Judit Bihari

Approaches to the notion of grammaticalization*

Renata Szczepaniak's textbook, *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen (Grammaticalization of German)* aims to introduce the reader to the basics of grammaticalization and explain some of its representative examples from the German language. As an introductory work, the book provides a definition and overview of the grammaticalization theory, clearly utilizing many different approaches to the field of linguistics in question. It is an interesting task to investigate which approaches the author exemplifies and on the basis of which interpretations she constructs her definitions. Furthermore, from a metatheoretical point of view, it is also highly relevant, whether, how, and to what extent the diverse definitions and perspectives relate to, or differ from, each other, and how scholars bridge the gap between them. Due to the limits of the genre, I am not intending to answer all these questions comprehensively, but rather to raise and delineate them for the purpose of further research.

Regarding the history of grammaticalization, it is incorrectly assumed to be a young subfield of linguistics, even though its core ten-

ets date back to the 19ᵗʰ century. Nevertheless, modern linguistics is informed by this interpretation of language change since the 1970s, when Givón's famous slogan, "Today's morphology is yesterday's syntax." (Givón 1971: 12 in Narrog & Heine 2011:1) revolutionized the study of grammatical evolution (Narrog & Heine 2011: 1). Since then, manifold definitions have been offered for the term *grammaticalization* itself, as well as for the approach and its key points, some of which are represented in Szczepaniak's monograph. The central idea of the approach, as presented by the author, is the following: Grammaticalization attempts to account for language change by placing *change or shift in function and form* at the centre of attention. More precisely, lexical items – free morphemes with more or less concrete meaning and *denotative* function – gain a new function, namely the *relational* one, as items carrying grammatical information at an abstract level. At the same time, they gradually lose their status as free morphemes; thus, a change in function is accompanied by one in form. Of course, such a change does not come about overnight but over the course of centuries. Narrog and Heine point out that "grammaticalization is far from being a uniform concept, and various definitions have been proposed." They offer a twofold classification of these: on the one hand, ample approaches highlight the pragmatic functions of linguistic material and grammaticalization as a diachronic change which turns secondary discourse functions into primary ones. More general approaches, on the other hand, allow grammaticalization to cover anything relating to grammar, basically anything that has to do with bearing a certain function within a grammatical system. Furthermore, Narrog and Heine refer to the possibility of approaching phenomena within a synchronic framework of grammaticalization. Still, "[F]or most students of the field, grammaticalization is understood to be a diachronic process, and, hence, findings can be verified or falsified by means of historical evidence" (Narrog & Heine 2011: 2-3). Diewald takes an opposing viewpoint by claiming that grammaticalization, following from its research object as a panchronic phenomenon, is inevitably engaged in inquiring into matters of synchronic *and* diachronic character, and combining the two perspectives (Diewald 2008: 151). We might argue that whichever approach we take to the broad definition of grammaticalization, the *function of linguistic items* – or even a shift in function – will be an issue that must inevitably be dealt with. Since Szczepaniak's reading clearly focuses on the functional, pragmatic and diachronic

aspects of grammaticalization, we may conclude that she belongs to the majority of scholars Narrog and Heine refer to. As we will see later on, she does utilize historical material and puts a great emphasis on the shift in function of linguistic items.

Unlike some other scholars, Szczepaniak devotes her approach for the most part to the very process of grammaticalization. Presumably for the sake of simplicity, the author does not go into detail concerning the multiple possible readings of the very word *grammaticalization*. This contrasts with Lehmann, for instance, who directs his readers' attention to the possible misinterpretation of the term: the derivational pattern of the word grammaticalization might suggest that a grammaticalized item becomes grammatically more correct – which has nothing to do with the field of study in question. It should much rather be read as a notion referring to an item making its way from the lexicon to the grammar; to be part of the latter to a greater extent than other items (Lehmann 2002: 8). Hopper and Traugott point out that by *grammaticalization* they wish to refer to two distinct things, namely a *research framework* one the one hand, and *language phenomena*, for which this framework is intended to account, on the other. As a research framework, they grasp grammaticalization as an approach to language change, which seeks to explain how lexical items and constructions become able to serve grammatical purposes or how grammatical items gain new grammatical functions. As a language phenomenon, it denotes the process where items become more grammatical. As such, it is part of a wider framework of structuration, which allows combinations of forms to become fixed in particular functions with time (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 1). Hopper and Traugott's views on grammaticalization as a research framework are shared with Diewald, who also highlights that the point where grammaticalization differs from historical linguistics is its perspective: the continuity and flexibility of a grammatical system is the core principle of the field (Diewald 1997: 1).

