

Degrammaticalization: three common controversies

Muriel Norde

University of Groningen

m.norde@rug.nl

Prof Dr Muriel Norde

Scandinavian Languages and Cultures

University of Groningen

P.O. Box 716

9700 AS Groningen

The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

From the very beginnings of its existence, the term ‘degrammaticalization’ has given rise to much controversy. Originally coined by Lehmann in 1982 for a supposedly non-existent phenomenon, the term soon came to be applied to a number of different changes, many of which had little in common, if anything at all. But since such ‘counterexamples’ pose a potential challenge to the unidirectionality of grammaticalization, they have been the focus of much attention from grammaticalizationists and grammaticalization critics alike. While the former have attempted to dismiss them as either statistically insignificant or inadequate analysis, the latter have tended to over-emphasize their implications for grammaticalization studies. Vehement and extensive though this discussion has been, it has not resulted in a better understanding of how degrammaticalization should be defined. Indeed, there is not a single case of degrammaticalization that is entirely beyond dispute. The main aim of this paper is to show that much of the debate is rooted in different understandings of what degrammaticalization entails, or what it should entail. This has given rise to the three common controversies in the title of this paper. After dealing with these controversies, I will propose a descriptive framework based on Lehmann’s parameters and recent work by Andersen, which will restrict the number of potential examples of degrammaticalization, while at the same time subdividing them into three clearly distinguishable subtypes.

1 Introduction¹

Few concepts in historical linguistics have been criticized as harshly as the concept of degrammaticalization. To some extent, this is not surprising – after all, the term was introduced by Lehmann for a phenomenon which he believed to be non-existent:

Various authors (Givón 1975:96, Langacker 1977:103f., Vincent 1980:56-60) have claimed that grammaticalization is unidirectional; that is, an irreversible process [...] there is no **degrammaticalization**. (Lehmann 1995 [1982]:16, emphasis original)²

Although things have changed considerably (and for the better) since this rather unfortunate start for the term, there is still no general agreement on what degrammaticalization entails, and what significance it might have for grammaticalization studies (if indeed it is of relevance at all). In this paper, I will address both these issues, thus paving the way for a more restricted use of the term. I will start by a short section (1.1) on the *Forschungsgeschichte* of degrammaticalization. In section 1.2, I will provide my own definition of degrammaticalization. The next three sections are concerned with three issues that have been at the centre of the degrammaticalization debate: (i) the question of whether degrammaticalization is grammaticalization in ‘reverse’ (section 2), (ii) the question of whether degrammaticalization involves more than a mere decrease in bondedness (section 3), and (iii) the question of whether degrammaticalization is classifiable (section 4). In section 5, I will propose a classification of degrammaticalization in the restricted sense, arguing that there are three clearly distinguishable types, and I will briefly discuss examples of each type in sections 6.1-6.3. Section 7 summarizes the paper.

1.1 Attitudes towards degrammaticalization, 1982 - present

The unidirectionality debate has been one of unusual vehemence and vigor and degrammaticalization case studies have been criticized accordingly. For one, degrammaticalization researchers have been accused of improper motives: “[...] in some cases, the enthusiasm for challenging the unidirectionality hypothesis appears to have lead [sic] to an interpretation of data that is certainly open to criticism” (Börjars 2003: 133f.).³ Another way to discredit degrammaticalization has been to dismiss it as “statistically insignificant” (e.g. in Heine, Claudi & Hünemeyer 1991:4f.; Kuteva 2001:110; Heine & Kuteva 2002:11).⁴ A third and slightly different approach has been to recognize that degrammaticalization exists, but that it is exceptional and hence need not be considered in grammaticalization theory because it cannot be explained (Haspelmath 2004:23; see further section 4). A presumable reason for this hostility is that the very existence of degrammaticalization challenges the unidirectionality of grammatical change. It is not difficult to see why this is undesirable — true (i.e. exceptionless) unidirectionality would provide the historical linguist with a universal with the explanatory power of a Neogrammarian sound-law. Weakening the notion of unidirectionality from a principle to a statistical hypothesis would thus deprive us from a handy reconstructional tool.

But ignoring or discrediting unwelcome evidence is obviously “not at the top of anybody’s hierarchy of epistemic goodness” (Lass 2000:214). I therefore agree with Joseph’s (2005: 4) suggestion that the only sensible way to deal with degrammaticalization is to “[...] simply “bite the bullet” and accept that there can be movement involving grammatical elements both “up and down the cline”, so that unidirectionality – or, better, movement in the direction of greater grammatical status – becomes a recognizable tendency in, but not an inviolable constraint on, grammatical change”. Van der Auwera (2002:25f.) makes a similar point:

I have argued that two decades of relatively intensive research on grammaticalization have shown that degrammaticalization exists [...] and that it should be studied in its own right, and not as a quirky, accidental exception to grammaticalization. One of the tasks on the agenda is to compare the properties of grammaticalization and degrammaticalization. Another one is to classify all types of degrammaticalization [...]

Although the debate is still far from being settled, consensus appears to be growing that “a presumed absolute universal had to be weakened to a statistical universal” (Haspelmath 2004:23). Traugott (2001:1) similarly defines grammaticalization as a “hypothesis about a robust tendency”. Thus, over a period of 20-odd years, degrammaticalization was promoted from a non-existent phenomenon to a generally recognized independent type of change.

1.2 *A generic definition of degrammaticalization*

Degrammaticalization has been defined in a number of different ways (see Heine 2003 and Norde 2009b for a comprehensive survey). The term has been used to refer to such widely divergent phenomena as full mirror-image reversals of grammaticalization chains (see section 2), the loss of grammatical content resulting in ‘empty morphs’ such as *for* in *forget* (see e.g. Koch 1996:241), or the lexicalization of function words (*ups and downs*) and affixes (*isms, ologies*; see e.g. Ramat 1992).

In this paper, I will expand on the definition I have proposed earlier (Norde 2001, 2002, 2006a), which is based on Hopper & Traugott’s (2003:7) ‘cline of grammaticality’ in (1). Even though I acknowledge that the cline is not uncontroversial, and not a sufficient diagnostic, it makes a good starting point for further analysis.⁵

- (1) content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix (> ø)⁶

On the basis of (1), I (2006a:202) defined degrammaticalization as a shift to a point further to the left on this cline. On the one hand, this definition is too narrow, because it excludes degrammaticalization of derivational affixes (see section 6.3). On the other hand, this definition is not specific enough, because it does not explicitly recognize that degrammaticalization, as will be explained below, is a construction-internal change. A more specific definition, which also pays heed to the primitive changes involved in degrammaticalization (see section 5.2) is therefore given in (2):

- (2) Degrammaticalization is a change whereby a gram in a specific context gains in autonomy or substance on one or more linguistic levels (semantics, morphology, syntax, and phonology).

In the remainder of this section, I will discuss three important properties of degrammaticalization. First, as we will see in section 2, degrammaticalization always involves a single shift from right to left on the cline of grammaticality, i.e. I know of no examples of degrammaticalization “all the way up the cline” (Norde 2009b). This separates degrammaticalization from grammaticalization.

Secondly, Haspelmath’s (1999:1064) observation that “in grammaticalization the identity of the construction and the element’s place within it are always preserved” is relevant for degrammaticalization changes as well. Degrammaticalization changes are shifts from affix to clitic or from clitic to grammatical word, within an ambiguous context. An example of such an ambiguous context is given in (3) (from Willis 2007:294): the phrase *yn ol*, originally an adposition, is ambiguous between ‘after’ and ‘fetch’. This ambiguity led to the reinterpretation of *yn ol* as a verb.

- (3) *Yna yd aeth y gweisson yn ol y varch a ’e arueu y Arthur*

then PART went the lads after his horse and his weapons for Arthur
'Then the lads went after / went to fetch his horse and his weapons for Arthur'

A shift from grammatical word to content item will also qualify as degrammaticalization if the constructional identity of the degrammaticalized item is preserved (at least initially). Changes into content items where function words or bound morphemes are 'taken out of their context', as it were, will be considered as instances of lexicalization, not degrammaticalization (Norde 2009b). These include 'upgradings' from minor to major word-classes (*pros and cons*, *to up*, *to down*), and from derivational affix to hypernym nouns (*isms*, *ologies*).⁷

Thirdly, degrammaticalization must result in a novel gram,⁸ as I will now illustrate by a brief discussion of the development of English *dare*. In Beths (1999), the history of *dare* is classified as a case of degrammaticalization, a view which is contested in Traugott (2001). According to Beths, historical evidence suggests that the predecessor of *dare* (**durran*) was a main verb in Old English which soon came to acquire modal properties and continued to do so until the Early Modern English period (these properties included lack of an infinitive form, increasingly deontic meaning, and no *do*-support). From the 15th century onwards however, main verb uses of *dare* started to appear (as evidenced by, among other things, *to*-infinitives, an NP direct object and *do*-support). In present-day English, Beths claims, *dare* is exclusively used as a main verb.

