

## CLIPP

**Christiani Lehmanni inedita, publicanda, publicata**

titulus	
	Preface
huius textus situs retis mundialis	
	<a href="http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/preface.pdf">http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/preface.pdf</a>
dies manuscripti postremum modificati	
	28.06.2013
ocasio orationis habitae	
	-
volumen publicationem continens	
	José Pinto de Lima, <i>Studies on grammaticalization and lexicalization</i> . Lisboa
annus publicationis	
	2013
paginae	
	4-7

## Preface

Professor José Pinto de Lima is professor of General and German linguistics at the University of Lisbon. The volume that I have the pleasure to introduce here represents his almost complete work on grammaticalization, with side glances at lexicalization. These articles have played an important role in introducing and establishing grammaticalization as a field of research in Portuguese linguistics. At the same time, Pinto de Lima has published not only in Portuguese, but also in English – something still rare among linguists of his country, but obviously necessary for the participation of Portuguese linguistics in international scientific communication.

The volume provides exemplary insights into contemporary research in grammaticalization. Its object are three West European languages, Portuguese, German and English, which – given the state of the art in their linguistics and philology – fulfill all the factual preconditions for in-depth structural and semantic analyses. The changes investigated all belong to the initial phase of a complete grammaticalization scale that leads down to complete loss. The reason for the limitation to the first phase is that changes belonging to the final phase that would have happened during the documented history of West European languages and might thus be investigated with the methods applied here are few in number. What we face, instead, is ongoing grammaticalization of formatives and morphological constructions that started out as lexical items and syntactic constructions in the Middle Ages and which – partly no doubt due to the retarding influence of the ruling grammatical and lexical norm of the standard languages – have not yet being fully grammaticalized. However, as this volume abundantly shows, a linguist has the necessary methods available to reveal what is currently happening in the language.

The first chapter is devoted to adverbial clauses in Portuguese. The development of the modern use of *embora* ‘although’ as a subordinative conjunction out of the adverbial *em boa hora* ‘at a favorable time’ is pursued in the introductory article. It fulfills all of the prototypical requirements of grammaticalization and could well join the treasure of stock examples. Pinto de Lima’s study is an exemplary specimen description combining a thorough historical and philological investigation with a systematic diachronic analysis and a theoretically based account in general terms. And he does not forget that, on top of it all, *embora* is subject to polygrammaticalization, since it also means ‘away’. In article #2, the same kind of analysis used for *embora* is applied to *mal* ‘no sooner’, which also develops from an adverb to a conjunction. In contrast to the former case, however, *mal* passes through an intermediate stage in which it introduces one of the clauses of a correlative construction. Only on this basis is it then reinterpreted as a subordinating conjunction. This case is interesting for yet another reason: a temporal grammatical concept does not arise, as is so often the case, from a spatial one, but instead from a quantitative one. The article devoted to the expansion of the subjunctive mood with concessive conjunctions in Portuguese takes up where the first article leaves off. The author shows convincingly how the subjunctive obligatorily appearing in a subordinate clause introduced by *embora* develops organically out of the original construction of an independent concessive clause, while the subjunctive more recently obligatory in concessive clauses introduced by *ainda que* develops by pragmatic strengthening of the original concessive conditional meaning.

There follows a pair of articles devoted to the periphrastic future. In discussing the role of metaphor and metonymy in grammaticalization, the first article offers the most thorough and precise analysis of the grammaticalization of the English *be-going-to* future extant in the