Nonetheless, Szczepaniak does seem to utilize diverse ideas formulated by pioneers of the field. Lehmann, Hopper, Traugott or Heine & Kuteva apparently grasp the gist of grammaticalization from different perspectives, which Szczepaniak organizes and incorporates in her volume in a justifiable and well-motivated fashion. Lehmann's interpretation focuses on the gradual loss of autonomy of the grammaticalized sign both on the syntagmatic and on the paradigmatic level. He offers a set of parameters – taken over by Szczepaniak – as a

guideline to identify the grade of grammaticalization of an item. Hopper – who coined the notion of *emergent grammar*, claiming that discourse and grammar mutually shape each other in face-to-face interactions – underlines that grammar is by no means a rigid system, but much rather one in constant alternation and motion. Heine and Kuteva emphasize the significance of the interaction between pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic and phonetic factors within the process of grammaticalization. Traugott captures grammaticalization as a means of problem-solving employed by language-users in communication. In Traugott's view, language-users have recourse to two main strategies by problem-solving, namely metonymy and metaphor (Mroczynski 2012: 42-84). Szczepaniak, as the author of an introductory work, simplifies and unites the ideas of prominent scholars in the field, and employs them to account for phenomena present in the German language. We can suggest that her work contributes to the mainstream studies of grammaticalization; yet, it is original: firstly, because it is a textbook written *in German*, and secondly, because it comments on the grammaticalization phenomena *of the German language.* In what follows, I attempt to provide a brief summary of the book chapter by chapter.

A glimpse into the structure of the book is offered in the preface, where the author points out that the work is an introductory one. It is meant to be a textbook of grammaticalization of the German language at an entry-level, comprehensible if the reader is familiar with the elementary terminology of linguistics. Apart from the *Introduction*, where some basic linguistic concepts are clarified, the monograph consists of two main parts: *Concepts of grammaticalization* and *The most important grammaticalization-processes in German.* Both parts are further divided into chapters and subchapters.

The *Introduction* starts in an "in medias res" fashion, with a striking example of the very process of grammaticalization: '*haben*', an auxiliary verb that has its origins in a full verb. The difference between *function words* and *content words* is clarified in accordance with the idea of function-assignment: the former have a relational function, while the latter a denotative one. The author accounts for the components of language by using *the onion-model*, where phonological, morphological and syntactical features of language use are represented in the core, the lexicon between pragmatic knowledge and the core, and the extralinguistic reality at the skin. Szczepaniak relies on the definition of the pioneers of the approach by describing

grammaticalization as a process in which grammatical morphemes occur, develop and finally descend (pp. 5). In practice, it is either a lexical item that develops to carry grammatical information, or a grammatical morpheme that acquires an even more abstract meaning. The author exemplifies this with the phenomenon of '*bekommen-passive*' and other instances from diverse historic periods of German.

Part I, *Concepts of grammaticalization*, targets a precise description of the approach to language change at hand. Szczepaniak argues that the shift in function of the linguistic sign – from denotative to relational – is followed by a change in form. She supports her claim with the example of the verb '*tun*', claimed to be the root of the past tense suffix '-*te*'. The author highlights four processes responsible for the systematic change of function and form: *desemantisation*, *extension* of context, *decategorialization* and *reduction* of the phonetic substance. For a linguistic sign, going through grammaticalization means to switch from an open system of lexical items to a much more closed one, the system of grammatical signs. The very process in which this switch takes place, and in which a once free morpheme thus becomes conventionalized as a bound one, is a very complex one consisting of several phases. The author makes use of Lehmann's 1995 grammaticalization scale to represent these phases and the components of grammar in which they take place. As a first step, a content word from the discourse-component, the placement of which depends more or less entirely on the speaker's intentions, becomes syntactically bound to a sentence structure. This syntactically bound element is *morphologized* in the second phase, i.e. it loses its status as a free morpheme and thus becomes bound. In this long process, a *periphrase* develops: an intermediate stage between a free morpheme and an inflectional element, or even lexical collocations and a single morpheme (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 122). *Clitics* (bound appearances of a free grammatical morpheme, for instance *mit dem Fahrrad → [mɪm] Fahrrad*), results of *coalescence*, also appear in this first subphase of morphologization and may further develop to be *affixes*, fully bound morphemes. Affixes may further undergo *fusion* into *agglutinating affixes* showing a one-to-one correspondence between affix and syntactic function. In the course of *demorphemisation*, the third phase of grammaticalization, agglutinating affixes develop into *flexives* and, as such, become integrated in the stem, lose their function and, in the last phase of grammaticalization, disappear entirely.