Arguing against Beths, Traugott (2001) cites data from Krug (2000), which show that *dare* did not cease to be a modal verb at all.⁹ But even if modal *dare* had become obsolete, Traugott argues, this is not a case of degrammaticalization because main verb uses and modal verb uses had always coexisted, which means that there is no evidence that (new) main verb uses arose out of previous modal ones. She concludes "that main verb and emerging auxiliary uses have coexisted for over a thousand years, with one type predominating over the other at different periods and in different styles." This kind of change, where more grammaticalized usages become marginalized (or even

obsolete), with less grammatical usages increasing in frequency, has been termed ‘retraction’ by Haspelmath (2004:33ff.).¹⁰ I agree with Traugott & Haspelmath that these are not cases of degrammaticalization. In degrammaticalization, ‘less’ grammaticalized functions must be shown to derive from ‘more’ grammaticalized functions. If they continue, or develop out of, a less grammatical function that had always been around, however marginalized, the change will not qualify as a case of degrammaticalization.

2 Controversy I: Is degrammaticalization the ‘reverse of grammaticalization’?

Some authors will only accept degrammaticalization as a meaningful concept in historical linguistics when it can be shown to be the mirror-image reversal of grammaticalization, by running the full course from affix to content item with the same intermediary stages as in grammaticalization (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994:13; cf. also Lehmann 1995 [1982]:16; Börjars 2003:151). Haspelmath (2004:27f.) defines such mirror-image reversals as follows:

By this I mean a change that leads from the endpoint to the starting point of a potential grammaticalization and also shows the same intermediate stages. For instance, a change from a case suffix to a free postposition with the intermediate stage of a postpositional clitic would be an antigrammaticalization.

In Haspelmath’s sense, a hypothetical example of degrammaticalization would be the inflectional French future to become enclitic, then turning into an auxiliary and finally into a lexical verb meaning ‘to possess, keep’. Such changes have indeed not been attested (nor have they ever been claimed to exist) – all examples of degrammaticalization that have been described until the present day involve a single change, for instance from function word to lexical item or from affix to clitic.

To my mind, this does not reduce the relevance of degrammaticalization case studies at all, because they still provide evidence against the claim that all grammar change is unidirectional.

To refine the notion of reversibility, I will introduce an important distinction between two kinds of reversal that have been suggested in Haspelmath 2004 and Askeidal 2008. The first kind, termed ‘token reversal’ by Haspelmath (2004:28) and ‘etymological category reversal’ in Askeidal (2008), refers to a process in which a grammaticalized item ‘returns’ to an earlier point in its development. As Haspelmath and Askeidal correctly point out, this kind is of little interest, not least because it may be very difficult to establish whether the less-grammaticalized item had ever really ceased to exist.¹¹ The second kind is termed ‘type reversal’ (Haspelmath 2004) or ‘non-etymological category reversal’ (Askeidal 2008) which is a change which goes against the general direction of grammaticalization. All examples which I consider degrammaticalization are of the latter kind.¹²

In sum, degrammaticalization always involves a type reversal, not a token reversal, and crucially, it always involves a single shift from right to left on the cline of grammaticality. This is essentially an empirical observation, not a theoretical one. Nevertheless, the fact that no degrammaticalization chains have been identified thus far is probably more than just a historical coincidence. Both semantic and morphological change show a clear directional preference towards reduction (Norde 2009b). In a degrammaticalization change, both form and meaning will have to change into a ‘marked’ direction, and this is problematical at any point on the cline of grammaticality. Degrammaticalization from affix to clitic is difficult because affixes are both strongly desemanticized and heavily reduced, with little room for change within the constructions in which they appear (Norde 2002:61). The shift from function word to content item, too, is severely restricted because in many languages, content items (nouns and verbs) typically inflect, which implies that in order for a grammatical element to degrammaticalize into a major lexical category it has to have a form which can plausibly be reanalysed as an inflected form (Fortson 2003:657;

Willis 2007:303). Accordingly, chances that the same gram degrammaticalizes more than once are extremely small.

To conclude, Controversy 1 is based on different definitions of degrammaticalization. In works of degrammaticalization critics, a definition of degrammaticalization as the reverse of grammaticalization is invoked to show that degrammaticalization does not exist. But those who have been arguing that degrammaticalization *does* exist, have never posited full degrammaticalization clines.

3 Controversy II: Is degrammaticalization a composite change?

This controversy primarily concerns examples of degrammaticalization involving bound morphemes. Some authors (Börjars 2003:157; Ziegeler 2004:119; Askedal 2008; Idiatov 2008)¹³ have been arguing that this type of degrammaticalization is merely a decrease in morphosyntactic bondedness. Askedal, for instance, argues that it is inappropriate “to refer to ‘degrammaticalization’ when a grammatical element in the shape of a bound morpheme attains syntagmatic independence as a result of typological and/or syntactic restructuring, while retaining its grammatical function in the sense of membership in a ‘closed’ class or a class of elements of an ‘abstract’ functional or semantic nature [...]”. What is implicit in this line of reasoning is that degrammaticalization ought to involve change on more than one linguistic level, in other words, it ought to be a composite change, as is grammaticalization. On this view, some examples of debonding (see section 6.3) would not be valid instances of degrammaticalization, because there is no change in semantics or function. But still there are other cases where degrammaticalization of bound morphemes does involve a change in function or meaning (see sections 6.2 and 6.3), so this criticism is not always justified.

To conclude, the confusion of degrammaticalization with a mere decrease in bondedness is based on a limited number of degrammaticalization changes whereby a bound morpheme becomes

a free morpheme (debonding) without a change in function or meaning. In the majority of cases however, change can be observed on other levels as well. I will return to this issue in sections 5 and 6.

4 Controversy III: Can degrammaticalization changes be classified?

Traditionally, grammaticalization is seen as a cross-linguistically regular type of change towards decreasing autonomy (both formally and semantically), whereas degrammaticalization changes are considered idiosyncratic exceptions which cannot be captured in any systematic way. Since most degrammaticalization changes are confined to a single language, it is often argued that degrammaticalization cannot be dealt with beyond the level of individual case studies (cf. Heine 2003; Haspelmath 2004).

This controversy is due, in part, to the proliferation of usages of the term ‘degrammaticalization’ (see Heine 2003 for a survey of all the terms that degrammaticalization has been treated as a synonym of). This overapplication of the term has provided degrammaticalization critics with ample ammo, as is reflected by the following quote from Lehmann (2004:180f.):

One cannot avoid the conclusion that those who wish to argue against unidirectionality of grammaticalization are amazingly sloppy in the selection and analysis of their examples. If one subtracts those alleged examples of degrammaticalization that for one reason or another miss the target, then very few actual cases of degrammaticalization remain. They are not “myriad” (Janda 2001:299), but closer to a proportion of 1 : 99 with historical cases of grammaticalization.”

Although I would not agree in general with Lehmann’s remarks on the “sloppiness” of the analysis of examples, he certainly has a point where the selection of examples is concerned. When the term

degrammaticalization is not clearly defined, we do indeed end up with a motley crew of phenomena. A more restricted use of the term will not merely limit the number of examples, it will, as I intend to show in the remainder of this paper, also reveal some striking similarities between these cases in terms of Lehmann's (1995 [1982]) parameters. Furthermore, a more restricted definition of degrammaticalization may have better chances of becoming part and parcel of grammaticalization studies. In sum, Controversy 3 is understandable to some extent as degrammaticalization is indeed less frequent, and less cross-linguistically regular, than grammaticalization, and the term 'degrammaticalization' has been applied over-enthusiastically. It is obvious then, that the definition of degrammaticalization needs to be narrowed down in order to be able to develop framework for classifying degrammaticalization changes.

5 Classifying (de)grammaticalization

In section 1.2, I have defined degrammaticalization as a change whereby a gram gains in autonomy or substance on one or more linguistic levels. In this section, I will explore what changes may occur on these different levels, and I will term such changes the 'primitive changes' of degrammaticalization.

