers, viz. *je trouve que* 'I think, I judge' (lit. 'I find (out)'), *j'ai l'impression que* 'I have the impression', *je pense que* 'I think', *je crois que* 'I think, I believe', *paraître* 'appear' and *sembler* 'seem'.

Evidentiality has been a concern of the Leuven team as well. In particular, Bert Cornillie's research has focused on the unidirectionality hypothesis and (inter)subjectivity as they manifest themselves in the domain of evidentiality. In his presentation at a conference in Gothenburg (see below) Cornillie investigates the relationship between source-evidentiality (the encoding of the source of the information) and evidential (inter)subjectivity (i.e. shared or non-shared access to the evidence described in terms of (inter)subjectivity or Self/Other). Cornillie (in press a) discusses both grammatical and lexical uses of Spanish *parecer*. Cornillie's approach differs from the one taken by Aikhenvald (2004, *Evidentiality*. Oxford UP.), who views evidentiality as an exclusively grammatical, obligatory category of a language. Although Aikhenvald's position has, at first sight, the advantage of being clear, her account seems to be based on a dichotomous view of grammar and lexicon, which contrasts with the idea argued for in the studies on grammaticalization of the last twenty years that they form a continuum. The alternative functional approach to evidential expressions used in this

research takes into account their *degree* of grammaticalization. It is argued on the basis of synchronic and diachronic evidence that an integrated account of both grammatical and lexical evidentiality can contribute to a better understanding of this functional domain as a whole. Cornillie (in press a) also discusses the relationship between evidentiality and (inter)subjectivity. Cornillie (in press b) discusses the grammaticalization and subjectification of Spanish *amenazar* ‘threaten’ and *prometer* ‘promise’

WP3: Mood

Partners: Antwerp: Idiatov, Schalley, van der Auwera, Van Olmen
Tervuren: Devos

Typological:

In the Antwerp team, Johan van der Auwera worked on the typology of the imperative and the prohibitive. The work primarily touched on the issues of semantics (the lexical sources of prohibitives) and scope (the role of analogy). From March to July basic typological work was with the aim of sketching how and why prohibitives differ from imperatives, and how both differ from negative and positive declaratives. Work that deals with this from the perspective of verbal aspect is reported on in Miestamo & van der Auwera (in press), and in Van Olmen & van der Auwera (in press). Studies that focus on first person plural imperatives (hortatives) are van der Auwera, Malchukov & Schalley (in press) and Van de Velde & van der Auwera (in press).

The work by van der Auwera is partially based on the ongoing PhD research by Ewa Schalley. Her typological study of the imperative paradigms, with special attention to the dimensions of person, gender and number, is scheduled to be defended in the course of 2008.

The work on the imperative has also led to work on interrogatives: Idiatov & van der Auwera (subm.) investigate whether the interrogative constructions of the Tucanoan family of South America have grammaticalized out of nominalizations.

The research on the prohibitive also involved the Tervuren team. M. Devos has started a typological study of prohibitive constructions in Bantu languages. Most Bantu languages have more than one way to express a prohibitive meaning and as in many other languages, the negative Imperative is seldom one of them. Devos’s research pays particular attention to lexical sources of specialized negative markers in prohibitive constructions. Next, preliminary observations show that when the negative subjunctive becomes to be primarily used as the prohibitive, it starts to take on some formal characteristics also typical of (affirmative) imperatives, which suggests that it becomes reanalyzed as the negative member of the imperative paradigm. Devos will report on this work at the conference *New Reflections on Grammaticalization* (Leuven, July 2008). Another member of the Tervuren team, Koen Bostoen, currently focuses on the descriptive and comparative study of some hitherto undescribed Bantu languages of the Western Province of Zambia (Kwamashi, Fwe and Shanjo), with special attention to their tense, mood and aspect systems.

In depth:

Several studies of the in depth research reported in WP1 (see above) concern the relations between modal categories (most notably, deontic modality) and mood (especially the imperative).

Daniel Van Olmen has tested van der Auwera's typological findings on the prohibitive (see above) on English and Dutch material. Some type of special marking of the negative imperative is argued to be attested as a by-product of the Jespersen's cycle in Old English, in the grammaticalization of *do not you* > *don't you* > *dontcha*, and in the strong correlation of negation with the imperative infinitive in contemporary Dutch. Further, in contrast to what the lexical origins of prohibitive markers in the languages of the world suggest, retrospective prohibition (prohibiting what is going on) has been found to be less frequent than prospective prohibition (prohibited a future event) in Dutch and English. Van Olmen (subm.) explains these results in terms of politeness theory and informational redundancy. An investigation of the rise of discourse markers out of imperatives of perception in English and Dutch and of their present-day use in the two languages has also been embarked upon. This research pertains to the debate of lexicalization vs. pragmaticalization vs. grammaticalization.

Elena Smirnova, continuing on earlier work (published in *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* (2007)), works on the hypothesis that in German *würde* 'would' (in combination with the infinitive) has become a marker of the grammatical category of mood. This hypothesis is supported by the results of Smirnova's diachronic study of the construction *würde* 'would' + infinitive – from its earliest occurrences in the Middle High German period to its diverse uses in Modern German. Although most contexts still allow more than one reading of this construction (which strongly suggests that the process of its grammaticalization is still going on), Smirnova clearly identified one specific grammaticalization path. It begins with the lexical unit *werden* 'become' and has led to the emergence of the grammatical construction *würde* + infinitive with a strong reading of preterit subjunctive. Smirnova argues that *würde* + infinitive has reached a state that puts it in a direct functional and semantic adjacency to the category of the past subjunctive mood.

WP4: Discourse

Partners: Ghent: Defour, Dhondt, Simon-Vandenberghe, Willems
Hanover: Diewald, Kresic, Smirnova
Louvain-l-N: Degand, Fagard, Mortier
Tervuren: Maniacky

In depth:

The Hanover research into discourse particles mostly concentrates on the specific role of the German modal particles as a grammatical category between conjunctive/connective elements on one hand and true discourse markers on the other. The work includes the study of the diachronic development of the grammatical category of modal particles in German and allows a contrastive perspective of realization of the function of modal particles in German and other languages. In doing so, grammaticalization paths of modal particles, the contexts involved, the source constructions and questions of subjectification also come into focus.