grammaticalization literature. Its result is that neither of the two semantic processes is involved; instead, it is essentially an instance of semantic bleaching. I am pleased to note that this study – first published in 1999 – is by 98% compatible<sup>1</sup> with my own analysis of the same construction, published in the same year (in *Linguistische Berichte* 180) in my review of Gabriele Diewald's book on grammaticalization. It is time that Pinto de Lima's insight find its way into the textbooks. The other member of this pair applies an analogous analysis to the Portuguese future formed with *ir* 'go'. And here, Pinto de Lima delivers a thorough corpus study, adducing evidence for each of the elementary steps of semantic change that separates the original motion-*cum*-purpose construction from the modern periphrastic future. From the beginnings of the documented history, the construction features the preposition *a* (*ir a fazer algo* 'go to do something'), just as in Spanish up to this day. But at the same time, the asyndetic construction *ir fazer algo* 'go do something' already coexists with it and completely ousts it during the ensuing centuries. It is intriguing to note that in either modern language, the motion-*cum*-purpose construction and the periphrastic future have the same structure, with the preposition in Spanish, without it in Portuguese. While this may be taken as evidence that the Portuguese construction is more grammaticalized than the Spanish one, it comes rather unexpected if one considers that the periphrastic future is more grammaticalized than the motion-*cum*-purpose construction.

Chapter III is devoted to particles which develop traits of subjectivity. The discourse marker *pois* 'well, okay' is dubbed quite aptly 'phatic marker' by Pinto de Lima. The element went a long way from a Latin preposition via an adverb, a conjunction, a discourse marker, an affirmative interjection up to a phatic marker conveying 'I am following you'. The author applies the usual criteria of grammaticalization to the fate of *pois* and concludes that it may be conceived as a case of grammaticalization. At the same time, this is one of the very few extant investigations on the origin of phatic markers. The other article describes the lexicalization of the clause *se calhar* 'if it fits' into an epistemic adverb 'maybe'. This adverb, at the same time, undergoes host expansion and displays certain other properties of grammaticalization.

The next set of articles again forms a coherent chapter both as regards their subject matter, viz. the grammaticalization of evidential verbs, and as regards their object languages, German and Portuguese compared. The first of them describes the course that grammaticalization of German *scheinen* 'seem' has taken in comparison with its Portuguese translation equivalent *parecer*. A historical scrutiny for both verbs reveals that although their modern epistemic syntactic constructions resemble each other to the extent possible, they must have originated through different pathways. The subsequent article is dedicated to the German and Portuguese verbs meaning 'threaten', which have been grammaticalized to modal verbs of epistemic meaning. Their development is largely parallel, with some evidence for a slightly more advanced stage of grammaticalization of German *drohen*. The last article neatly complements the preceding one. Here, instead, Portuguese *ameaçar* 'threaten' is opposed to its positive counterpart *prometer* 'promise'. Their course of grammaticalization is largely parallel, and they end up forming a privative opposition of evidential modals. By methods relying on text frequency, Pinto de Lima also succeeds in assigning evidentiality in Portuguese a place preceding modality and tense on a grammaticalization scale.

---

<sup>1</sup> The difference of 2% is due to the fact that, while both of us argue that the FUTURE component is already present in the original construction, he assumes that it is due to a pragmatic inference, which should read 'logical inference'.

The last chapter deals with two types of complex constructions which, by grammaticalization, join existing paradigms. The first article undertakes an analysis of the five most frequent complex prepositions in modern European Portuguese in order to find out to which extent they are grammaticalized. The differences in their grammatical status are shown to be gradual, with two of them approaching the status of simple prepositions. In the concluding article, finally, I had the pleasure to cooperate with José Pinto de Lima and Rute Soares. Our aim was to show to what extent the construction *ver-se* ‘find oneself’ + participle has already joined the Portuguese voice system. José contributed chiefly, but not exclusively, the diachronic and semantic analysis. The article highlights particularly the role of paradigmaticization in the grammaticalization of periphrastic constructions.