Developing a framework for classifying degrammaticalization naturally presupposes a framework for classifying grammaticalization. No such framework exists however, which is quite surprising in view of the extensive literature on grammaticalization phenomena. Of course all the relevant parameters, changes and mechanisms have been identified by now, but few attempts have been made to connect these to different types of grammaticalization, or different stages in a grammaticalization chain in a systematic way. For this reason I will start with a section on the classification of grammaticalization (without however offering an exhaustive typology), using two taxonomic tools: Lehmann's (1995[1982]) six parameters of grammaticalization and Andersen's (2005, 2006, 2008) four 'levels of observation'. Once it has been shown how these tools can be

applied to grammaticalization chains (section 5.1), I will demonstrate how they can be used to generate a degrammaticalization typology (section 5.2).

5.1 *Classifying grammaticalization*

For a start, let us consider Kuryłowicz's 'classical' definition of grammaticalization:

Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a grammatical to a more grammatical status. (Kuryłowicz 1975 [1965]:52)

It has been pointed out, with increasing frequency, that the two types of change mentioned in Kuryłowicz's definition are actually of a completely different kind. It has indeed been suggested by some authors (e.g. Detges & Waltereit 2002:188) that only the first part of Kuryłowicz's definition refers to grammaticalization proper. On this view, subsequent changes (cliticization, affixation) are merely subsequent stages of increasing bondedness. In some cases indeed, increasing bondedness is not accompanied by change on other levels. For example, it is hard to see why '*m* as in *give 'm what they want* would be 'more grammatical' than its unreduced equivalent *them* as in *give them what they want*. In many other cases however, we also witness changes on the semantic level. One of the stock examples of grammaticalization, the Norwegian inflectional passive in $-s(t)$ ¹⁴, is a case in point. This suffix ultimately derives from a 3SG reflexive pronoun, which in the course of its increasing bondedness was phonetically reduced and went through several changes in grammatical meaning, following the well-known path REFLEXIVE > ANTICAUSATIVE > PASSIVE (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2002:44; for details of the development in Scandinavian languages see Enger 2002, 2003). In yet other cases, there may be distributional differences. For example, cliticized '*ll* in *I'll do that* cannot have a volitional reading, but the full form *will* can (as in *if you will*).¹⁵ On the level of syntax, clitics may be more restricted as well, e.g. when they are ungrammatical in comparisons

(*she's older than he is* / * *he's*). For these reasons, I think it makes sense to use the term grammaticalization for entire grammaticalization chains involving continuous development on all levels.

Nevertheless, it is useful to distinguish between the two main stages reflected in Kuryłowicz's definition. Traugott (2002:26f.) proposes to refer to the first part of Kuryłowicz's definition as 'primary grammaticalization' ("the development in specific morphosyntactic contexts of constructions and lexical categories into functional categories"), and to the second part as 'secondary grammaticalization' ("the development of morphophonemic "texture" associated with the categories in question").

With this bipartite division as a point of departure, it may be interesting to examine how these two types relate to Lehmann's (1995[1982]) parameters of grammaticalization.¹⁶ Lehmann (1995 [1982]: 121ff.) distinguishes three aspects that determine the autonomy of a linguistic sign: *weight*, *cohesion* and *variability*, which can be analysed from a paradigmatic and syntagmatic point of view. This results in 6 parameters, or six criteria that can be used to determine which of two linguistic items is *more grammatical* than the other:

	paradigmatic	syntagmatic
weight	integrity	structural scope
cohesion	paradigmaticity	bondedness
variability	paradigmatic variability	syntagmatic variability

Table 1: Lehmann's parameters (Lehmann 1995 [1982]:123)

Each parameter is associated with a number of primitive changes, the most important of which are listed below:

1. **Integrity:** *desemanticization* (loss of semantic substance); *phonological attrition* (loss of phonological substance); *decategorialization* (loss of morphosyntactic properties)¹⁷
2. **Paradigmaticity:** *paradigmaticization* (1: from major to minor word class; 2: integration into a paradigm)
3. **Paradigmatic variability:** *obligatorification* (becoming obligatory in specific morphosyntactic contexts)
4. **Structural scope:** *condensation* (reduction of syntactic scope)
5. **Bondedness:** *univerbation* (boundary loss); *coalescence* (increase in morphophonological integration)
6. **Syntagmatic variability:** *fixation* (decrease in syntactic freedom)

The interaction between Lehmann's parameters is very complex and cannot be discussed in much detail in this paper (see Lehmann 1995 [1982]:160ff. for extensive discussion). However, a few things need to be mentioned. First, not all primitive changes need to be attested in a given grammaticalization change. This holds true, in particular, for phonological attrition. Especially during the first stage of grammaticalization, from lexical item to function word, there need not be any change on the phonological level, as in prepositions such as *considering* or *notwithstanding*. Serious reduction is often not attested until the later stages, when the grammaticalizing gram becomes bound and fuses with its host (in the case of clitics) or stem (in the case of inflections).

Secondly, some parameters work 'continuously', whereas others have very different effects at different stages in grammaticalization chains. An example of a continuous parameter is integrity.

Desemanticization, for example, is a continuous process which goes hand in hand with increasing grammaticalization (cf. the discussion of the Norwegian inflectional passive above).

An example of a parameter with quite different effects in primary and secondary grammaticalization is paradigmaticization. In primary grammaticalization, this implies a shift from an open category (e.g. nouns or verbs) to a closed category (e.g. prepositions or subjunctions).¹⁸ For instance, when *to be going to* grammaticalized into an auxiliary it joined the ‘paradigm’ of auxiliaries. In secondary grammaticalization on the other hand, paradigmaticization implies that grams (eventually) become part of inflectional paradigms.

Thirdly, some parameters appear to be relevant to only one type of grammaticalization (primary or secondary). The parameter of bondedness only applies in secondary grammaticalization, because it is first here that a gram becomes bound (in primary grammaticalization, the gram remains a free morpheme). Conversely, the parameter of syntagmatic variability only applies in primary grammaticalization, because bound morphemes are inherently fixed in a certain position.¹⁹ In other words, bondedness and syntagmatic variability can be seen as essentially one and the same parameter, with different effects in different types of grammaticalization. This means that there would be three paradigmatic parameters of grammaticalization, but only two syntagmatic ones, which makes Lehmann’s system less elegant, but more in accordance with observable facts.

A fourth and final note on Lehmann’s parameters is that some of them are controversial. This is especially true of the parameter of structural scope. In Lehmann’s model, grammaticalization involves a decrease in scope. For example, when an adposition grammaticalizes into a case affix the scope is reduced from (inflected) full NP to the stem of a noun or adjective (Lehmann 1995[1982]:143f.). Another example of scope reduction is the loss of *coordination reduction* (the possibility to be deleted in coordinated constructions). However, the view that scope always decreases in grammaticalization has been called into question in research on

pragmaticalization (e.g. Traugott 1997, Tabor & Traugott 1998), but this discussion is too complicated to summarize in detail).²⁰ Still, it will be interesting to see how scope changes in degrammaticalization, so I will retain this parameter for now.

A second way to classify different types of grammaticalization or different stages in a grammaticalization chain is proposed in Andersen (2005, 2006, 2008) who identifies four ‘levels of observation’ in language change: (i) content; (ii) content syntax; (iii) morphosyntax and (iv) expression. Since there is no terminology to capture these changes, Andersen (2006:232) proposes the following:

1. Changes in content.

1.1. *Grammation*: a change by which an expression through Reanalysis is ascribed grammatical content (change from any other, including zero, content to grammatical content).

1.2. *Regrammation*: a change by which a grammatical expression through reanalysis is ascribed different grammatical content (change within and among grammatical paradigms).

1.3. *Degrammation*: a change by which an expression through reanalysis loses grammatical content (change from grammatical content to other, including zero, content).

2. Changes in content syntax.

2.1. *Upgrading*: a change from dependent to head or an enlargement of scope.

2.2. *Downgrading*: a change from head to dependent or a scope diminution.

3. Changes in morphosyntax.

3.1. *Bond weakening (emancipation)* (affix > clitic, clitic > word, compound word > phrase).

3.2. *Bond strengthening (integration)* (phrase > word, word > clitic, clitic > affix).

4. Changes in expression.

4.1. *Reduction*. 4.2. *Elaboration*.

According to Andersen (ibid.) the crucial change in grammaticalization is either a *grammation* or a *regrammation* – corresponding to Kuryłowicz’s changes ‘from lexical to grammatical’ and ‘from grammatical to more grammatical’. Applying Andersen’s model to all types of grammaticalization is way beyond the scope of this paper (for this the reader is referred to the papers of Andersen himself), but I will use this model to identify the major types of degrammaticalization in the next section.