Diewald, Kresic & Smirnova (subm.) is a paper concerned with the grammaticalization of German evidentials and modal particles (thus relevant to both WPs 4 and 2). In Present-day German these linguistic elements are still involved in the process of grammaticalization. However, evidentials as well as modal particles may be considered grammatical markers of two different grammatical categories, since they exhibit the reinterpretation of their basic relational structure, show a high degree of grammaticalization, serve as means for expressing different grammatical contents, and build paradigms. Starting point of this work is the assumption that in their development these elements follow general tendencies and clines

established in grammaticalization theory. Taking this into consideration, similarities and differences in the diachronic development of German evidentials and modal particles may be generalized into a specific grammaticalization channel for each category. In doing so, the authors establish two new grammaticalization paths which have not yet been investigated for German and shed light on the relation between evidentiality and modality.

The aim of the UCL team is to conduct in depth and broad-scope analyses for a wide variety of markers, including markers of causality (Dutch *want* 'for', *aangezien* 'because' *omdat* 'because' etc. and their French, Italian and Spanish equivalents) and contrast (*eigenlijk* 'in fact', *alleen* 'only', *terwijl* 'while' etc. and their French equivalents). The ongoing analyses of discourse markers in the causal and contrastive domains make use of a wide variety of corpus material, including historical data (French: 11th-20th century, Italian and Spanish: 12th-13th century, Dutch: 13th-20th century), translation corpora (French->Dutch and Dutch->French), comparable corpora and spoken material (Dutch: Corpus Gesproken Nederlands; French: Base de données Valibel; Italian: Badip). Such a combined approach seems to be crucial for the description of discourse markers, because of their strong polysemy, and allows us to establish detailed and in depth profiles for each marker. These methodological issues are at the heart of a paper Degand, Evers-Vermeul, Fagard & Mortier, to be presented at the conference *New Reflections on Grammaticalization* (Leuven, July 2008).

The contrastive (French-Dutch) perspective has the additional benefit of revealing cross-linguistic differences which may be significant not only on a typological level but also as far as pragmatic-semantic meaning is concerned. Finally, the historical perspective helps us to understand the current shape and meaning of discourse markers and to explain them against the background of grammaticalization (and (inter)subjectification).

In 2007, the UCL team has been mainly concerned with operationalizing the theoretical, empirical and methodological principles of the project outline. Three lines of research prevail. The first concerns the role of speech in language development in general, and grammaticalization in particular. Systematic synchronic studies of discourse markers in speech and writing (min. 100 occurrences per marker) should tell us whether the semantic distribution of these markers varies with respect to mode or not. If they do, we hypothesize an ongoing development, which gives rise to the second line of research, namely a diachronic analysis in order to confirm this development (min. 100 occurrences of the marker per century), and postulate a number of semantic paths of change. The validity of these semantic paths of change is tested through cross-linguistic analysis, both synchronically and diachronically, in comparable and parallel (i.e. translation) corpora, which builds the third line of research. One post-doctoral researcher, Liesbeth Mortier, was attracted to conduct (primarily) synchronic analyses on discourse markers, using translation, spoken and comparable data, and to further the reflection on grammaticalization/(inter)subjectification and its relevance for discourse markers. She started working on the project in June 2007. Benjamin Fagard was hired for his expertise in diachronic analyses of Romance languages. He started working with the team in September 2007 and will be with the project for one year. So far his work has concentrated on causal discourse markers *car* 'for' and *parce que* 'because' in French (see the planned presentations at future conferences - see below) and similar markers in Spanish and Italian (Fagard 2008), and on the evolution of French *alors* from temporal adverbial to conditional and speech-act uses (conference presentations mentioned above, also *Diachro4* (Madrid, October 2008)). On a methodological level of analysis, many efforts were invested in the assembling and operationalizing of the corpus material.

Work in progress concerns the following aspects:

- A pilot study was conducted for the French marker *en fait* ‘in fact’, which turned out to have *eigenlijk* as its closest equivalent in Dutch, rather than the formally more similar *in feite*. This raises interesting questions about the grammaticalization paths of the two markers. These questions will be discussed by Mortier & Fagard at the conference *Languages in Contrast - Grammar, Translation, Corpora* (Bologna, September 2008).
- A diachronic study of *car*, *parce que* and *puisque* has shown a clear subjectification path for *parce que* going hand in hand with a frequency decline of *car*.
- An in depth study of the decline of *car* in Modern (spoken) French has shown that this decline is not due to the rise of subjective *parce que*. Instead, it is the rise of *parce que* that is due to the decline of *car* (Fagard & Degand’s presentation at the *Conférence mondiale de linguistique française* (July 2008)
- Degand & Fagard (2008) tackles the relationship between syntactic position and semantic distribution of *alors* ‘then’ both in writing and in speech in modern data, and in diachronic data. We argue that the meaning of *alors* is strongly related to the syntactic position it takes in the sentence/utterance.
- In a presentation planned for the *International Conference of Contrastive Linguistics* (Leuven, July 2008) Fagard and Degand tackle the issue of variation in speech and writing on the example of *alors*. A diachronic analysis shows a decrease in the temporal use of *alors* in favour of its conditional and causal uses in line with Traugott’s cline from temporal to causal, while the spoken data show a predominance of metadiscursive use. The question at stake is whether this metadiscursive use can be seen as ongoing intersubjectification.

In the Tervuren group work has started on the grammaticalization of focus constructions in Bantu languages. Heine & Reh (1983. ‘Diachronic Observations on Completive Focus Marking in Some African Languages’, *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 5: 7-44) make a distinction between weakly and strongly grammaticalized systems in African languages, both traceable to cleft constructions. In weakly grammaticalized systems the in-focus part shows resemblance to identificational constructions, while the out-of-focus part resembles relative clauses. Preliminary observations show that in some Bantu languages the in-focus part is clearly derived from an identificational construction but the out-of-focus part shows no resemblance at all to relative clauses. The ongoing work will be reported on at the *Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (Georgia April 2009) and the conference *Syntax of the World’s Languages III* (Berlin, September 2008).

The analyses of the UG team focus on two main components, i.e. a diachronic and contrastive component. A first stage of their research involves tracing the historical evolution of individual markers from the semantic field of (f)actuality, both for English forms (*in fact*, *actually*) and their French cognates (*en fait*, *de fait*, *au fait*, *actuellement*). By means of a formal and functional classification, the semantic-pragmatic stages in the evolution of diverse markers is traced on the basis of a number of historical corpus collections. For the English part, this includes the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC), the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (CEECS), the *Corpus of English Dialogues* (CED) and the *Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (Extended Version)* (CLMETEV). The latter is a historical corpus developed by the Leuven research team. The French cognates are traced in the *Base Textes de Français Ancien*, the *Base textuelle du Moyen Français*, *Frantext* (i.e. the diachronic version)

and finally the *Corpus Le Monde* (which is synchronic). Because the boundaries between semantic and pragmatic meanings of individual adverbs of (f)actuality are not always clear-cut, a formal and functional basis is taken up as the foundation for a further semantic-pragmatic classification. The origins of various adverbs of (f)actuality have been traced back to their earliest occurrences in the different historical corpora. For each adverb, structural features (e.g. sentence position; structural collocations (e.g. contrast words)) as well as semantic-pragmatic features (e.g. contextual indications and collocations, verb type fields, semantic-pragmatic meaning changes, and semantic references to truth, objectivity/subjectivity, agreement, empirical observations) have been taken into account for a further categorization when tracing historical layers of 'functional split'.