It is obvious that the degree of grammaticalization of an item is in inverse proportion to its autonomy. To be able to give a more precise account of this, the author relies on Lehmann's three dimensions of the autonomy of linguistic signs: semantic and formal *weight*, *cohesion* and *variability* (Lehmann 1995: Chapter 4 in Szczepaniak 2011: 19). When a linguistic sign is grammaticalized, its weight is reduced, its cohesion is increased and its variability is, again, reduced. Together with the two dimensions of sign-usage, namely *paradigmatic* and *syntagmatic*, the dimensions of autonomy result in six parameters of grammaticalization: paradigmatic weight or *integrity* (in inverse proportion to the degree of grammaticalization), *structural scope* (the quantity of the construction in which the sign occurs), *paradigmatic cohesion* (the degree of the systematic and formal homogeneity of a paradigm), *syntagmatic cohesion* (the degree of fusion with other elements), *paradigmatic variability* (the degree to which an item can be substituted by others), and *syntagmatic variability* (the degree to which an element can be moved freely). The subprocesses of grammaticalization, as established by Lehmann, are represented in an expressive and detailed chart on pp. 23. These lead to an irreversible loss of semantic components; the development from a lexical item to a grammatical one takes only one direction. Thus, Szczepaniak highlights the *principle of unidirectionality*, which does not allow *degrammaticalization*. There are, however, ample examples of *lexicalization* which come about in diverse ways: *idiomatization* and *compounding*, *fossilization*, *development of derivational affixes* (although they are bound morphemes they possess lexical meanings) and *transformation* of grammatical morphemes into affixable words.

From the point of view of the speaker, Szczepaniak – in agreement with Traugott – explains grammaticalization as a solution to communicative problems: whenever a language lacks a construction, the *creativity* of the community bridges the gap with the help of two cognitive and, at the same time, communicative, strategies. Grammaticalization makes use of *conceptual metonymy* operating on the syntagmatic level on the one hand, and *categorical metaphor* operating on the paradigmatic level on the other. Conceptual metonymy, as defined by Panther and Thornburg 2004, is a non-necessary relation within one conceptual domain between a source meaning and a target meaning, in which the former provides mental access to the latter (Panther & Thornburg 2004: 1). The information conveyed by the target meaning is not solely its semantic meaning; it is enriched by the

hearer's intuitions about the speaker's intentions, i.e. conversational implicature. The author relies on the Gricean Cooperation Principle and its four maxims: that of quantity, quality, relevance and modality. Conversational implicature comes into existence if the maxims are flouted or violated. Furthermore, an implicature may well be conventionalized if it appears frequently enough. Thus, a new meaning of the item at hand occurs and may replace the old one entirely. Categorical metaphors are sense-relations conveying meaning based on similarity of form and function between the source and the target domain. Thus, concrete concepts, which are easier to grasp and process, may substitute abstract ones, or, in other words, more prototypical concepts may substitute less prototypical ones. Source items are usually basic-level terms, such as, for instance, parts of the human body, while target meanings can be represented on a scale from concrete to abstract: person – object – activity – space – time – quality.

Szczepaniak highlights two mechanisms of the grammaticalization process, namely *reanalysis* and *analogy*, both of which are based on the already described two cognitive strategies, metonymy and metaphor. Reanalysis, a semantic and structural reinterpretation of an ambiguous expression triggered by violation of the Gricean conversational maxims, is based on conceptual metonymy. It is the most important mechanism of grammaticalization; however, despite its being the very process that initiates enrichment of information content and thus changes in language use, it is invisible on the surface. It is analogy that brings about visible changes by extending the new usage patterns to new contexts till they become independent forms.

The author argues that due to the universal presence of these cognitive strategies and mechanisms, the channels of grammaticalization are very similar in the most divergent languages. In practice it means that the lexical items undergoing the process of grammaticalization are not picked in a random fashion; they are much more systematic: the lexical item is conceptually related to the abstract meaning it is about to stand for.

Part II of the book is devoted to the most important grammaticalization processes of the German language: negation, the NP, the VP and syntactic alternations. Due to limitations of space, not all the processes are summarized in this review.