5.2 *Classifying degrammaticalization*

As I have done in the previous section, I will start the classification of degrammaticalization changes with the observation that there is primary degrammaticalization, whereby a function word becomes a full lexical item, and secondary degrammaticalization, whereby a bound morpheme (inflectional, derivational or clitic) becomes ‘less grammatical’. There is, however, a crucial difference between primary and secondary grammaticalization on the one hand, and primary and secondary degrammaticalization on the other: where the former two may form part of a single grammaticalization chain, the latter two never do.²¹ Thus, case studies in degrammaticalization always concern a change which is either primary or secondary degrammaticalization, never a chain where secondary degrammaticalization is followed by primary degrammaticalization.

It will be seen later on in this section that there are two subtypes of secondary degrammaticalization, one in which there is only a decrease in bondedness and one in which other changes occur as well. But first I will consider Lehmann’s parameters and their connection to primary and secondary degrammaticalization. Since degrammaticalizations are changes in the opposite direction, we may expect Lehmann’s parameters to work in the reverse way as well. Hence I will assume the following ‘parameters of degrammaticalization’ and their associated primitive changes:²²

1. **Integrity:** As far as **integrity** is concerned, a degrammaticalized item can be expected to *gain* semantic and phonological substance, which will be termed *resemanticization* and *phonological strengthening* respectively. It is also likely to involve *recategorialization*, the acquisition of morphosyntactic features of members of major word classes (only to be found in primary degrammaticalization).
2. **Paradigmaticity:** The reverse primitive change associated with this parameter is *deparadigmaticization* which is expected to have different effects in primary degrammaticalization, where it signifies movement from a closed word class to an open word class, and in secondary degrammaticalization, where it refers to ‘discharge’ from an inflectional paradigm.
3. **Paradigmatic variability:** Degrammaticalization can also be expected to go hand in hand with increasing paradigmatic variability, or becoming optional in specific morphosyntactic contexts (*deobligatorification*).
4. **Structural scope:** As briefly noted above, scope has proved a problematic parameter in grammaticalization, but for the time being, following Lehmann’s model, degrammaticalization will be expected to involve *scope expansion*.
5. **Bondedness:** A decrease in bondedness (*severance*) is typically found in secondary degrammaticalization. Severance comes in several forms. In the second type of degrammaticalization (deinflectionalization, see below), inflectional affixes may become either enclitic or derivational. In the third type of degrammaticalization (debonding), bound morphemes become free morphemes, accompanied by a change in meaning or function (if the debonding gram is derivational), or without such change (in most cases of debonding inflectional affixes or clitics).

6. **Syntagmatic variability:** As regards this parameter, the expected primitive change is *flexibilization*, i.e. an increase in syntactic freedom. Unlike in grammaticalization, this parameter is relevant in both primary and secondary degrammaticalization (cf. note 23).

As was the case with the grammaticalization parameters, these degrammaticalization parameters do not apply to all instances of degrammaticalization. Thus, the parameter of bondedness is restricted to secondary degrammaticalization, just as it was restricted to secondary grammaticalization.²³ And as in grammaticalization, the parameter of integrity has different effects in different types of degrammaticalization — when a grammatical word becomes a content item, it naturally gains full lexical content, but in other cases (see section 6.2) there is not so much an increase in semantic substance as in grammatical function (other, less abstract, functions are being added).

Concrete examples of primitive changes in degrammaticalization will be given below, but first I will consider the relevance of Andersen's levels of observation to types of degrammaticalization. A systematic comparison of all attested degrammaticalization changes (Norde 2009b) reveals that degrammaticalization can be observed on three of Andersen's levels, yielding three clearly distinguishable types of degrammaticalization:

1. **Content level:** shift from grammatical content to lexical content (resemanticization).
Degrammaticalization at the content level is primary degrammaticalization and will be termed **degrammation**.
2. **Content-syntactic level:** shift from 'more grammatical' to 'less grammatical', or movement out of a paradigm accompanied by a change in grammatical content. Degrammaticalization at the content-syntactic level is the first subtype of secondary degrammaticalization and will be termed **deinflectionalization**.

3. **Morphosyntactic level:** shift from bound morpheme (affix, clitic) to free morpheme. This is the second subtype of secondary degrammaticalization and will be termed **debonding**.²⁴

Interestingly, there exists an implicational hierarchy between changes in content, changes in content syntax, and changes in morphosyntax in the following way:

- i. a change in content implies changes in content syntax and morphosyntax
- ii. a change in content syntax implies a change in morphosyntax, but not necessarily one in content
- iii. a change in morphosyntax does not imply a change in either content syntax or content

Changes in expression (in the case of degrammaticalization: phonological strengthening) do not form part of this hierarchy — as in grammaticalization, they may or may not occur.

6 Selected case studies

In this section, I will illustrate each of the three types of degrammaticalization and discuss their relevant parameters. For reasons of space, I will briefly discuss just one example of each, but comparable changes are listed at the end of each section (see Norde 2009b for an extensive survey).

6.1 *Degrammation: Pennsylvania German wotte*

Degrammation, as here defined, is a composite change whereby a function word in a specific linguistic context is reanalysed as a member of a major word class, acquiring the morphosyntactic properties which are typical of that word class, and gaining in semantic substance.

Probably the best-known case of degrammation is the development of the full verb *wotte* ‘to wish’ from the preterite subjunctive of modal *welle* ‘to want to’ in a variety of Pennsylvania German

spoken in Waterloo County, Canada (Burridge 1995, 1998). Etymologically, *wotte* is the rounded vowel variant of *wette*, the preterite subjunctive form of the modal auxiliary *welle* ‘to want’. At present however, *wotte* is rapidly developing into an autonomous verb with full lexical meaning ‘to wish, desire’, thus becoming synonymous with the verb *winsche* ‘to wish’.²⁵ Degrammation of *wotte* is evidenced by a number of morphosyntactic properties that *wotte* did not possess as a modal form, as well as by a semantic shift from modal ‘would’ to lexical ‘to wish’ (Burridge 1998:28f.). Thus, it can no longer take infinitival complements ((4)a), it can be nominalized, as in (4)b, it has acquired verbal inflections such as the imperative in (4)c, or a participle as in (4)d, and it can itself be the complement of a modal auxiliary, as in (4)e.

- (4) a. **Ich wott kumme*
 I want come
 ‘I want to come’
- b. *Er ist juscht am wotte, er kennt noch eens vun die Ebbel hawwe*
 He is just at.the wishing, he could againone of the apples have
 ‘He is just wishing he could have one more of the apples’
- c. *Wott net fer sell*
 Wish not for that
 ‘Don’t wish for that’
- d. *Er hat gewott er kennt noch eens vun die Ebbel hawwe*
 He had wished he could again one of the apples have
 ‘He wished he could have one more of the apples’
- e. *Ich muss wotte er brauch net lang Schmaetze hawwe*
 I must wish he need not long pain have
 ‘I must wish, he doesn’t need to have pain for long’

According to Burridge (1998:32) the explanation for this change from modal verb to full lexical verb is sociological rather than linguistic. She points out that Pennsylvania German speakers are a deeply religious people, who have chosen to avoid blunt expressions of desire or will. The ‘modest’ subjunctive is more in accordance with their strongly felt belief that their self-will and self-love should be entirely subordinated to the will of God. Nevertheless, the change itself is linguistic in nature, and can be described in terms of Lehmann’s parameters as follows:

1. **Integrity:** *resemanticization*: yes, there has been a shift from grammatical (modal) meaning (‘would’) to full lexical meaning (‘to wish’); *phonological strengthening*: does not occur; *recategorialization*: yes, *wotte* has acquired regular verb morphology.
2. **Paradigmaticity:** *deparadigmaticization*: yes, there has been a shift from modal verb (closed class) to lexical verb (open class).
3. **Paradigmatic variability:** *deobligatorification*: yes, the selection of *wotte* as a full verb meaning ‘to wish’ depends on the lexical context, not on the syntactic construction (as was the case with modal preterite subjunctive *wotte*, which was obligatory in modal constructions).
4. **Structural scope:** *scope expansion*: yes, modal verbs only take scope over a VP, but lexical *wotte* may take clausal complements, as in some of the examples above.
5. **Bondedness:** *severance* (decrease in bondedness): not relevant, because *wotte* is a case of primary degrammaticalization.
6. **Syntagmatic variability:** *flexibilization* (increase in syntactic freedom): yes, as a full verb, *wotte* can appear in more construction types (both finite and infinite).