In October 2007, Tine Defour started working for the UG team as a post-doctoral researcher, mainly examining the diachronic development and synchronic multifunctionality of English markers of (f)actuality. Her PhD project (supervised by A.-M. Simon-Vandenberghe, defended in 2007) was dedicated to tracing the semantic-pragmatic development of a set of adverbs. A publication dealing with possible generalizations within the theories of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification is Defour, T. (in press). Another article by T. Defour, 'The development of interpersonal functions in the cases of *well* and *now*: semantic-pragmatic meanings within a theory of (inter)subjectification', and a joint article by T. Defour, A.-M. Simon-Vandenberghe and M. Van Herreweghe, 'A renewed look at the diachronic evolution of pragmatic markers *well* and *wella*, from the perspective of (inter)subjectification', are in preparation.

The second component of the UG research is contrastive. In order to establish a semantic map of notions of 'reality', 'truth' and '(f)actuality', a historical approach is complemented by a contrastive study of English and French cognates of a specific set of markers. To complement the lack of current research on the semantic and pragmatic relationships between different adverbs of (f)actuality, and between their different semantic-pragmatic meanings, the UG team aims to expand the semantic-pragmatic map by taking into consideration translation equivalents – which are semantically related – and contrastive similarities or differences in meaning and function between cognates in English and French.

It has become evident that the English adverbs/markers which were chosen as a starting point of the study (e.g. *actually*, *in fact*, *really*,...) and their French cognates (e.g. *actuellement*, *en fait* / *de fait* / *au fait*; *en effet*; *effectivement*;) *réellement*; *vraiment*) do not enter into a one-to-one relationship in terms of semantic-pragmatic meaning. For instance,

- The semantic-pragmatic meanings of English form *in fact* was found to correspond with different forms in French, i.e. *en fait*, *de fait*, / *au fait*, and *effectivement* each corresponding to a subset of the pragmatic meanings expressed by *in fact*. The differences in meaning of the French forms largely correspond to the different prepositions used. A shift in prepositional uses and semantic-pragmatic differences can be motivated historically. Results with regard to these counterparts will be presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference in Leuven, 16-19 July 2008.

- Ongoing research on the cognates *actually* and *actuellement*, to be completed by the beginning of 2008, showed that the English and French forms have similar semantic-pragmatic meanings up until c. 1700. From that period onwards, the development of the two cognates seems to split up (mainly pragmatic in English, mainly temporal in French). The results found for these counterparts are to be presented at the 5th International Contrastive Linguistics Conference in Leuven, 7-9 July 2008.

The contrastive study of English-French adverbial cognates is complemented by cross-linguistic research on French and Portuguese adverbials, and on indefinita in French and Portuguese. This double contrast creates the possibility to attest hypotheses of grammaticalization against the background of two different types of structural development, which forms the basis for the PhD-project of Ulrique D'Hondt, who started working for the IUAP project as a doctoral researcher in October 2007.

WP5: Complementation

Partners: Leuven: Cuyckens, Heyvaert, Van Linden

In depth:

As a result of a fairly lengthy hiring procedure (post-doctoral scholar within the framework of international mobility), the main investigator in this work package, Christopher Shank, was not able to start work until January 10, 2008. The work to be reported here is mainly preparatory research, carried out by the promoter and other Leuven team members who are not on the IAP-payroll.

Traditionally, grammaticalization is defined in terms of developments of (clusters of) morphemes. However, even Meillet's (in his seminal *L'évolution des formes grammaticales*, 1912) already hinted at a broader use of the term, also encompassing the development of grammatical structures in general. An important area of study within the broader definition of grammaticalization is clause combining, as suggested, for instance, in chapter 7 of Hopper & Traugott's *Grammaticalization* (Cambridge UP, 2003), where the following grammaticalization cline is hypothesized: parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination (2003: 177), i.e. from relatively loose adjoining to tight embedding. With regard to clausal complementation, then, this means that (i) clausal complement structures at the tighter end of the cline can be said to show increased coalescence or bondedness; (ii) the replacement of finite complement clauses (in a loose relationship with their matrix) by non-finite ones (in a tighter relationship with their matrix) can be viewed as an instance of decategorialization (and in particular, desententialization; cf. Lehmann's 1988 "Towards a typology of clause linkage"), and (iii) an increase of relative proportion of non-finite (more bonded) structures to finite-structures – when there is a choice of structures – can be seen as increasing obligatorification.

Against this background, Cuyckens & Heyvaert (Krakow conference, see below) investigate the distribution, from Early Modern English to Present-day English, of *that*-clauses and gerundive *-ing* complements with matrix predicates that can be used *factively* (*admit, agree, regret, resent, (be) sorry*) – this is a set of predicates that allows both *that*- and *-ing* clauses. It was found that over time, there is an increasing share of gerundive complements vs. *that*-clauses, and gerundive complementation has shifted from increasing *independence* (loose relationship with the matrix) up until LModE (marked by inclusion of subject, tense and voice marking) to growing dependence (tight relationship with the matrix, and marked by loss of explicit subject and secondary tense marking).

These results seem to bear out the directionality implicit in Hopper & Traugott's cline from looser complement structures to tighter complement structures. However, further research is necessary here, which will be carried out from 2008 onwards.

Underlying An Van Linden's work on the shifting distribution of *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives with adjectives expressing modality (see also WP2) is also the question of the shift from loosely bonded complement clauses (e.g. *that*-clause) to more tightly bonded complement clauses (*to*-infinitive).

More general issues with regard to grammaticalization research come to the fore in joint work by Hubert Cuyckens and Hendrik De Smet. They investigate the recruitment of an element from the matrix clause as subject of a non-finite clause, The change can be characterized in terms of a shift from a (semantic) control relationship between an NP in the matrix and a *to*-infinitive to a subject-predicate relationship, as in (1) and (2):

- (1) a. Window locks can make it extremely difficult *for the thief to break in*.
- b. In these cases it is wise for patients to be taken to casualty first.
- (2) a. Of course I knew I could depend on Mrs Reardon to show them kindness in that way.
- b. But can I count on your software to do everything you claim it will?