Regarding negation, the author argues that since Old High German (OHG) the position, form and quantity of negation words have experienced significant changes. Concerning verbal negation, OHG

was a mononegative system having the negation word '*ni*' at its centre. In the passage of time from OHG to the present, a complete grammaticalization cycle (Jespersen-cycle) took place. From the OHG obligatory element '*ni*', a clitic developed, which turned into a new free morpheme in Middle German. From the combination of this free morpheme and the clitic ('ne…nich'), the clitic element disappeared, and thus the cycle resulted in today's sentence-level negation word, '*nicht*'. As for nominal negation, the variety of negation words capable of replacing a noun in a contemporary German sentence, are rooted in the OHG obligatory element '*ni*' as well. '*Ni*' already merged in the OHG period with indefinite pronouns into so-called n-indefinita, such as, for instance, '*nioman*', combining the meaning of their components. Thus, scholars argue that the development of n-indefinita is much rather a process of lexicalization than of grammaticalization.

Regarding grammaticalization in the noun phrase, Szczepaniak highlights the vicissitudes of the plural, the articles, the prepositions, and of the NP itself. The first subchapter is devoted to the development of the nine plural allomorphs in today's German. These came into existence by the reanalysis of existing grammatical morphemes already deprived of their original functions. The author exemplifies this grammaticalization process by the plural suffix '*-er*', which originates in the OHG syllable '*-ir*'. '*-ir*', as in '*lembiro*', was already in Germanic a functionless suffix of the stem, thus, in the OHG period it was erased in the singular forms, but kept in the plurals. The motivation of this process is not a phonological one, but much rather analogy, following the pattern of other inflectional classes, namely, stem + suffix. The reanalysed suffix '*-ir*' became productive and spread by substantives with neutral grammatical gender and by borrowings as well. It is, in today's form '-er', not productive any more. Now, since the Germanic '*-ir*' was itself a product of a grammaticalization process which lost its grammatical function with time and was loaded with another one just before it was to disappear, the question arises as to whether the development of the plural suffix under scrutiny is a grammaticalization process at all. In the author's view, it is much rather a *de*grammaticalization process, in which, opposing the principle of *unidirectionality*, the empty morpheme made its way into the grammar again. The process is defined as *exaptation*, i.e. refunctionalizing. If the plural of a noun is suffixed by '-er' and the stem vowel is capable of *Umlaut*, the vowel alternation takes place, meaning that the degree of cohesion between stem and suffix is high. An-

other degrammaticalization process can be observed by weak masculine nouns, which, unlike feminine ones, kept their historical suffix '-n'. In this case it was not the suffix that became grammatically loaded again. Quite the opposite: belonging to the class of nouns carrying the inflectional element is bound to the semantic criterion of being animate.

The next chapter is dedicated to the development of the definite and indefinite articles and thus that of the category of definiteness.

In the OHG period, German lacked articles. The information +/- *definite* had to be expressed at the syntactic level, by means of word-order (topic / comment structure: what is known is definite, what is unknown is indefinite), verbal aspect (perfective – definite / imperfective – indefinite), object case (accusative – definite / genitive – indefinite), position of the genitive attribute (prenominal – definite / post-nominal – indefinite), declension of the adjective (weak declension – definite / strong declension – indefinite) and by determiners. The definite article developed from the OHG deictic element '*ther*' ('dieser'). This process, having a *less grammatical* element instead of a lexical one as its starting point, is referred to as *secondary grammaticalization*. After its weakening as a demonstrative, the item took over the function of the definite article, and is now, as such, a bound morpheme on the one hand, and capable of fusion with other elements, for instance prepositions ('zu dem' → 'zum') on the other. During this process, the demonstrative gradually loses its ability to immediately refer to a single object, its so-called *pragmatic definiteness*. Parallel to this, its semantic usage contexts as a definite article gradually extend. An independent definite article may occur in abstract-situative usage and in associative-anaphoric usage. Szczepaniak provides a detailed description of how the German definite article witnessed this very process on pages 73-78.

It is obvious that with the occurrence of the opposition between referring to definite and indefinite objects, expressing indefiniteness also finds its way into everyday language use. The German indefinite article '*ein*' stems from the numeral '*eins*'. In the first place, the accent was shifted from pointing out the exact quantity, namely one, of the item referred to by the NP containing the numeral, to referring to *some* item of a class of similar things. In the next step, the element took over the real function of an indefinite article: from this point on it has been able to refer to things unknown to the listener. As a last phase, a so-called generic indefinite article developed by extending its

usage to referring to objects of the same class. Apart from the generic meaning, a predicative one (*Sie ist eine gute Lehrerin.*) and a non-specific meaning (*Ich suche einen Stift.*) arose in the Middle High German period. These latter grammaticalization processes are, however, not yet complete.