Other examples of degrammation include the shift from the Bulgarian pronoun *nešto* ‘something’ into a noun meaning ‘thing’ (Willis 2007); the shift from the Welsh pronoun *eiddo* ‘his’ into a noun meaning ‘property’ (Willis 2007); and the shift from the Welsh preposition *yn ol* ‘after’ into a verb *nôl* > ‘to fetch’ (Willis 2007).

6.2 *Deinflectionalization: the s-genitive*

Deinflectionalization, as here defined, is a composite change whereby an inflectional affix in a specific linguistic context gains a new function, while shifting to a less bound morpheme type. The s-genitive, found in English and Continental Scandinavian,²⁶ is probably one of the most debated cases of degrammaticalization of this kind (see Börjars 2003 and Norde 2006a for recent discussion). I will illustrate the relevant changes with data from Swedish (Norde 1997, 2001, 2002, 2006a).

Originally a genitive singular ending of specific masculine and neuter nouns with obligatory agreement on modifiers of the noun, *s* is now a clitic which attaches to the rightmost element in a full NP. The difference is illustrated by the contrasting Old and Modern Swedish constructions in (5): while inflectional genitive *-s* is found on both the article, the attributive adjective and the noun in (5)a, enclitic *=s* in Modern Swedish is only found on the last element.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|
| (5) | a. | <i>ens</i> | <i>riks</i> | <i>mans</i> | <i>hws</i> | Old Swedish |
| | | a-MASC.SG.GEN | rich-MASC.SG.GEN | man-MASC.SG.GEN | house | |
| | b. | <i>en</i> | <i>rik</i> | <i>mans</i> | <i>hus</i> | Modern Swedish |
| | | [a | rich | man]=s | house | |
| | | ‘a rich man’s house’ | | | | |

The most obvious examples supporting the view that the s-genitive is a clitic are the so-called ‘group genitives’, where =s is attached to a postmodifying prepositional phrase (as in (6)a), or relative clause (as in (6)b):

- (6) a. *en vän till mig's företag* Modern Swedish
 [a friend to me]=s company
 ‘a friend of mine’s company’
- b. *företaget pappa jobbar på's hemsida* Modern Swedish
 [company daddy works at]=s homepage
 ‘the homepage of the company that (my) daddy works for’

The change from affix to clitic is deinflectionalization in the sense that, in the 14th and 15th centuries, inflectional –s ceased to form part of nominal paradigms, after which it gradually spread to all kinds of nouns (both singular and plural), with the first group genitives appearing in the 15th century (see Norde 2006a for details). Deinflectionalization was most probably facilitated by the entire collapse of the case system in many varieties of Swedish, which meant the end of inflectional case paradigms (Norde 2002, 2006a).²⁷ The development of the s-genitive is captured by Lehmann’s parameters in the following way:

1. **Integrity:** *resemanticization*: yes, the Modern Swedish s-genitive not only marks possession (in the widest sense) but gained a new function: that of determiner (Delsing 1991, Norde 1997, 2001, 2002, 2006a), which can be considered a case of functional enrichment; *phonological “strengthening”*: does not occur; *recategorialization*: not relevant in secondary degrammaticalization.

2. **Paradigmaticity:** *deparadigmaticization*: yes, inflectional –s ceases to be part of an inflectional paradigm.
3. **Paradigmatic variability:** *deobligatorification*: yes, when Old Swedish case marking was still productive, it was obligatory, and hence inflectional –s was obligatory when nouns of certain declensions appeared in constructions requiring the genitive case. The Modern Swedish s-genitive, on the other hand, is not obligatory, because a noun is not ungrammatical when it is not ‘marked’ for s-genitive.
4. **Structural scope:** *scope expansion*: yes, scope of inflectional –s was confined to the word level, because in full NP’s, it had to be attached to both the noun and its (adjectival) modifiers. But when inflectional –s developed into an enclitic s-genitive, scope was expanded to the NP-level (including its postmodifiers), as the examples in (6) show.
5. **Bondedness:** *severance* (decrease in bondedness): yes, the s-genitive remains bound, but with a weaker degree of attachment (host-clitic boundary).
6. **Syntagmatic variability:** *flexibilization* (increase in syntactic freedom): not relevant, because grams remain bound in deinflectionalization.

Similar examples of this type of degrammaticalization include the development of Old Swedish MASC.SG.NOM –*er* into a nominalizer (Norde 2002) or the development of Swedish –*on* from NEUT.PL suffix to derivational ‘berry-suffix’ (Norde 2002).

6.3 *Debonding: Northern Saami haga and English ish*

Debonding, as here defined, is a change whereby a bound morpheme in a specific linguistic context becomes a free morpheme. This type of degrammaticalization is more heterogeneous than the previous two, because it may affect three types of bound morphemes: inflectional affixes, derivational affixes, and clitics. When inflectional affixes and clitics debond, they continue the

function they had when bound, but debonding derivational affixes usually do become semantically enriched. I will therefore discuss two cases in this section – one concerning a debonding inflectional affix (Northern Saami *haga*) and one concerning a debonding derivational affix (English *ish*).

In the Northern Saami case, an inflectional suffix expressing the abessive case has been reanalysed as a postposition, but continues to signal an abessive relation. Like most other Finno-Ugric languages, Northern Saami possesses an abessive morpheme *haga*,²⁸ meaning ‘without’. It derives from Proto-Finno-Ugric sequence of affixes **-pta-k-e/i-k/n* [CARITIVE-LATIVE-e- (‘pleonastic’) LATIVE],²⁹ yielding Proto-Saami **-ptā-k-ē-k/n*. The Northern Saami abessive was originally a suffix (as is still the case in other Finno-Ugric languages), but present-day Northern Saami *haga* has the morphosyntactic characteristics of a postposition (Nielsen 1926:65; Nevis 1986a).³⁰ Like postpositions (but unlike affixes), it governs the genitive case, it can be stressed, and it can occur independently. When the abessive is contrasted with similar constructions with different case marking, other differences become apparent as well. For example, the abessive prefers conjunction reduction as in (7)a, which is not possible with case suffixes (cf. (7)b):

- (7) a. *Áhč̆i* *ja* *Issáh-a* ***haga*** (ABESSIVE)
 father.SG.GEN and Issát-SG.GEN without
 ‘without father and (without) Issát’
- b. *Áhč̆i-in* *ja* *Issáhi-in* (CASE SUFFIX)
 father-COMITATIVE and Issat-COMITATIVE
- b'. **Áhč̆i-* *ja* *Issáhi-in*
 father- and Issat-COMITATIVE
 ‘with father and Issat’

In addition, *haga* can occur without an object, as in (8)a, and in some varieties of Northern Saami in Norway, *haga* may even occur as a preposition, as in (8)b (possibly due to influence from Norwegian, which has prepositions) :

- (8) a. *mun báhcen haga*
 I remain-PRETERITE.1SG without
 ‘I was left (“remained”) without’
- b. *haga skuova-id*
 without shoe-PL.GEN/ACC
 ‘without shoes’

The Saami case relates to Lehmann’s parameters as follows:

1. **Integrity:** *resemanticization*: no, there has been no semantic or functional enrichment in the case of *haga*. There has been no *phonological strengthening* either. *Recategorialization* is not relevant because this is a case of secondary degrammaticalization.
2. **Paradigmaticity:** *deparadigmaticization*: yes, *haga* no longer forms part of the paradigm of Northern Saami nominal case inflections.
3. **Paradigmatic variability:** *deobligatorification*: yes, but only for some varieties of Northern Saami where the postpositional abessive may be substituted by other abessive grams (Ylikoski 2008:106f.). In other varieties, *haga* is still the only abessive gram, and hence obligatory in abessive constructions.
4. **Structural scope:** *scope expansion*: yes, postpositional *haga* has expanded its scope when compared to Saami case suffixes, because unlike suffixes it can take scope over e.g. coordinated NP’s, as evidenced by example (7)a.

5. **Bondedness:** *severance* (decrease in bondedness): yes, *haga* is no longer a bound morpheme.
6. **Syntagmatic variability:** *flexibilization* (increase in syntactic freedom): yes, *haga* can occur both independently (example (8)a, and even as a preposition (example (8)b).

Similar examples of debonding of inflectional affixes and clitics that retain their original function the change from Proto-Finnic *-(*ko*)s > Estonian enclitic question marker *=*es* > free particle *es* (now obsolete), and from Proto-Finnic *-*pa* > Estonian enclitic emphatic *=*ep* > free particle *ep* (archaic) (Nevis 1986b; Campbell 1991); desuffixation of the Irish 1PL verbal suffix -*muid* into an independent 1PL pronoun (Doyle 2002); and decliticization of English infinitival *to* (Fischer 2000; Fitzmaurice 2000) of the Norwegian infinitival marker *å* (Faarlund 2007).