In as far as the change gives rise to a new abstract category – and this is especially clear in (1), with the subject marker *for* – it presents us with several of the characteristics of grammaticalization, including at least bleaching and decategorialization. More generally, what appears from this research is that grammaticalization-like change (as seen in (1)) can be broken down into smaller mechanisms, highly sensitive to the specific linguistic patterns available in a language at a given time (cf. Fischer 2007, *Morphosyntactic change*, OUP), and firmly based in the usage-based approach, involving analogy and gradual semantic change.

The research carried out by the main investigator in WP5, Christopher Shank, will initially focus on the cognition/mental processing/and epistemically expressive verbs set of complement-taking verbs such as *feel, know, believe, guess, understand, realize*. The research will start off with a diachronic analysis of the complement-taking verb *feel*: the historical data will be used to explore the diachronic progression of *feel* and to trace its grammaticalization path into its current state as a verb of perception/cognition/mental processing and epistemicity. Second, the role of complementation will also form an important part of this research: (i) the types of complement clauses and clause types utilized in the diachronically emerging senses of *feel* will have to be accounted for; (ii) by working from the current slate of complementizers that appeared in various historical corpora (e.g. *like, that, as if, as though*), the historical progression and frequency of complementizers in *feel*-constructions will be examined. Finally, the diachronic study will be used to further illuminate the contribution that subjectification and intersubjectification play in grammaticalization processes.

The goal of this initial research is to develop a framework in which to investigate the diachronic development, complementization patterns and grammaticalization of other cognition/mental processing/and epistemically expressive verbs such as *know, believe, guess, understand, realize*. One of the primary goals would be to explore the historical processes that have allowed these epistemically expressive verbs to be perceived and analyzed as a constituent or ‘unit’ (in Bybee’s sense) in present-day English. This research should allow looking at the similarities, the differences, and to explore the role that analogy has played in their respective developments. Finally, this research will allow addressing the question why the aforementioned appear to be less grammaticalized than the patterns seen in the primary mental processing verb *think*?

WP6: Nominal modification

Partners: Leuven: Breban, Brems, Davidse, Ghesquière, Van Rompaey
Tervuren: Maniacky

Typological:

In Tervuren, Maniacky has been surveying the so-called ‘tone case’ languages. Going through old and newly available descriptions enabled him to collect enough data to bridge the gaps in areas suspected to have tone cases or remnants of them. He is now framing the hypothesis that tone case languages are found in (South-)West Bantu, a geographical grouping which has already been assumed not to be accidental (Blanchon J.A. 1998. ‘Semantic/Pragmatic Conditions on Tonology of the Kongo Noun Phrase: a diachronic Hypothesis, In L.M. Hyman. & C. W. Kisseberth (eds), *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Tone*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1-32). Taking into account the interesting fact that case marking by means of tone is certainly related to the high tone left by an ancient augment (the augment itself is believed to come from a demonstrative), research focuses now on the diachronic approach to the problem by analyzing the situation in the periphery. The Bantu subgroup K10, for instance, reveals a kind of South/Eastern border for the phenomenon investigated. The region around the whole delimited area is taken into account for the diachronic approach, as it shows a fossilized situation of ‘tone case’ languages more often than just languages without such a supra-segmental function. K. Bostoen is currently studying the nominal tone system of some of these presumably peripheral tone case languages from the Western Province of Zambia, i.e., Kwamashi, Fwe and Shanjo.

In depth:

The work on the grammaticalization and the (inter-)subjectification of elements of the English NP at KULeuven is coordinated by Kristin Davidse. She has been, or currently is, the supervisor of all the doctoral research projects referred to in this section of the report. Care was taken to direct the synchronic-diachronic research on the English NP, which has been the topic of projects and doctorates for a number of years already, to questions central to the IAP. Thus, in 2007, postdoc Tine Breban and doctoral student Lieselotte Brems (doctoral degree awarded on 20/12/2007) consciously turned their attention to research questions of the IAP. Tine Breban’s postdoctoral project is concerned with the ‘deictification’ of adjectives into secondary and/or primary deictics, while Lieselotte Brems’s doctoral research investigated the synchronic layering of lexical versus grammaticalized uses of size and type nouns. In July 2007, Lobke Ghesquière was appointed on the IAP-project as a four year doctoral bursary; she will investigate the directionality and the underlying formal and conceptual mechanisms of the development by certain sets of adjectives of both subjective and intersubjective deictified uses. In October 2007, Tinne Van Rompaey started work as a FLOF-bursary; the topic of her doctoral research is the two-step development from lexical nouns to complex prepositions, and from complex prepositions to aspectual markers (Van Rompaey, Pijls & Davidse 2007). Finally, in January 2008, Sigi Vandewinkel was appointed on the IAP-project for one year; he will investigate the development of the various types of intensifying uses of adjectives and adverbs in the English NP and has submitted an application for a doctoral grant with the FWO in the hope of continuing with this research when his IAP-financing runs out. In the first year, the main focus of the IAP-work was descriptive and was focused most on the issue of directionality of (inter-)subjectification. The thinking here was that this general

hypothesis has to be looked at in terms of maximally varied and representative case studies. Through in depth diachronic and/or synchronic corpus study of various constituent elements of the NP, the team investigated whether the structural-semantic changes affecting these elements generally proceed along the unidirectional cline of (inter)subjectification as hypothesized by Traugott (2003, *From subjectification to intersubjectification*, Hickey (ed), *Motives for Language Change*, Cambridge: CUP). In addition, the team set out to verify Adamson's (2000, *A lovely little example*, Fischer et al. (eds), *Pathways of Change*, Amsterdam, Benjamins) hypothesis predicting that elements in the English NP will change meaning and shift function – occasionally also category - in a systematic right-to-left movement, from objective to subjective to intersubjective. The following articles - either in press, forthcoming or submitted - study these issues

- diachronically for adjectives such as *various*, *sundry*, *several*, *different*, which developed secondary deictic and quantifier uses (Breban In press a)
- diachronically for the adjectives of completeness *whole*, *complete*, *total* (Ghesquière 2007 and in press)
- diachronically for the specificity adjectives *particular* and *specific* (Ghesquière 2008 and subm.)
- diachronically for *pure* (Vandewinkel & Davidse 2008)
- synchronically for the type nouns *sort*, *kind*, *type* (Davidse, Brems & De Smedt 2008)

Directionality of (inter-)subjectification in the English NP is also central to the following congress presentations (see below):