As for the capacity for syntactic cohesion of German articles, the author points out that a tendency towards the definite article fusing with prepositions can be clearly observed. Yet, this grammaticalization process – however long it has been in progress – has not yet been completed. Differences in meaning are not only to be found between cliticized and independent occurrences of the definite article, but even between usages of the cliticized form itself. For instance, a definite meaning is expressed by 'Sie geht *zur Schule*' referring to *one certain school*, while in 'Sie geht gern *zur Ausstellung*' a generic reading is preferred, meaning *any exhibition*. This grammaticalization process of the cliticized definite article is referred to by the author as "*Grammatikalisierungsbaustelle*", a "building site" of grammaticalization.

Interestingly enough, open grammaticalization processes can be explored even through prepositions, which are commonly assumed to build up a closed system. The author supports this point by manifold salient examples, such as '*links* des Rheins', '*nahe* dem Ufer', '*im Laufe* des Gesprächs' or '*kraft* des Amtes', where the lexical items in italics – whichever part-of-speech category they belong to – are to be read in a relational function. These are referred to as secondary prepositions, highlighting the opposition to the well-known primary ones. The group of primary prepositions, with the highest degree of grammaticalization, is indeed a closed one, as Szczepaniak argues. She relies on Lindquist's ideas (1994) by pointing out the most important features of prototypical prepositions, i.e. the primary ones: government of the accusative or the dative case; pronominal word order; brevity; syntactic multi-value; semantic multi-value; monosegmentality and lack of capitalization. In the author's view, it is not necessary that all the German prepositions undergo a complete process of grammaticalization, which is exemplified by that of the preposition 'wegen' on pages 97-103.

As regards the grammaticalization of the whole noun phrase, the syntactic fixation of the elements determiner, adjective and noun took place such that they acquired a firm position and grew in morphosyntactic cohesion. The author presents processes as a result of

which the NP may be claimed to have a high degree of grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization processes of the Verb Phrase are the focus of chapter 6. An extensive account is given of the vicissitudes of the so-called weak verbal suffix, the dental ' –*te*', which marks regular past-tense forms and is still productive. Its roots are to be found in the Germanic verb '*dōn*' ('tun'), meaning 'to do'. According to Szczepaniak, the probability of a grammaticalization process is much higher in the case of verbs with such general meanings as 'to do' than in the case of those with more specific ones. Thus, '*dōn*', in all likelihood, even served as the basis for manifold grammaticalization processes in different Germanic languages, as, for instance, for the auxiliary 'do' in English, or for the auxiliary reading of 'tun' in dialects of German. Since weak verbs were derived from items of other part-of-speech categories, they consist of more than one syllable, and are not capable of a stem-vowel alternation as are strong verbs. Thus, expressing the past tense of weak verbs was made possible by an auxiliary-like reading of the verb 'tun': '*wecken tat*'. In a subsequent phase of the grammaticalization process, the meaning of the verb 'tun' was semantically bleached and reanalysed, then its usage context extended and thus the full verb was decategorialized, i.e. it lost most of its morphosyntactic features. The erosion of the form took place early on in the Germanic, and clitics substituted the full verb. These, in the OHG period, developed the whole paradigm of the dental suffix.

Personal pronouns are in German obligatory elements of the verb phrase, since in their absence the verbal suffixes are ambiguous. The grammaticalization process, which resulted in this feature of pronouns, began in the OHG period. The factors catalysing this development are summarized in five points: sentence structure, person, word order, textual pragmatics and mood. Pronouns have remained free morphemes up until the present day; however, dialectal records of German show a tendency towards their cliticizing (as in '*meinste*' – 'meinst du'). It is remarkable that this is the very phenomenon that supplied the basis for the grammaticalization process of verbal suffixes: clitics of pronouns were reanalysed.

Regarding politeness-forms, the author points out that today's binarity of the formal 'Sie' and informal 'du' has developed in five phases. In Germanic, the address system counted only one form, whereas from OHG on, there were at least two different ones. In Old and Middle High German the opposing forms were '*du*' and '*ihr*'. From the

17th century on, the pronouns '*er/sie*' were the means of exclusively polite address, since '*ihr*' became more frequent among lower social classes as well. The 18th century saw even more varieties with the occurrence of today's formal '*Sie*', the pronoun '*dieselben*' and the continuous usage of the creations of the previous century. In the 19th century, this complex system collapsed, and today's address-forms, '*du*' and '*Sie*' were selected to remain in usage.