Debonding of derivational affixes differs from debonding of inflectional affixes and clitics in that the shift from bound to free morpheme is accompanied by an increase in semantic substance. But just like all other types of degrammaticalization, debonding is a result of a construction-internal reanalysis. This sets debonding of derivational affixes apart from the lexicalization of affixes (*isms*, *ologies*), as well as from metalinguistic usages of affixes (as in *the plural of most English nouns is formed by adding an s to the stem*), because these do not involve structural reanalysis.

A relatively recent example of a derivational suffix that came to be used as a free morpheme is English *ish*, discussed in Bauer (2005:101), and especially Kuzmack (in prep.). In English, the derivational suffix -*ish* can occur independently when it functions as a qualifier (cf. *greenish*), as in examples (9)a-d; it can even be separated from the adjective it qualifies, as in (9)e.

- (9) a. *They have a pleasantly happy_i ending (well, t_i ish)*
- b. *Is everyone excited_i? I am- t_i ish.*

- c. *Can you swim well_i? t_i Ish.*
- d. *If I [accept the premises]_i (and from a maths viewpoint i sort of can - t_i ish)*
- e. *Tomorrow's an easy day (ish) – graduation audit, voice lesson, CS lab ...*

There is evidence that *ish* underwent a further shift in meaning, because it is also attested in constructions where it obviously does not modify an (elided) entity:

- (10) *Hobbies: painting, photography, documentary film, skating(ish)*

In the above example, *ish* does not modify *skating*, but *hobbies* — it can be paraphrased as “skating is kind of a hobby of mine, but not serious” (Kuzmack, in prep.).

Note that the development of *ish* is not a case of lexicalization of an affix (such as *isms*) for two reasons. First, lexicalized affixes become part of major word classes (primarily nouns or verbs), but *ish* does not (it is best paraphrased as an adverbial ‘kind of’). Secondly, lexicalized suffixes are hypernyms of all the derived words with that suffix (*isms*, for example, refers to all ideologies ending in *-ism*, such as *fascism* and *communism*), but *ish* is not a hypernym of all adjectives ending in *ish*.

In terms of Lehmann’s parameters, this change can be described as follows:

1. **Integrity:** *resemanticization*: yes, independent *ish* is no longer merely a modifying morpheme and must be paraphrased by a sentence; *phonological strengthening*: yes, in the sense that *ish* is always stressed when it occurs independently. *Recategorialization* does not occur because *ish* does not join a major (inflected) word class.
2. **Paradigmaticity:** *deparadigmaticization*: this is not relevant for derivational affixes, because they never did form part of an inflectional paradigm.

3. **Paradigmatic variability:** *deobligatorification*: not relevant, because derivational affixes are generally not obligatory in English.
4. **Structural scope:** *scope expansion*: yes, *ish* can take scope over a predicate, as in (9)d.
5. **Bondedness:** *severance* (decrease in bondedness): yes, *ish* has become a free morpheme.
6. **Syntagmatic variability:** *flexibilization* (increase in syntactic freedom): yes, *ish* can occur in various slots, as exemplified in (9)e.

Other examples of debonding derivational affixes include the development of the Dutch numeral suffix *-tig* (*twintig, dertig* etc. ‘twenty, thirty etc.’) into an independent quantifier *tig* ‘dozens’ (Norde 2006b)³¹, and the development of the Norther Swedish verbal prefix *bö-* into a full verb meaning ‘to need’ (Rosenkvist 2008).

7 Conclusion

By addressing three common controversies concerning degrammaticalization I have aimed to refine the definition of degrammaticalization in such a way that it can be a meaningful concept in grammaticalization studies. First, I have shown that it is meaningless to define degrammaticalization as a (potentially) full reversal of a grammaticalization cline (controversy 1), because the term would then refer to a non-existent phenomenon. Secondly, I have shown that, in many cases, degrammaticalization involves much more than a bound morpheme detaching itself, as has sometimes been claimed (controversy 2). And finally, I have demonstrated that it is by no means impossible to classify degrammaticalization (controversy 3. Note however, that I do not regard Lehmann’s parameters as *criteria*, for in that case, a much larger number of changes would qualify as degrammaticalization (or grammaticalization, for that matter), simply because they happen to have a ‘positive score’ on one or more parameters. I have used these parameters in a

purely descriptive way to identify primitive changes in different types of degrammaticalization (see Norde 2009b for further discussion).

The first type, degrammation, is perhaps the most challenging to unidirectionality claims, because it involves changes on all levels and is prompted by pragmatic inferencing (Willis 2007), which means that pragmatic inferencing need not result in grammaticalization, but can also have the opposite effect. The second type, deinflectionalization, involves the exaptation³² of obsolescent morphemes, also with changes on all levels. The third type, debonding, is the most frequent of the three, but also the most heterogeneous one, since it may affect both inflectional affixes, clitics, and derivational affixes. It is not inconceivable that debonding of inflectional affixes and clitics is the least acceptable type of degrammaticalization, because there are no changes in semantics or grammatical function. For in spite of it all, the debate about the existence or acceptability of degrammaticalization remains largely a definitional matter.

References

- Andersen, Henning. 2005. Review of Joseph and Janda 2003. *Diachronica* 22:1, 155-176.
- Andersen, Henning. 2006. Grammatication, regrammation and degrammation. Tense loss in Russian. *Diachronica* 23:2, 231-258.
- Andersen, Henning. 2008. Grammaticalization in a speaker-oriented theory of change. In Eythórsson, Thórhallur (ed.) *Grammatical change and linguistic theory. The Rosendal papers*, 11-44. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Andersson, Peter. 2007. *Modalitet och förändring. En studie av må och kunna i fornsvenska*. Göteborg: Institutionen för Svenska Språket.
- Askedal, John Ole. 2008. 'Degrammaticalization' versus typology. Reflections on a strained relationship. In Eythórsson, Thórhallur (ed.) *Grammatical change and linguistic theory. The Rosendal papers*, 45-77. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Auwers, Johan van der. 2002. More Thoughts on Degrammaticalization. In Ilse Wischer & Gabriela Diewald (eds) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 19-29. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Auwers, Johan van der & Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79-124.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2005. The borderline between derivation and compounding. Dressler, Wolfgang U., Dieter Kastovsky, Oskar E. Pfeiffer & Franz Rainer (eds) *Morphology and its demarcations*, 97-108. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Beths, Frank. 1999. The history of *dare* and the status of unidirectionality. *Linguistics* 37:6, 1069-1110.
- Börjars, Kersti. 2003. Morphological status and (de)grammaticalisation: the Swedish possessive. *Nordic journal of linguistics* 26:2, 133-163.
- Brinton, Laurel J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burridge, Kate. 1995. On the Trail of the Conestoga Modal: recent movements of modal auxiliaries in Pennsylvania German. *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 8.
- Burridge, Kate. 1998. From modal auxiliary to lexical verb: The curious case of Pennsylvania German *wotte*. In Hogg, Richard M. & Linda van Bergen (eds) *Historical linguistics 1995*. Vol. 2: *Germanic linguistics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins. 19-33.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1991. Some grammaticalization changes in Estonian and their implications. In *Approaches to grammaticalization I*, Elizabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), 285-299. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2003. Semantic change. In Joseph, Brian D. & Richard D. Janda (eds) *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 648-666.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1991. Om genitivens utveckling i fornsvenskan. In Malmgren, Sven Göran & Bo Ralph (eds) *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 2, 12-30. Göteborg: Institutionen för Nordiska Språk.
- Detges, Ulrich & Richard WALTERIT. 2002. Grammaticalization vs. Reanalysis. A semantic-pragmatic account of functional change in grammar. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 21, 151-195.
- Doyle, Aidan. 2002. Yesterday's affixes as today's clitics. A case-study in degrammaticalization. In Wischer, Ilse & Gabriela Diewald (eds) *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 67-81.
- Enger, Hans-Olav. 2002. The story of Scandinavian *-s(t)* retold: grammaticalising a clitic to a derivational affix. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 23:1-2, 79-105.
- Enger, Hans-Olav. 2003. Skandinavisk *-s(t)* en gang til: grammatikalisering fra klitikon til avledningsaffiks. In Jan Terje Faarlund (ed.) *Språk i endring. Indre norsk språkhistorie*, 29-56. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2007. Parameterization and change in non-finite complementation. *Diachronica* 24:1, 57-80.
- Fischer, Olga. 2000. Grammaticalisation: Unidirectional, non-reversible? The case of *to* before the infinitive in English. In Fischer, Olga, Anette Rosenbach & Dieter Stein (eds) *Pathways of change. Grammaticalization in English*, 149-169. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2000. Remarks on De-grammaticalization of infinitival *to* in present-day American English. In Fischer, Olga, Anette Rosenbach & Dieter Stein (eds) *Pathways of change. Grammaticalization in English*, 171-186. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2003. Semantic change. In Joseph, Brian D. & Richard D. Janda (eds) *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 648-666.
- Givón, Talmy. 1975. Serial verbs and syntactic change: Niger-Congo. In Li, Charles (ed.) *Word order and word order change*, 47-112. Austin / London: University of Texas Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Why is Grammaticalization Irreversible? *Linguistics* 37:6, 1043-1068.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Fischer, Olga, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds) *Up and down the cline — the nature of grammaticalization*, 17-44. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd. 2003. On degrammaticalization. In Blake, Barry J. & Kate Burridge (eds) *Historical Linguistics 2001*, 163-179. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi & Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Bernd Heine (eds) *Approaches to Grammaticalization, vol. I*, 17-35. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1994. Phonogenesis. In Pagliuca, William (ed.) *Perspectives on grammaticalization*, 29-45. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul. J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2008. Antigrammaticalization, antimorphologization and the case of Tura. In Seoane, Elena, María José López-Couso, in collaboration with Teresa Fanego (eds) *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*, 151-169. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Janda, Richard D. 2001. Beyond “pathways” and “unidirectionality”: on the discontinuity of transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* 23:2-3, 265-340.
- Janda, Richard D. 2005. Morphemes grammaticalizing gradually vs. theories scientizing glacially: On pushing grammaticalization studies along the path towards science. *Logos and Language* 6:2, 45-65.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2005. How accommodating of change is grammaticalization? The case of “lateral shifts”. *Logos and language* 6:2, 1-7.
- Joseph, Brian D. & Richard D. Janda. 1988. The how and why of diachronic morphologization and demorphologization. In Hammond, Michael & Michael Noonan (eds) *Theoretical morphology. Approaches in modern linguistics*, 193-210. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Källström, Roger. 1996. On gender assignment in Swedish. In: Ottóson, Kjartan G. et al. (eds) *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics* 9, 151-167. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Koch, Harold. 1996. Reconstruction in morphology. In: Durie, Mark & Malcolm Ross (eds) *The comparative method reviewed. Regularity and irregularity in language change*, 218-263. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krug, Manfred G. 2000. *Emerging English modals. A corpus-based study of grammaticalization*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1975 [1965]. The evolution of grammatical categories. In *Esquisses linguistiques II*, J. Kuryłowicz, 38-54. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation. An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuzmack, Stefanie. in prep. *Ish: a new case of antigrammaticalization*. Ms., University of Chicago.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. Syntactic reanalysis. In Li, Charles N. (ed.) *Mechanisms of syntactic change*, 57-139. Austin / London: University of Texas Press.