- diachronic study of all the subjective uses of *very*
- synchronic study of *true*, *real*, *pure*, *mere*, *awesome*
- diachronic study of the various emphasizing uses of *very*, *mere*, *bloody*
- survey of (inter)subjectification and leftward movement in the English noun phrase
- diachronic study of the type nouns *sort*, *kind*, *type* (Brems & Davidse, *Postgraduate conference in English Linguistics*, Santiago de Compostela, May 2008)

While these studies confirm the (inter-)subjective teleology and concomitant leftward movement as a general tendency, they also reveal a number of (possible) counterexamples. Most notably, completeness and specificity adjectives (as studied by Ghesquière) first develop secondary deictic uses, which are viewed as being intrinsically hearer-oriented, i.e. intersubjective. Postdeterminers, as in *the complete reign of Commodus*; *a certain/particular student*, are added as “devices by which speakers take responsibility for success in communication and seek to meet the hearer’s attempts to integrate new information with information that is already accessible” (Blakemore 1990:364, quoted in Traugott 1995:45, *Subjectification in grammaticalisation*, Stein et al. (eds), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, Cambridge: CUP). By their choice of determiners, speakers negotiate the correct identification of discourse referents by (over-)hearers. These secondary deictic uses may then

lead, in a second step, to emphasizing uses such as *a complete knave*, *a particular problem*, which are expressive of speaker-stance. In a similar vein, Denison (2002, *History of the Sort of Construction Family*, Paper presented at the 2nd *International Conference on Construction Grammar*, Helsinki 2002) puts forth the hypothesis that type nouns first developed – intersubjective - postdeterminer uses, e.g. *these sort of skills like driving*, which later gave rise to subjective qualifying uses, e.g. *some type of baptism in booze*. This hypothesis is fully compatible with the synchronic layering observed by Davidse, Brems & De Smedt (2008), but still has to be validated by analysis and quantification of historical data (Brems & Davidse, 29th *International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English Conference*, Ascona, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 2008). In that the shift to secondary deictic meanings involves anchoring to the deictic centre of the general relation expressed by adjective or noun, it also involves lexical persistence. This means that the semantic shift from the lexically expressed objective relation is not very big, but rather a natural first extension, often involving semantic generalization. The next shift towards subjective meanings such as emphasizers and qualifiers involves more drastic changes of the original lexical semantics. In the case of the type nouns, the subjective qualifier meaning further leads via bleaching to intersubjective uses (expressing e.g. the speaker’s deference to the hearer or saving of hearer’s face). This is intersubjectification motivated by the speaker’s attention to the social self of the hearer, on which Traugott’s (forthc. (Inter)subjectivity and (Inter)subjectification: A Reassessment, Cuyckens et al. (eds) *(Inter)Subjectivity, (Inter)Subjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton) recent work has mainly focused and which does seem to take subjectified constructions as immediate input. However, we hold that the development of uses motivated by attention to the hearer as speech event participant, such as secondary deictification, which may develop straight from descriptive uses, also have to be accounted for in a theory of intersubjectification.

The more theoretical questions to do with (secondary) deictification as a hitherto largely neglected phenomenon of grammaticalization and (inter-)subjectification are dealt with in the following publications. Davidse, Breban and Van linden (in press) define the phenomenon of lexical adjectives acquiring the value of secondary deictics in analogy to lexical verbs becoming secondary (or semi-) auxiliaries. In case studies invoking the main deictic notions (spatial (*opposite*), identifying (*identical*), quantifying (*complete*), temporal (*old*), modal (*necessary*)), it is investigated how adjectives may become secondary deictics; the semantic mechanism involved is defined as the general relation depicted by the adjective acquiring a reference point in or related to the speech event. Breban (in press b) develops the specifics of the deictification process within the frame of Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991) in which the deictic centre is referred to as “the ground”. First, she discusses how adjectives become grounding elements, i.e. how their meaning becomes tied to the ground as reference point. Secondly, she argues that the thus established grounding relation can be construed with differing degrees of subjectivity (Langacker 1991, 2002) leading to a further classification of deictified adjectives into secondary grounding elements, which lexically supplement the primary deictic, *the old* “former” *prime minister*, and complex grounding predications constituted by primary + secondary deictic as integrated parts, *another man*. In the back-to-back presentations which Breban and Davidse will give at the international workshop on *The evolution of the English Noun Phrase* (April 2008, University of Sheffield), they will attempt to synthesize all the findings so far about the general paths “From descriptive to deictic and stance-taking meanings in the English NP”. Breban (subm.), finally, proposes that, besides Hopper’s ‘lexical persistence’, the principle of ‘constructional persistence’ has to be recognized. She bases her case on the schematic constructions of NP-external and NP-internal comparison, in which adjectives of comparison function differently in these in their lexical uses, and which define very different grammaticalization paths. The external comparison

construction leads to anaphoric and cataphoric postdeterminer uses, while the internal comparison construction leads to distributive postdeterminer and quantifier uses.

A second research question of the IAP, the place and precise understanding of analogy in the grammaticalization process, has so far been tackled mainly by Brems in her pre-IAP publication (Brems 2007, The grammaticalization of Small Size Nouns: Reconsidering frequency and analogy. *Journal of English Linguistics* 35 (4): 293-324), but she will develop this topic further, amongst others, in Brems (accepted). In a nutshell, her point is that simple analogy with structurally similar *a bit of* does not explain the grammaticalized status of infrequent small size nouns such as *a hint/whiff of*, (*not*) *a jot/trace of*, etc. More complex analogy models need to be envisaged, incorporating for instance also polarity sensitive *some/any* as functional analogues, to account for the polarity sensitivity, collocational and discursual restrictions manifested by the quantifier uses of infrequent small size nouns (*a bit of*, by contrast, is polarity neutral and is subject to few collocational and discursual restrictions). By incorporating the different levels of schematicity proposed by Traugott (2006, *Constructions and language change revisited*, Paper Düsseldorf 2006) of micro-, meso- and macro-constructions, it should be possible to account for the diachronic development of all small size nouns.

Research in the next years of the IAP-project will focus more on theoretical implications and possible modifications of or additions to the general grammaticalization framework, always basing these on maximally accurate and fine-grained descriptions of empirical phenomena of grammaticalization and (inter-)subjectification in the English NP.