The analytical past-tense forms and the grammaticalization process of the auxiliary '*haben*' are reflected on again, this time from the point of view of the VP. Pertaining to the lexical origins of the auxiliary, the author suggests that it roots in the possessive verb '*haben*'. As a result of the structural reanalysis of the VP containing the auxiliary in question, the Subj-'*haben*'-O_d-V sequence was assigned two readings. Initially, the O_d was read as a complement of '*haben*', the possessive verb. However, ambiguous constructions made a new interpretation available, namely one in which the O_d is a complement of the V. In OHG, this latter reading referred exclusively to the present, with a perfective component of the meaning. In MHD, the time reference shifted to today's denotation, although initially the auxiliary matched only with transitive verbs with an obligatory O_d. As soon as the O_d became optional, it made room for combination with intransitive verbs and, at the same time, for a resultative interpretation. Unlike in English, the German perfect tenses make reference to the past; furthermore, they are on course to supersede the analytic past form 'Präteritum'.

Subchapter 6.4 is devoted to the polygrammaticalization of the multifunctional lexeme '*werden*'. Five different functions are attributed to what was only a copula, all of them having their own route of grammaticalization:

  – copula, as in 'Sie wird krank.'
  – passive-auxiliary, as in 'Du wirst gefragt.'
  – future-auxiliary, as in 'Wir werden schweigen.'
  – subjunctive-auxiliary, as in 'Ich würde kommen.'
  – epistemic modal verb, as in 'Sie wird es ihm (wohl) gesagt haben.'

All these functions stem back to the OHG full verb, '*werdan*', which itself had already been subjected to meaning change, namely from the concrete meaning 'to turn' to the more abstract one, 'to happen, to come into existence'. From this intransitive meaning the copula 'wer-

den' arose, bringing a second semantic change: from 'to happen' its meaning turned into 'to change'. The author argues that this latter semantic content, the implicature of 'something turns into something', is the catalyst of the rest of the grammaticalization processes.

Pertaining to the grammaticalization of the passive construction, in Szczepaniak's view, it developed as early as the OHG period. The ingressive meaning, referring to the occurrence of a new *passive* condition, was transferred by the combination of '*werdan*' and a participle. With the high degree of the so-called Vorgangspassive's grammaticalization, the *sein-passive* – which was already an established construction in OHG – gradually lost its significance, until, in the 17th century, it concluded its development as today's 'Zustandspassiv'.

There are several rival hypotheses explaining the grammaticalization path of the modal-like future construction 'werden' + infinitive. Szczepaniak accounts for the process by placing the ingressive semantic content in the centre. She refers to OHG 'werden' + participle constructions as phrases denoting the abrupt occurrence of a new condition ('werden') and pointing towards the future (participle). In MHG, the ingressive meaning component was replaced by an inchoative one, which no longer implied an abrupt, but rather a slow change from one condition to another. Parallel to this semantic change, the infinitive supplanted the participle, and thus, in early New High German times, the construction acquired its current form. Unlike in other Germanic languages, the grammaticalization of a future form built by a modal verb and an infinitive hit barriers in German. However, *subjectification* did play a significant role in the evolution of the future form. It exhibits the speaker's justification to the proposition at hand; thus her prognosis in the case of future events.

The analytical subjunctive form, 'würde' + infinitive, appeared as a rival form of the synthetic subjunctive as late as the Early New German period. The construction is based on the condition-consequence relation of conditional sentences, and at the outset of its grammaticalization process it appeared exclusively with reference to unrealistic conditions.

The next subchapter discusses the vicissitudes of the so-called *recipient passive*, where a verb with an inherent meaning of possession change (such as 'bekommen', 'erhalten', 'kriegen') is read as an auxiliary in combination with a participle in order to aim at a passive interpretation. As opposed to 'werden'-passive, which represents a rival form to this ongoing process of grammaticalization, it is the receiver