- Lass, Roger 1990. How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* 26. 79-102.
- Lass, Roger 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lass, Roger. 2000. Remarks on (Uni)directionality. *Pathways of Change. Grammaticalization in English*, ed. by Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach & Dieter Stein, 207-227. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. München / Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2004. Theory and method in grammaticalization. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32:2, 152-187.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1986a. Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: abessive *taga*. In Joseph, Brian D. (ed.) *Studies on language change* (= *The Ohio State University working papers in linguistics* 34), 1-9.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1986b. Decliticization in Old Estonian. In Joseph, Brian D. (ed.) *Studies on language change* (= *The Ohio State University working papers in linguistics* 34), 10-27.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1998. *Language Form and Language Function*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Nielsen, Konrad. 1926. *Lærebok i lappisk I: Grammatik*. Oslo: A.W. Brøggers Boktrykkeris Forlag.
- Norde, Muriel. 1997. *The history of the genitive in Swedish. A case study in degrammaticalization*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Norde, Muriel. 2001. Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences* 23: 2-3, 231-64.

- Norde, Muriel. 2002. The final stages of grammaticalization: affixhood and beyond. In Wischer, Ilse & Gabriela Diewald (eds) *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 45-65.
- Norde, Muriel. 2006a. Demarcating degrammaticalization: the Swedish s-genitive revisited. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 29:2, 201-238.
- Norde, Muriel. 2006b. Van suffix tot telwoord tot bijwoord: degrammaticalisering en (re)grammaticalisering van *tig*. *TABU* 35:1/2, 33-60.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009a. Review of Brinton, Laurel & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2005) *Lexicalization and language change*. To appear in *Language* 84.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009b. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ramat, Paolo. 1992. Thoughts on degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 30, 549-560.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2008. A case of degrammaticalization in Northern Swedish. Paper presented at the *Continuity and Change in Grammar* workshop, University of Cambridge, March 2008.
- Tabor, Whitney & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1998. Structural scope expansion and grammaticalization. In Giacalone Ramat, Anna & Paul J. Hopper (eds) *The limits of grammaticalization*, 229-272. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Taeymans, Martine. 2004. An investigation into the marginal modals DARE and NEED in British present-day English. A corpus-based approach In Fischer, Olga, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds) *Up and down the cline — the nature of grammaticalization*, 97-114. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1997. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf>
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2001. Legitimate counterexamples to unidirectionality. Paper presented at Freiburg University, October 17th, 2001.
- <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/Freiburg.Unidirect.pdf>

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2002. From etymology to historical pragmatics. In Minkova, Donka & Robert Stockwell (eds) *Studies in the history of the English language*, 19-49. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1980. Iconic and symbolic aspects of syntax: prospects for reconstruction. In Ramat, Paolo (ed.) *Linguistic reconstruction and Indo-European syntax*, 49-68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Willis, David. 2007. Syntactic lexicalization as a new type of degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 45:2, 271-310.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2008. Non-finites in North Saami. Ms., University of Oulu.
<http://cc.oulu.fi/~jylikosk/080216.pdf>
- Ziegeler, Debra. 2004. Redefining unidirectionality. Is there life after modality? In Fischer, Olga, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds) *Up and down the cline — the nature of grammaticalization*, 115-135. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

¹ This paper was first presented at the *What's new in grammaticalization?* workshop held in Berlin, May 11-12 2007. I am grateful to the audience at that workshop for their questions and comments. I am furthermore indebted to Mark Loudon for his comments on Pennsylvania German *wotte*, to Ante Aikio and Jussi Ylikoski for additional Northern Saami data, and to Stefanie Kuzmack for discussing English *ish*. In particular I would like to thank three anonymous referees for their detailed reports of an earlier version of this paper. All remaining shortcomings are my own.

² Of the authors mentioned in this quote, only Vincent actually claims that grammatical change is unidirectional — the other two chose more careful formulations. Thus Langacker (1977:104) writes: "I think the tendency toward signal simplicity is an undeniable aspect of the evolution of natural language. Not only are all these kinds of change massively attested, but also they are largely unidirectional. Boundary loss is very common, for instance, but boundary creation is quite uncommon by comparison. Words are frequently incorporated as affixes, but affixes show no great tendency to break away and become independent words." And Givón (1975:96) asserts that "an opposite process than the one outlined above, i.e., a process of prepositions becoming *semantically enriched* until they turn into verbs, is at least in theory possible. (emphasis original)"

³ Admittedly, formulations have been no less harsh at the other end of the extreme. Thus Newmeyer (1998) wrote a lengthy critique of grammaticalization theory (entitled "Deconstructing grammaticalization"), concluding that "*there is no such thing as grammaticalization*" (p. 226, emphasis original). In another critical paper, Janda (2005:47) has compared grammaticalization theory to alchemy, with the "obsession" with fixed grammaticalization pathways being compared to the alchemist's idle quest for the philosopher's stone.

⁴ One anonymous referee suggests that "[...] others may have had a completely different phenomenon in mind when claiming that degrammaticalization is non-existent, marginal or exceptional." Although this may be true for some of the authors quoted in this paper – Lehmann, for instance, did not explicitly define degrammaticalization when he said that it does not exist – it is not true for others, who specifically refer to degrammaticalization case studies that had been published previously (e.g. Heine et al. 1991: 52; Aske 2008).

⁵ For example, the cline has been criticized for being an oversimplification and for mixing up terms primarily denoting content (content item, grammatical word) and morphological terms (clitic, affix) (Andersen 2008:15). However, if the cline is considered as a scale of increasing bondedness it makes a useful, if not conclusive, criterion.