WP7: Theoretical implications

Partners:	Antwerp:	Idiatov, Nuyts
	Ghent:	D'Hondt
	Hanover:	Diewald
	Louvain-l-N:	Degand

The UA team has been concerned with the theoretical context, especially of the process of (inter)subjectification. Subjectification can be related very directly to theories about the layered or hierarchical representation of qualificational (or TAM) dimensions in the functionalist literature. And intersubjectification taps into the issue of the relations between (the semantic cline of) qualificational categories and the position of all kinds of discursive and illocutionary notions in linguistic theories. Issues addressed in this context include: what is the precise nature of the semantic cline of subjectification, in terms of human cognition? how do interactive (and especially illocutionary) dimensions relate to this cline in terms of the cognitive processing underlying language use? how should all of this be implemented in a cognitively and functionally plausible model of language use? (Publications so far: Nuyts in press b, subm. a, b, c. - and preparation for talks in China in June 2008).

Idiatov (in press) examines the unidirectionality hypothesis and scrutinizes the notions of grammaticalization, de-, and especially, antigrammaticalization, as they have been defined and are being used in the literature. The notion of grammatical meaning, which is of paramount importance for any discussion on (de-, anti-)grammaticalization, is also addressed and a stricter definition of (anti)grammaticalization in terms of obligatoriness is proposed. Furthermore, it is argued that cases of alleged antigrammaticalization suggested in the literature, at best represent nothing more than an evolution from less to more morphological bonding. Therefore, such an evolution is best referred to as antimorphologization.

The Hanover team works towards a suitable notion of grammar for grammaticalization theory. Relations between ‘grammaticalization’ as a functional term and notions like ‘analogy’, ‘reanalysis’, ‘strengthening’ etc., which describe processes of change, are of particular interest here and in need of further clarification. The same applies to relations between subjectification, deictification, grammaticalization and the notion of grammatical category in grammaticalization theory. Elaboration of an abstract developmental scenario for evidentiality and modal particles and other elements which might be generalized to an abstract grammaticalization scenario also works to this end.

The UCL team is currently working on discourse markers as an illustration of the interface between grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification and is as such concerned with establishing diachronic as well as contrastive patterns typical of these markers in French and Dutch. These analyses should allow us to make assertions on the appropriateness of grammaticalization theory as a theoretical frame to explain the nature and development of discourse markers, and to adjust and complete the traditional inventories of grammaticalization parameters if and where necessary. More specifically, the relationship between grammaticalization, on the one hand, and (inter)subjectification, on the other hand, is a central focus of attention, given the non-propositional meaning of discourse markers which makes it difficult to describe them as ‘strictly’ grammatical terms and which has inspired some authors to consider them the outcome of a ‘pragmaticalization’ or ‘subjectification’ process, partly or entirely distinct from grammaticalization. Discourse markers thus pinpoint a number of more general issues with theoretical relevance: what is the relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization, and on a broader scale, how do pragmatics relate to semantics and grammar, respectively? Over the last 6 months, the UCL team engaged in a thorough analysis of the current literature on grammaticalization and discourse markers, with the intention of dressing up an adequate and operational definition of grammaticalization and the place of discourse markers in its realm. These discussions will have a first outlet at the conference *New Reflections on Grammaticalization 4* (July 2008, Leuven), during which we will organize a workshop in collaboration with the Ghent team specifically dedicated to the theoretical and methodological aspects of the relationship between grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification. The title of the workshop is: ‘Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization and/or (inter)Subjectification: Methodological issues for the study of discourse markers’.

Through different combined approaches in their research (i.e. diachronic ~ synchronic; contrastive English ~ French; contrastive French ~ Portuguese; contrastive adverbial developments ~ indefinita), the UG team hopes to provide a more clear-cut outline of the grammaticalization process. This research question forms the theoretical point of departure of the doctoral thesis by Ulrique D’Hondt (*Etude contrastive des phénomènes de grammaticalisation et de pragmatization de quelques indéfinis et marqueurs discursifs français et portugais*). In order to deal with this question, she will extend her subject of research by adding to the indefinite expressions adverbial expressions for both languages, i.e. French and Portuguese. This way, she will be able to examine the paths towards grammaticalization for two very different grammatical categories.

By taking a closer look at the nature of the grammaticalization process, the UG group wants to contribute to the discussion that deals with the generalization and delineation of grammaticalization features and historical clines, with the validity of hypotheses of unidirectionality, with the nature of the relationship between grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification, and with possible analogies in the developments of similar structures (diachronically and cross-linguistically).

Appendix

Publications submitted

- Breban, T. (subm.). 'Constructional persistence' in the grammaticalization of English adjectives of difference. *English Language and Linguistics*.
- Devos, M. (subm.). Modality and the Subjunctive in Shangaci. *Africana Linguistica*
- Diewald, G. (subm. a). Kontextfaktoren und der Abbau von Satzmodusrestriktionen bei der Grammatikalisierung der Modalpartikeln – mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung der Partikel *ruhig*. In: O. Letnes & H. Vater (eds.), *Modality*. Trier: wvt (Fokus).
- Diewald, G. (subm. b). Grammatikalisierung und Grammatikalisierungsforschung: Einführung und ausgewählte aktuelle Tendenzen. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*.
- Diewald, G. (subm. c). Die Funktion 'idiomatischer' Konstruktionen bei Grammatikalisierungsprozessen – illustriert am Beispiel der Modalpartikel *ruhig*. In: K. Fischer & A. Stefanowitsch (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik II: Von der Konstruktion zur Grammatik*. Tübingen. Stauffenburg.
- Diewald, G., M. Kresic & E. Smirnova (subm.). The grammaticalization channels of evidentials and modal particles in German: Integration in textual structures as a common feature. In: B. Fraser, K. Fischer & M-B. Mosegaard Hansen (eds.), *Studies in Pragmatics*.
- Ghesquière, L. (subm.). (Inter)subjectification and structural movement in the English NP: the adjectives of specificity. *Folia Linguistica*.
- Idiatov, D. & J. van der Auwera (subm.). From nominalizations to questions - evidence from Tucanoan. *Jezikoslovlje*, special issue to the memory of Dubravko Kučanda.
- Mortelmans, T. K. Boye & J. van der Auwera (subm.). Modals in the Germanic languages. In: Bj. Hansen & F. De Haan (eds.), *Modals in the languages of Europe*.
- Nuyts, J. (subm. a). Pattern vs. process concepts of grammar and mind: A cognitive functional perspective. *Jezikoslovlje*, special issue to the memory of Dubravko Kučanda.
- Nuyts, J. (subm. b). Pattern vs. process concepts of grammar and mind: A cognitive functional perspective. In: M. Brdar et al. (eds.), *Converging and diverging trends in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Nuyts, J. (subm. c). Qualificational and illocutionary meanings and the cognitive planning of language use. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*.
- Nuyts, J., P. Byloo & J. Diepeveen (subm.). On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: The case of Dutch 'mogen' and 'moeten'. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

van der Auwera, J. & M. Taeymans (subm.). The *need* modals and their polarity. In: M. Möbärg et al. (eds.), Book for Gothenburg University Press.