who occupies the subject position in a recipient passive phrase. Thus, while in the case of *Vorganspassiv* an accusative conversion takes place, the recipient passive requires a dative conversion relative to an active construction. Concerning the structure of the recipient passive, it contains two predicates: a primary one (a verb like 'bekommen') and a secondary one, a participle, such as 'geröstet' in the sentence 'Ich become den Kaffee geröstet'. The ambiguity which set the grammaticalization process in motion is obvious: the one reading focuses on the subject receiving the coffee *roasted*, while the other highlights that the coffee is roasted *for the subject*. In the passive interpretation, the participle behaves like a verb with three argument places: subject, theme and recipient. Thus, the primary predicate loses its relevance as a full verb and functions as a passive auxiliary instead. The range of application is broadening: not only concrete direct objects, but abstract ones, may be featured; inanimate subjects can now constitute a well-formed recipient passive, and, on top of everything, there is a tendency to omit the direct object (as in 'Ich bekomme [ein Buch] vorgelesen') which clearly indicates that this grammaticalization process is not yet complete.

As opposed to English, the German verb tense system does not include an obligatory present continuous. This, however, does not mean that uttering information about the moment of speaking is impossible. Quite the contrary: the creativity of the users of the language has found a way to fill this gap, namely by the combination of the once merely locative preposition 'am' and a substantivized infinitive, as in 'Sie ist *am Essen*.' The so-called 'rheinische Verlaufsform' is the most widespread of the four progressive constructions: 'am + infinitive + sein', 'beim + infinitive + sein', 'im + infinitive + sein' and 'dabei + infinitive with zu + sein'. The gist of Szczepaniak's argumentation regarding the grammaticalization of these progressive constructions is that they stem from locative prepositional phrases which allowed twofold interpretations: a locative and a progressive one. In the first place, only some so-called activity-verbs could build up a prepositional phrase with a progressive meaning in the present day; however, the construction is extended to non-additive verbs expressing a change in condition as well. Stative verbs, on the other hand, are only capable of connecting to the 'am-progressive'. In the latter, the infinitive gradually loses its nominal status, which indicates that however high its level of grammaticalization, the process is not yet complete.

In subchapter 6.7, the grammaticalization of German modals is discussed, with special emphasis on the distinction between objective and subjective modality. After a brief summary of the nature of both modality-types, the author makes the point that the number of modal verbs grew from the OHG three ('*skulan*', '*wellen*' and '*mugan*') to six ('*können*', '*dürfen*', '*müssen*', '*sollen*', '*wollen*', '*mögen*'). All these verbs require an infinitive. Furthermore, '*nicht brauchen*' is developing a modal function, inasmuch as it is used with an infinitive and a facultative 'zu' as a rival form of '*nicht müssen*'. Special emphasis is put on the grammaticalization of the epistemic modality, which proceeded from the MHG period on. Prior to that, the means of expressing the speaker's estimation of a situation had been the first subjunctive form. Like other grammaticalization paths, that of epistemic modality was started by the occurrence of conversational implicature while using modal verbs in their *untypical contexts*. The already familiar implicature reading is repeated in *critical contexts*, until it becomes established on its own in *isolating contexts*.

The last chapter of the volume is devoted to grammaticalization processes on the syntactic and discourse-pragmatic levels. After enlightening the reader about some basic concepts related to subordinating conjunctions, the conjunction '*dass*' and its development is elaborated on. It roots in the demonstrative pronoun '*thaz*' originally occupying the object position of one of two independent sentences. Whether these two sentences were read in an anaphoric or cataphoric relation to each other depended on the position of '*thaz*'. Determining the order of the two sentences involved was the first step to a higher degree of syntactic cohesion, from *parataxis* to *hypotaxis*. As soon as the subordinated object sentence was integrated into the main clause – something which had already occurred in OHG –, the conjunction became available for other types of subordinate clauses, such as subject, final, causal or consecutive clauses. Regarding the causal subordinating conjunction '*weil*', the author points out that in MHG, before its grammaticalization process started, it had the function of a time adverb referring to an unspecified duration. As the latter was located in MHG, the primary subordinating conjunctions, beside which '*(al) die wîle*' was a secondary conjunction specifying the relation of the subordinate clause to the main one, gradually disappeared. From the 15th century on, the now primary conjunction, that knotted two clauses denoting actions taking place in parallel or following each other, was capable of evoking the implicature of a cause-effect relation. In-

terestingly enough, the grammaticalization of '*weil*' is not complete yet: in recent decades, it has been developing a discourse-marker function, which is elaborated on in subchapter 7.3. Firstly, as opposed to the sentence structure required by the conjunction, '*weil*', as a DM, is syntactically independent, and thus occurs with a verb-second-clause, and secondly, it is semantically bleached. As a linking phrase, it may connect an utterance to previous ones signaling that the speaker wishes to hold the turn. As regards the development of '*weil*' as a DM, this is referred to as a process of *pragmaticalization*. Thus, the author seems to share the view that in order to be able to count it as an instance of grammaticalization, the concept of *grammar* has to be revised. She suggests that grammatical forms should be called *open forms*, which may be used to express a reasonable concrete meaning only in relation to other words. A DM is such an open form, which gains its actual function only when uttered in context. Along the lines of the newly introduced definition of open forms, the author captures grammaticalization as a development process which yields items with a flexibly utilizable function, much rather than heavily context-dependent units.

