

## Implications of form vs. function approaches for defining grammaticalization

Elizabeth Closs Traugott

Kiparsky (Forthcoming), among others, points out that the two competing definitions of grammaticalization now dominating the literature pick out different aspects of the unidirectionality hypothesis because they address different aspects of change: form on the one hand and function on the other (see Traugott Forthcoming for an account of recent trends in work on grammaticalization). The definition associated with Haspelmath and Lehmann focuses on form, and identifies grammaticalization with a change “by which parts of a constructional schema come to have stronger internal dependencies” (Haspelmath 2004). The definition associated with Bybee, Heine, Roberts, Traugott, and their colleagues, focuses on function, and identifies grammaticalization with a change whereby a lexical unit or construction is assigned a grammatical function, or where an already grammatical unit is assigned a more grammatical function. From the perspective of form, grammaticalization is often construed as reduction, and sometimes little attention is paid to semantics and pragmatics. From the perspective of function, grammaticalization is often construed as expansion, and semantics-pragmatics are considered to be of central importance (see Himmelmann 2004 on pragmatic-semantic, syntactic, and host-class expansion). Whether the dominant mechanism of change is reanalysis or analogy is a current issue for both perspectives.

Some of the differences in approach will be exemplified by discussion of debates concerning:

- A. Whether or not the development of modal particles and discourse markers is an instance of grammaticalization (Diewald Forthcoming, Fischer 2007).
- B. How best to conceptualize the onset of the well-known change of motion-with-a-purpose *be going to* to future *be gonna* (Danchev and Kytö 1994, Fischer 2007).

### References

- Danchev, Andrei and Merja Kytö. 1994. The construction *be going to + infinitive* in Early Modern English. In Dieter Kastovsky, ed., *Studies in Early Modern English*, 59-77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Diewald, Gabriele. Forthcoming. On some problem areas in grammaticalization. In Elke Gehweiler, Ekkehard König, and Katerina Stathi, eds., *What's New in Grammaticalization?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Peridon, eds., *Up and down the Cline—The Nature of Grammaticalization*, 17-44. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal? In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, and Björn Wiemer, eds., *What Makes Grammaticalization - A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, 19-40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kiparsky, Paul. Forthcoming. Grammaticalization as optimization. In Dianna Jonas and John Whitman, eds., *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. Forthcoming. Grammaticalization. In Silvia Luraghi and Vit Bubenik, eds., *A Companion to Historical Linguistics*. London: Continuum Press.

**Required readings**

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Peridon, eds., *Up and down the Cline—the Nature of Grammaticalization*, 17-44. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Available at:  
<http://email.eva.mpg.de/~haspelmt/2004dir.pdf>

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. Forthcoming. Grammaticalization. In Silvia Luraghi and Vit Bubenik, eds., *A Companion to Historical Linguistics*. London: Continuum Press.