Van Olmen, D. (subm.). The retrospective prohibitive and strategies of avoidance. *Folia Linguistica*

Van Olmen, D. & T. Mortelmans (subm.). Movement futures in English and Dutch. A contrastive analysis of *be going to* and *gaan*. In: A. Tsangalidis & R. Facchinetti (eds.) Book for Lang.

Preprints:

Ghesquière, L. (2007) On the subjectification and intersubjectification paths followed by the adjectives of completeness. *Preprints of the Department of Linguistics* 265. Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven.

Ghesquière, L. (2008) (Inter)subjectification and structural movement in the English NP: The adjectives of specificity. *Preprints of the Department of Linguistics* 267. Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven.

Co-publications submitted

Cornillie, B., W. De Mulder, W., T. Van Hecke & D. Vermandere (subm.). Modals in the Romance languages. In: Bj. Hansen & F. De Haan (eds.), *Modals in the languages of Europe*.

Smirnova, E. & T. Mortelmans (subm.). Some remarks on the role of the reference point in the construal configuration of 'more' and 'less' grounding predications. In: F. Brisard (ed.), *Cognitive Approaches to Epistemic Modality, Tense and Aspect*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

2. Network organization and operation

As mentioned in §0, a very important activity of the first year was the selection of the collaborators. This process also had a component of freeing the new collaborators of earlier commitments or of integrating some of these in the new IAP project. As a result teams were typically set up in the second part of 2007 (and in one case completed only in 2008) and the exchange and interaction was minimal. Nevertheless, the groups *in statu nascendi* had intensive e-mail contact and June saw the launching of the project, during a one day meeting in Antwerp. Each partner presented a report on its plans, often with the help of the newly contracted or soon to be contracted investigators. A second planning meeting took place on November 12, this time only involving Antwerp and Tervuren, the two teams that will most strongly focus on typology. In the course of November, the website (<http://webh01.ua.ac.be/gramis/>) was launched.

Partners presented various aspects of the IAP research at conferences and meetings:

Members of individual teams:

Breban (et al.)

About nominal modification:

Breban, T. 'Constructional persistence' in the grammaticalization of English adjectives of difference, Workshop "What's New in Grammaticalization", Berlin, May 2007; 'Subjectification and leftward movement in the English noun phrase', 28th International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English Conference, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 2007; '(Inter)subjectification and leftward movement in the English noun phrase', SHEL 5 (5th Biennial Conference on Studies in the History of the English Language), Athens (Georgia), October 2007.

Breban, T., K. Davidse & S. Vandewinkel 'Adjectives and subjectivity: towards a comprehensive typology', ICLCE2 (2nd International Conference on the Linguistics of Contemporary English), Toulouse, July 2007.

Breban, T. and K. Davidse 'Subjectification and structural movement of prenominal adjectives in the English NP: a diachronic perspective', International Conference on 'Adjectives', Lille, September 2007.

Cornillie

About evidentiality: 'Source-evidentiality vs. evidential (inter)subjectivity. The case of Spanish *parecer* 'to seem'', International Pragmatics Conference, Gothenburg, July 2007.

Cuyckens et al.

About complementation: Cuyckens & De Smet 'From controller to subject: The emergence of new subjects in English non-finite clauses', SHEL 5 (5th Biennial Conference on Studies in the History of the English Language), Athens (Georgia), October 2007; Cuyckens & Heyvaert 'Finite and gerundive complementation: from Middle English till now: Semantics, variation and change', 10th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Krakow, July 2007.

Davidse

About nominal modification: 'Deictification', International workshop "What's New in Grammaticalization", Berlin, May 2007; (with the collaboration of P. Petré, K. Pijls, M. Vanden Eynde & T. Van Rompaey. 'The expression of aspectual meanings by grammaticalized prepositions'. Annual Conference Societas Linguistica Europaea, Joensuu, September 2007.

Degand & Fagard

About discourse marking: '(Inter)subjectification des connecteurs: le cas de *car, parce que et puisque*', Change and Variation in Romance, Porto, December 2007.

Diewald

About theoretical implications: 'On some problem areas in grammaticalization theory – and a suggestion how to tackle them', workshop 'What's new in grammaticalization', Berlin, May; 'Zu einigen Problemzonen der Grammatikalisierungsforschung', Linguistics colloquium, Bremen, June 2007.

Mortelmans

About Germanic modals: 'Modal verbs and mood as evidential markers in German and Dutch. A contrastive analysis', Annual Spring meeting of the Belgian Linguistics Circle, Ghent, April 2007; 'Grammatikalisierung der Modalverben im Westgermanischen: English, Deutsch und Niederländisch im Vergleich', Workshop Issues in Comparative Germanic Morphosyntax, Naples? May 2007.

Maniacky

About auxiliarization: '-*ko* & *co*: Negative postfinal morphemes and evidence of grammaticalization', International Conference on Bantu Languages, Gothenburg, October 2007.

Nuyts

About theoretical implications: 'Constructionist versus processual modales: what's the difference?' '10th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Krakow, July 2007: Constructions and processes', Annual conference of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Joensuu, September 2007.

Nuyts, Byloo & Diepeveen

About modality and mood: 'On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: The case of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*'. 2007 Semantics Colloquium, Nijmegen, June 2007.

Simon-Vandenberghe

About modality: *Almost certainly* and *most definitely*: degree modifiers and epistemic stance'. Lund, International Association of University Professors of English conference, August 2007 'Graduating modal certainty: adverbs in interaction'. 40th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Joensuu, September 2007.

van der Auwera

About acquisitive modality: 'Modality's map revisited', Guest lecture Princeton University, March; 'La modalité acquisitive' Workshop on modality, CNRS, Villejuif, March 2007; 'Modality's map revisited' 7th International Conference of Linguistic Typology, Paris, September 2007.

About mood and aspect 7th International Conference of Linguistic Typology, Paris, September 2007.

About negation and prohibitives: 'German as Standard Average European', Universität Bremen, Bremen, December 2007.

About imperatives and analogy : ‘Les conjugaisons dangereuses’, Société de Linguistique de Paris, Paris, December 2007.

Van linden

About modality: ‘Deontic-evaluative adjectives in extraposition constructions and their clausal complementation: A functional diachronic approach’ m 40th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Joensuu, September 2007.