Subchapter 7.2 covers the grammaticalization processes on the sentence level, marked by significant changes in verb placement. According to the model of topological fields, other elements of a sentence are placed in accordance with the position the finite verb occupies. Main clauses of declarative sentences have developed a verb-second structure from OHG to MHG, while polar questions already had a verb-first structure in OHG. Thus, the left sentence field, the one preceding the finite verb, had been located by MHG. The middle field and the right field (the field that follows the infinitive) on the other hand, were only fixed by the Early New German period. The subordinate clause, which in today's German is introduced by a conjunction and terminated by a finite verb, was only one of the available structures in OHG which prevailed towards the end of the period. Regarding the order of the elements of the analytic verb form, the development process stretched right into the NHG period.

A General index, an Index of abbreviations and a list of References conclude the volume, offering the reader useful help with the orientation within the monograph itself and in further research.

Szczepaniak's volume offers a comprehensive overview of the gist and most important notions of the study of grammaticalization. Given that the monograph is a textbook, the author confines herself to a

clear-cut and straightforward presentation of the field at an entry-level, which promises to be intelligible for readers with an elementary background knowledge of linguistics. This is, on the one hand, due the fact that it refrains from the extensive usage of puzzling notions; and on the other to the way it provides ample explanation and examples of newly introduced termini. Also in line with the textbook-character of the work reviewed, the author concentrates on offering an introductory demonstration of the very process of grammaticalization. She places mechanisms, strategies and the very procedure of grammaticalization at the centre of attention and elucidates these in a reasonable and transparent fashion. Elaborating on the mechanisms of grammaticalization of the German language at an elementary level makes the volume a novel, innovative and complementary addition to the study of the field. In comparison to Diewald's significant 1997 introductory textbook on grammaticalization written in German, Szczepaniak provides a more detailed and diversified account on actual grammaticalization phenomena. Regarding the structure of the book, the author proceeds with prominent examples of the grammaticalization of German, organizing the phenomena on the basis of syntactic categories: starting at the word level, she discusses the vicissitudes of negation; on the phrase level those of the noun and the verb phrase, and, last but not least, at the sentence and discourse-pragmatic levels. This logical and advantageous structure helps the reader comprehend the gist of the approach step-by-step. Unlike other monographs on the subject, Szczepaniak does not go into detail regarding the history of research into grammaticalization, but refers to her predecessors' work with relevance to individual phenomena. This is helpful for the reader wishing to find immediate clues to further research. However, a passage describing the evolution of a subfield of science has the advantage of making it more transparent for the reader. In such an overview, the author might also find space to refer to examples from other languages, further facilitating the understanding the essence of the subject.

The extent of the volume, 219 pages, with a well-proportioned division of the chapters and subchapters, is suitable for an introductory textbook.

References

Diewald, Gabrielle (1997): *Grammatikalisierung. Eine Einführung in Sein und Werden grammatischer Formen.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Diewald, Gabrielle (2008): Grammatikalisierung und Grammatikalisierungsforschung – Einführung und ausgewählte aktuelle Tendenzen. In: Fandrych, Christian (ed.): *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 45. Leipzig: Herder-Institut der Universität Leipzig, 151-159.

Hopper, Paul J. & Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1993/2008): *Grammaticalization.* Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Lehmann, Christian (2002): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization.* Second, revised edition. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Mroczynski, Robert (2012): *Grammatikalisierung und Pragmatikalisierung.* Tübingen: Narr Verlag.

Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd (ed.)(2011): *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Thornburg, Linda L. (2004): The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction. In: Osthus, Dietmar (ed.): *Metaphorik* 06/2004. http://www.metaphorik.de/06/panthert hornburg.pdf, accessed 28. 06. 2013, 13:11.

Judit Bihari
MTA-DE Research Group for Theoretical Linguistics
Pf. 47
H–4010 Debrecen
j.bihari.j@gmail.com