⁶ The zero stage does not officially form part of Hopper & Traugott's cline, but it has been added here because loss (of form and / or function) is considered to be the end product of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott 2003:172ff). The

question of whether loss is really the only option for maximally grammaticalized morphemes (i.e. inflectional endings) is discussed in Norde 2002.

⁷ I will not adopt Haspelmath's (2004) distinction between 'degrammaticalization' as a superordinate term for all counterdirectional changes (including the lexicalization of function words and affixes), and "antigrammaticalization" for the narrow definition of degrammaticalization (as it is defined here). If a clear distinction is made between degrammaticalization and lexicalization, the introduction of yet another term is not necessary. Note also that I use the term 'lexicalization' in wider sense different than Brinton & Traugott (2005), who regard shifts from bound morphemes to lexical items such as nouns and verbs as 'clippings'. For a discussion of Brinton & Traugott's definition of lexicalization see further Norde 2009a. and 2009b.

⁸ The term *gram* is taken from Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994:2) to refer to all sorts of grammatical morphemes (e.g. function words, particles, clitics, affixes), including phrasal grammatical items such as auxiliary *be going to*.

⁹ More support for this view can be found in Taeymans' 2004 corpus-based study of *dare* in present-day British English.

¹⁰ See also Andersson 2007 for a similar argument against a degrammaticalization analysis of Swedish *må* (meaning both 'may' and 'feel'), as had been suggested in Van der Auwera & Plungian 1998.

¹¹ Compare the discussion on *dare* in 1.2.

¹² The reason why token reversals will not be discussed is not that they are uninteresting per se, but simply that I am not aware of any true example (i.e. of a token reversal that does not involve retraction).

¹³ It must be mentioned however that some of these authors (Askedal, Idiatov) are similarly critical of the claim that increasing bondedness forms part of a grammaticalization cline.

¹⁴ Equivalent suffixes are found in the other Scandinavian languages.

¹⁵ I owe this observation to an anonymous referee.

¹⁶ Lehmann's parameters have been criticized for being a taxonomic system rather than a descriptive model with explanatory force (e.g. in Detges & Waltereit 2002:172). But nowhere does Lehmann claim that his parameters were intended to explain grammaticalization phenomena, and I think it is safe to say that, as a taxonomy, Lehmann's system has proven quite successful. After all, we have to identify phenomena before we can explain them.

¹⁷ This term is not from Lehmann, but introduced by Hopper (1991) to refer to the transition from open class to closed class and its accompanying changes (see also Hopper & Traugott 2003:110ff.). I have chosen this term because it is so well established.

¹⁸ Naturally, the term 'closed class' does not mean that no new members can be added, because if that were the case, there would be no grammaticalization. It does mean that the number of members is and remains limited, as opposed to open classes, where new members are being added continuously and in great numbers.

¹⁹ As one anonymous referee points out, there may be cases where grams that become increasingly bound lose in syntactic freedom as well, for instance when a clitic that can be attached both host-initially and host-finally becomes a suffix. Although such clitics certainly exist (e.g. Dutch *k* for *ik* 'I': *k=wil* 'I want' and *wil=k* 'want I'), I am not aware of any examples where such flexible clitics became inflexible affixes. Although clitics may be less specific about the word-class they attach to, they usually do occupy a fixed position (e.g. Wackernagel position). Therefore I think that the observation that syntagmatic variability is of little relevance to secondary grammaticalization is essentially correct.

²⁰ I will merely note that much of the evidence against the scope parameter involves the development of discourse markers (such as *you know* or *indeed*), the scope of which expands to the entire proposition. However, not all researchers agree that the development of discourse markers qualifies as grammaticalization, because, apart from scope expansion, they display a number of other untypical properties (see Norde 2009b for discussion). Another case, mentioned in Tabor & Traugott 1998 is the s-genitive, but here it can be argued that the increase in scope is due to the fact that the development of the s-genitive is an instance of degrammaticalization, not grammaticalization (see section 6.2).

²¹ According to one anonymous referee, the fact that primary and secondary degrammaticalization never form part of one and the same change reduces the usefulness of the term 'degrammaticalization'. This comment is in fact a good illustration of the disagreement, discussed in section 2 of this paper, about the view that 'degrammaticalization' is a meaningful concept only if it can be shown to be the reverse of grammaticalization in all its aspects. I do not share this view, because I think that degrammaticalization is useful as a superordinate term, even if secondary degrammaticalization is never followed by primary degrammaticalization. The terms 'primary and secondary' degrammaticalization are effective too, because primary degrammaticalization involves primitive changes opposite to those attested in primary grammaticalization, and secondary degrammaticalization involves primitive changes opposite to those attested in secondary grammaticalization.

²² Note that these terms are not Lehmann's, but antonyms coined by the present author. Lehmann would probably not use his parameters in this sense, since he remains critical of degrammaticalization (Lehmann 2004), but to me it only shows the strength of his framework that it works 'both ways'.

²³ Note however that the parameter of syntagmatic variability, which is only relevant to primary grammaticalization, is not restricted to secondary degrammaticalization. In secondary grammaticalization, a gram becomes bound and hence

inherently fixed, so that the parameter of syntagmatic variability is no longer relevant. But in secondary degrammaticalization, a bound morpheme may become a free morpheme, and as a free morpheme it need not be fixed in a specific syntactic slot.

²⁴ To prevent terminological confusion, I have attempted to choose unambiguous terms, i.e. terms that have not been used to refer to other kinds of linguistic change. The term ‘degrammation’ was coined by Henning Andersen, as we have seen, to refer to loss of grammatical content. Andersen uses the term in a slightly wider sense in that he includes loss of grammatical content resulting in empty morphs, but I use it in the narrow sense, i.e. the loss of grammatical content in exchange for lexical content. ‘Deinflectionalization’ was chosen because this term appears not to have been used before. ‘Debonding’, finally, is preferred to the term ‘demorphologization’, because this term has been used in a number of different senses already. For instance, in Joseph and Janda (1988) it refers to the relocation of morphological phenomena to either phonology or syntax, whereas in Hopper (1994) it is a synonym for ‘phonogenesis’, the degradation from morpheme to phoneme(s), or empty morphs. The term ‘debonding’ is used in chemistry and related sciences for the severance of inter- and intra-molecular ties.

²⁵ The verb *winsche* has not disappeared entirely — it survives in a subjunctive form, and both *Ich wott, er kennt mitkumme* and *Ich wünsch, er kennt mitkumme* (both meaning ‘I wish he could come with us’) are possible in present-day Pennsylvania German. (Mark Loudon p.c.)

²⁶ The distribution of the s-genitive in the individual languages may vary. Most notably, English does not have an s-genitive in plural NP’s (see Norde 2006a:217ff. and references there).

²⁷ In Modern Swedish, nouns are only inflected for number and definiteness, e.g. *stork-ar-na* (stork-PL-DEF) ‘the storks’. It has been argued that Swedish has retained some form of gender marking as well (see Källström 1996).

²⁸ In Nevis 1986a and literature based on this paper, this morpheme is usually spelled *taga*, but actually this pronunciation (and spelling) is only found in the Eastern Finnmark dialect group. The Western Finnmark dialects, on which the Saami literary language is based, underwent a regular sound change *ht > *h on the border of the second and the third syllable (Ante Aikio p.c.).

²⁹ This sequence cannot have been a free morpheme in Proto-Finno-Ugric, because Proto-Finno-Ugric did not allow word-initial consonant clusters (Ante Aikio, p.c.). Thus, on the basis of this reconstruction at least, a grammaticalization scenario for the abessive can be ruled out. According to that scenario, the abessive would have been a free morpheme in Proto-Finno-Ugric, which grammaticalized into an abessive suffix in all languages but the Northern Saami varieties that have the postposition.

³⁰ Although Nevis’s analysis of the historical events is generally correct, Ante Aikio (p.c.) has pointed out to me that his examples should be treated with care. First, examples are contrasted that are taken from different Saami languages (there are ten official Saami languages, six of which have their own written language). Secondly, the examples contain quite a few errors in morphological analyses and translations. Hence, the examples given here have either been rewritten or provided by native speakers (Ante Aikio and Jussi Ylikoski).

³¹ The case of *tig* has equivalents in German (–)zig and Frisian (–)tich. It is particularly interesting because, in Dutch at least, the independent quantifier is at present (re)grammaticalizing into an intensifier, as in *tig leuk* ‘very nice’ (Norde 2006b).

³² See Lass 1990 and 1997 for discussion of this phenomenon.