Several of the articles deal with modal and discourse categories. Since modality is by definition concerned with the speaker’s relationship to what he says, and a discourse is necessarily a speaker’s discourse, subjectification is an expected ingredient of many semantic developments described in this set. It is certainly compatible with grammaticalization. However, it is not its essence. There is no such thing as a unified notion of ‘grammatical meaning’ just as there is no unified notion of ‘lexical meaning’. These concepts cannot be defined in interlingual substantive terms, by characterizing them through the kinds of semantic features or categories which constitute them. That has, nevertheless, been tried by various authors: Grammatical meaning has been said to be relational. However, on the one hand, there are grammatical morphemes whose meaning is not relational, such as gender and number morphemes, which would only acquire a relational function if they were taken up in agreement. And on the other hand, many a lexical meaning is inherently relational, such as the meanings of kinship terms or of spatial regions. Others have identified deixis as the *proprium* of grammatical meaning. And again, there are grammatical morphemes whose meaning is not deictic, such as, once more, gender and number morphemes or, for variation, voice morphemes; as well as there are lexical stems whose meaning is deictic, such as Portuguese *vir* ‘come’ and *trazer* ‘bring’. Yet others have said that grammatical meaning is abstract. There is some truth in this proposition, given that grammatical meanings are so generic that any attempt to determine the extension of the concepts in question (in the sense that the set of stallions is the extension of the concept ‘stallion’) must fail: they never have a *denotatum*. However, the same is true of many lexical concepts, starting with ‘time’ and not ending with ‘pragmatics’. A fourth proposal is that grammatical meaning is ‘procedural’ in nature in that it relates not to the *designatum* of what is conveyed but instead to the conveyance itself. That is, again, true of many a grammatical meaning, but obviously not of all of them. It is true of grammatical categories such as mood and definiteness which are at the service of mutual understanding rather than characterizing the *designatum* as such. But then there are other grammatical meanings such as participant roles (agent, patient, experiencer etc.), local relations (locative/essive, allative, ablative, perlative) or categories such as stativity/dynamicity, durativity/telicity, which clearly structure the content of what is being conveyed rather than its transmission. Language has two basic functions, communication and cognition. Categorizing the nature of grammatical meaning as ‘procedural’ is an attempt to reduce language to its function in communication – often attempted in the history of our field, but necessarily doomed to failure. Thus, it is quite possible that many a process of grammaticalization leads to grammatical meanings involving deixis or, more specifically, the relation to the speaker, or concerning the organization of discourse, or what else has been brought forward in recent research on semantic and pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. But none of all of this can be definitional. Grammar is not a kind of meaning, it cannot be

characterized in semantic terms. Grammar is structure. Not, of course, sheer formal, empty structure, but meaningful structure. However, its function is not to contribute some kind of meaning to the message, but to structure it for communication and cognition.

José Pinto de Lima's interest lies chiefly in the semantic and pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. However, he does not join any of the four doctrines just mentioned – or any other, for that matter – of the semantic or pragmatic foundation of grammaticalization. Instead, he analyzes and describes in precise terms what happens to the meaning of an item or a construction if it is grammaticalized. And unlike a lamentable majority of cognitive linguists, he always keeps a keen eye on the formal aspects of the expressions that he studies, bearing in mind that grammaticalization must be conceived and diagnosed in structural terms.

As anybody may gather from this collection, José Pinto de Lima displays a rare combination of specializations: He is a philologist of a foreign language – German, in this case – in the full sense of the word, which includes not only familiarity with the language, literature and social life of the speech community in question, but naturally also the ability to speak the language fluently, which is always a safe basis for its scientific analysis. Secondly, he can compare this language with his native language and a couple of other European languages he knows. This allows him a look from outside on his native language, something still relatively rare in Portuguese linguistics. Thirdly, he combines the synchronic with the diachronic perspective. For the latter, he does not confine his analysis to generalizations of diachronic typology, but takes on himself the task of concrete historical work on the corpora of the languages in question. Fourthly, he combines his structural and diachronic semantic analyses with up-to-date approaches from language philosophy and pragmatics. This rare combination of approaches is brought to bear on a great variety of topics and makes for stimulating reading. This volume represents a clear advance in grammaticalization studies.