About complementation: Van linden (with K. Davidse and Mieke Roselle) ‘The clausal complementation of *(it’s) important*’, 28th International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English Conference, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 2007.

Van Olmen

About the English prohibitive: ‘*Boy, dontcha you play with me.* The emergence of a prohibitive marker in English?’, 28th International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English Conference, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 2007.

About retrospective prohibitives: ‘Retrospective prohibitives: out of place in society and in context’, 2007 Conference Belgian Association of Anglicists in Higher Association, Liège, December 2007.

Van Rompaey et al.

About nominal modification: Van Rompaey, T., K. Pijls & K. Davidse, ‘*Be in the middle/midst of* versus *be in the process of*: source meaning and grammaticalization of complex prepositions into progressive markers’, Belgian Association of Anglicists in Higher Education, Liège, December 2007.

Members of different teams:

Mortelmans (Antwerp) and Smirnova (Hanover)

About German modality and mood: ‘The German modals as analytical moods’, 10th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Krakow, July 2007.

L. Degand (UCL) and A.-M. Simon-Vandenberghe (Ghent) will be convening a panel ‘Grammaticalisation, pragmaticalisation and/or (inter)subjectification: methodological issues for the study of discourse markers’. New Reflections on Grammaticalization 4. K.U. Leuven, 16-19 July 2008.

3. Publications

a. Publications by team

Antwerp

- Byloo, P., R. Kastein & J. Nuyts (2007). On 'certainly' and 'zeker'. In: M. Hannay & G. Steen (eds.), *Structural-functional studies in English grammar*, 35-57. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- De Mulder, W. T. Mortelmans & J. Mortelmans (eds.) (in press). *Cahiers Chronos 7*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Dendale, P, & J. Van Bogaert (in press). A semantic description of French lexical evidential markers and the classification of evidentials. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*.
- Idiatov, D. (in press). Antigrammaticalization, antimorphologization and the case of Tura. In E. Seoane, M. J. López-Couso & (in collaboration with) T. Fanego (eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Miestamo, M. & J. van der Auwera (in press). Negation and perfective vs. imperfective aspect. In: W. De Mulder, T. Mortelmans & J. Mortelmans (eds.), *Cahiers Chronos 7*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nuyts, J., P. Byloo & J. Diepeveen (2007). 'Mogen' en 'moeten' en de relaties tussen deontische modaliteit en modus. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 12: 153-174.
- Nuyts, J., J. Diepeveen & P. Byloo (2007). 'Hopen' is niet 'niet vrezen', 'vrezen' is niet 'niet hopen'. In: D. Sandra, R. Rymenans, P. Cuvelier, P. Van Petegem (eds.), *Tussen taal, spelling en onderwijs*, 101-112. Gent: Academia Press.
- Nuyts, J. (in press a). 'Kunnen' diachroon. *Taal en Tongval*.
- Nuyts J. (in press b). The 'one-commitment-per-clause' principle and the cognitive status of modality. *Linguistics*.
- van der Auwera J., P. Kehayov & A. Vittrant (in press). Modality's semantic map revisited: acquisitive modals. In: L. Hogeweg, H. De Hoop, & A. Malchukov (eds.), *Cross-linguistic Studies of Tense, Aspect, and Modality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van der Auwera, J., A. Malchukov & E. Schalley (in press). Thoughts on (im)perfective imperatives. In: J. Helmbrecht et al. (eds.), *Studies on grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Van de Velde, M. & J. van der Auwera (in press). Le marqueur de l'allocutif pluriel dans les langues bantu. In : F. Floricic (ed), *Essais de Linguistique Générale et de Typologie linguistique.*, Paris, Presses de l' École Normale Supérieure
- Van Olmen D. & J. van der Auwera (in press). *Ne chante pas* ou, tout simplement, *arrête?* Sur la fréquence des constructions prohibitives rétrospectives. [Festschrift for a Belgian colleague]

Ghent

Defour, T. (in press). The semantic-pragmatic development of *well* from the viewpoint of (inter)subjectification. In: H. Cuyckens, K. Davidse & L. Vandelanotte (eds), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton.

Simon-Vandenberghe, A.-M. (in press). *Almost certainly* and *most definitely*: degree modifiers and epistemic stance. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Willems, D. & Cl. Blanche-Benveniste (in press) Verbes 'faibles' et verbes à valeur épistémique en français parlé : *il me semble, il paraît, j'ai l'impression, on dirait, je dirais*. Proceedings of the International Congress of Romance Languages and Linguistics, Innsbruck, Sept. 2007

Hanover

Diewald, G. (in press). The catalytic function of constructional restrictions in grammaticalization. In: J. Helmbrecht et al. (eds.), *Studies on grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton.

Diewald, G. & A. Bergs (in press). Introduction: Constructions and Language Change. In: G. Diewald & A. Bergs (eds.), *Constructions and Language Change*. Berlin: Mouton.

Diewald, G. & E. Smirnova (in press). The German evidential constructions and their origins: a corpus based analysis. In: W. De Mulder, T. Mortelmans & J. Mortelmans (eds.), *Cahiers Chronos 7*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Leuven

Breban, T. (in press a). The grammaticalization and subjectification of English adjectives expressing difference into plurality/distributivity markers and quantifiers. *Folia Linguistica*.

Breban, T. (in press b). Deictification of the English adjectives of comparison. In S. Coulson (ed.), *Proceedings of CSDL 2006 (8th Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language: Language in Action), 3-5 November 2006, San Diego (CA)*. Stanford: CSLI publications.

Cornillie, B. (in press a). The difference between lexical and grammatical evidentiality. Evidence from Spanish. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*.

Cornillie (in press b). Subjectification or how to make pragmatics semantic. - The case of Spanish *amenazar* 'to threaten' and *prometer* 'to promise'. In K. Turner (ed.), *Making Semantics Pragmatic*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Davidse, K., T. Breban & A. Van linden. (in press). The deictification of adjectives: the development of postdeterminer meanings. *English Language and Linguistics*.

Davidse, K., L. Brems and L. De Smedt. (2008). Type noun uses in the English NP: a case of left-to-right layering. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 13:2: 139-168.

Ghesquière, L. (in press). On the (inter-)subjectification paths followed by the adjectives of completeness. In H. Cuyckens, K. Davidse & L. Vandelanotte (eds), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton.

Vandewinkel, S & K. Davidse (2008). The interlocking paths of development towards emphaziser adjective *pure*. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 9:2: 255-287.

Louvain-la-Neuve

Fagard B. (in press). L'analyse sur corpus ou comment renouveler la romanistique: une étude de cas, *Corpus*.

Tervuren

—

b. Co-publications

—