

### Grammaticalization vs 'lateral grammaticalization', formalism vs functionalism, in Minimalism:

Vincent and Borjars (V & B) (2010) criticise Roberts and Roussou (R & R) (2003) and Roberts (2010) by arguing that 'lateral grammaticalization' in Simpson and Wu (S & W) (2002) is problematic for R & R's Minimalist model of grammaticalization. V & B also assert that formalism and functionalism should not be seen as mutually exclusive in explaining language change. In this paper I defend R & R (2003) and Roberts (2010) by showing that Minimalism is an elegant model for accounting for the relationship between grammaticalization and 'lateral grammaticalization'. I also verify V & B's claim that formalism and functionalism are not mutually exclusive by examining cross-linguistic examples of grammaticalization and 'lateral grammaticalization'. S & W (2002) analyse Chinese *de* (D > T) as their case of 'lateral grammaticalization', and I have compared it with R & R's (2003) and Roberts' (2010) analyses of the Romance future *habeo* > *aio* (V > T), since both are geneses of T elements.

Lightfoot (1999, 2006) argues that 're-analysis' is essential in language change. He also argues that the primary linguistic data (PLD) is unpredictable (Lightfoot (1999:180-204, 2006:90-111, 164-165)), which predicts that language evolution is random. This is contradicted by the 'cross-linguistic distribution' of grammaticalization (R & R (2003:2-4)), and R & R (2003) propose that since grammaticalization produces 'simpler' structures, it is a natural change that can occur cross-linguistically. Other features of grammaticalization include 'phonological weakening', 'univerbation', 'semantic bleaching', 'lexical > functional' and 'functional > more functional' (Campbell and Janda (2001), Janda (2001)).

Grammaticalization and 'lateral grammaticalization' both show 're-analysis' (R & R (2003:50), S & W (2002:177)), as defined by Hopper and Traugott's (H & T) *going to* > *gonna* (H & T (1993:2-4)), and this correlates with Lightfoot's model (Lightfoot (1999:60-63)). 'Cross-linguistic distribution' is another similarity, and the cross-linguistic examples of Chinese *de* (determiners (D) > copula verbs (T) e.g. Chinese *shi* and Hebrew *hu* (Li and Thompson (1977)) and the Romance future *habeo* > *aio* (e.g. English *have to* > *hafta*, *shall* > *ll*) all undergo R & R's (2003) 'simplification', namely 'reduction in feature syncretisms' (R & R (2003:210)). Furthermore, there are close parallels in these cross-linguistic examples: in determiners > copula verbs, pronouns are in apposition with the dislocated constituent and the predicate; both Latin *habeo* 'to have' and English *have to* originate from the verb 'to have' taking a direct object modified by the infinitive implying modality; both Latin *aio* and English *shall* imply 'obligation/necessity' and 'futurity' simultaneously. There are also sub-types for these changes, since different pronouns (D) in Panare give rise to copula verbs with different tenses (T) (Gildea (1993)), and Latin *habeo* 'to have' is not the only path that leads to futurity e.g. Spanish *ir* (*a*) 'to go' + infinitive, which, like English *going to* > *gonna*, imply directional movement and futurity simultaneously.

The Romance future and its cross-linguistic counterparts also display 'phonological weakening' and 'univerbation' (*habeo* > *aio*, *have to* > *hafta*, *shall* > *ll*, *going to* > *gonna*, *va* (*a*) *dormir* > *vadormir*) as well as 'semantic bleaching' and 'lexical > functional' since while *habeo*, *have*, *go to*, *ir* (*a*) are lexical verbs (V) with clear antonyms, *aio*, *hafta*, *gonna*, *va* are auxiliary verbs (T) with no antonyms (Radford (1997:45)). English *shall* originates 'obligation/necessity' (Visser (1969:1582)), which is in a lower functional position than *ll* (futurity) (Cinque (1999:106)), and since future tense markers no longer inflect for tense, 'functional > more functional' can be defined in terms of Cinque's hierarchy and 'semantic bleaching' can result from an ascent in this hierarchy where higher functional elements like T(future) are semantically more defective than lower ones like Mod(obligation/necessity) as the former no longer has tense features whereas the latter does. Chinese *de* and its cross-linguistic counterparts do not display these features, since D and T are different functional categories (Radford (1997:45)) and there is no evidence for 'phonological weakening' or 'univerbation'. T, especially higher elements in Cinque's T hierarchy, is argued to be 'weaker' than V both in terms of Phonetic Form and Logical Form (R & R (2003:224-232)), and so V > T and lower T > higher T entail 'phonological weakening', 'univerbation', 'semantic bleaching', 'lexical > functional' and 'functional > more functional', whereas D > T does not. V & B (2010:292-293) assert that D > T does not conform to R & R's (2003:36, 202) or Roberts' (2010:48) account, yet I argue that it is precisely these discrepancies which allow us to account for the empirical differences between grammaticalization and 'lateral grammaticalization'. 'Lateral grammaticalization' therefore does not contradict R & R's model. In fact, R & R's model is supported by 'lateral grammaticalization' since their definition of 'simplification' independently explains the 'cross-linguistic distribution' of Chinese *de*. Nonetheless, V & B's assertion that formalism and functionalism are not mutually exclusive is verified by my examination of cross-linguistic parallels, since while 'simplicity', a formalist consideration, holds for all of them, the PLD, which is a functionalist factor, shows clear cross-linguistic trends. Formalism and functionalism account for different aspects of 're-analysis' and are hence not mutually exclusive. Furthermore, formalism and functionalism mutually complement each other, since functionalism allows us to explain cross-linguistic sub-types, namely the exact T element that V and D can produce, and conversely formalism refines functionalism since the formal feature analysis proposed in this paper accounts for the empirical differences between V > T and D > T.

### **Bibliography:**

Campbell, L. (2001): What's wrong with grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 23:113-161.

Campbell, L. and Janda, R. (2001): Introduction: conceptions of grammaticalization and their problems. *Language Sciences* 23:93-112.

Cinque, G. (1999): *Adverbs and the Universal Hierarchy of Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gildea, S. (1993): 'The Development of Tense Markers from Demonstrative Pronouns in Panare (Cariban)', *Studies in Language* 17 (1):53-73.

Hopper, P. J. and Traugott, E. C. (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, C. N. and Thompson, S. A. (1977): 'A Mechanism for the Development of Copula Morphemes', in Li, C. (ed) *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, Austin and London: University of Texas Press, p. 419-444.

Lightfoot, D. (1999): *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lightfoot, D. (2006): *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, I. (2010): 'Grammaticalization, the clausal hierarchy and semantic bleaching'. In Traugott, E. C. and Trousdale, G. (eds), *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 45-73.

Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (2003): *Syntactic change. A Minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, A. and Wu, Z. (2002): 'From D to T – determiner incorporation and the creation of tense.' *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11:169-202.

Vincent, N. and Borjars, K. (2010): 'Grammaticalization and models of language'. In Traugott, E. C. and Trousdale, G. (eds), *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 279-299.

Visser, F. T. (1969): *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, vol III. Leiden: Brill.

Wu, Z. (2004): *Grammaticalization and Language Change in Chinese: a Formal View*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This document was created using  
Smart PDF Creator  
To remove this message purchase the  
product at [www.SmartPDFCreator.com](http://www.SmartPDFCreator.com)