



## Book Review

**Tania Kuteva, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog and Seongha Rhee**, *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, 2nd edn, 2019. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. xiv + 632. ISBN 9781107136243.

Reviewed by **Yue Zhang** and **Lei Wang**, School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, P. R. China, E-mail: zhangy799@mail2.sysu.edu.cn, elenawang2017@163.com

<https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2021-2027>

Expanded both in depth and width, this second edition of *World lexicon of grammaticalization* (*Lexicon* henceforth) is almost a new book. The first edition, which appeared in 2002, dealt with the origin and development of grammatical forms (Heine and Kuteva 2002). The main purpose, as mentioned by the authors, was to reconstruct the cognition and communication sources of grammatical categories across languages. The new edition, published 17 years later, keeps up with this tradition while providing an update on new, general developments in grammaticalization since 2002. The content is widely expanded in terms of both languages and the grammatical paths: it now explores 1,009 distinct languages (twicing the first edition) and 544 grammaticalization paths (adding more than 100 paths to the first edition).

The book consists of three parts and three appendices. Part 1 'Introduction' starts with the authors' understanding of grammaticalization at large. This part discusses the definition and mechanisms of grammaticalization, some existing problems and the corresponding resolutions. In addition, it points out several directions relevant to grammaticalization: construction grammar(s), pragmaticalization, language contact and sign language. Among them, some are intersected fields, while others provide alternative perspectives of linguistic analysis and play specific roles in the study of grammaticalization. The first part closes with conventions to help readers understand the source-target lexicon (Part 3) better.

Part 2 'Grammatical concepts used in this work' clarifies grammatical concepts used in a pre-theoretical sense. At the beginning of this part, the authors acquaint readers with the term 'grammatical concept' by noting that concepts used in the book stand for semantic-functional, rather than for morphological or syntactic, categories. To avoid conceptual ambiguity and to narrow down the range of meanings conveyed by the concepts, the authors provide 'approximate gloss and descriptive notes' for each concept label used in this second edition of *Lexicon*.

Part 3 'Source-target lexicon', the central part, is the source-target lexicon arranged alphabetically. Grammaticalization is a unidirectional process in which the development is "from less grammatical to more grammatical forms and constructions" (p. 6). Following this principle, the authors discuss 544 grammatical paths based on data from more than 1,000 different languages and depict them with two salient concepts: source and target. Each path involves definitions of lexical concepts, examples from different languages (and different language families), and references to the respective entry. As a reference book, it offers three appendices involving a source-target list, a target-source list and a list of languages where readers can easily retrieve specific cases, especially in search of historical evidence for diachronic reconstruction.

Grammaticalization describes changes in which linguistic items come to serve grammatical functions. Several monographs on grammaticalization have been published in recent decades dealing with its mechanisms, approaches, limitations, genesis, etc. However, the second edition of *Lexicon* differs from them for it primarily discusses grammaticalization in a "comparative typological perspective" (p. 2) and focuses mainly on the regularity of the development of grammatical forms across languages. It argues in favor of the fact that human beings tend to process languages in a way that more abstract functions are expressed in the form of concrete concepts (e.g. HEAD > FRONT). To illustrate this point, the authors take language families as the bases for typological comparisons in an attempt to avoid "theoretical and regional biases" (p. 2). To this end, the second edition has been enriched with linguistic data from Eastern Asia, especially from Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, to fill existing gaps left in the earlier edition.

Statistically, the sources and targets used in the second edition of *Lexicon* have the following characteristics. Of more than 210 sources of grammaticalization, nearly one third (31%) are common nominal concepts, mainly including body parts (e.g. 'back', 'belly', 'head', 'hand', 'heart', 'neck'), concrete objects (e.g. 'earth', 'house', 'people', 'tree'), abstract concepts (e.g. 'soul', 'time', 'limit'), and over a quarter (26%) are verbal entities (e.g. 'arrive', 'come', 'eat'). Then come grammatical cases (10%), adverbs (8%), adjectives (3%), pronouns (3%) and some other markers (e.g. intensive markers, negation markers, tense markers, or number markers). Most targets of grammaticalization in the book are case roles (e.g. agent, patient, instrument, benefactive), aspects (e.g. completive, habitual), modalities (e.g. epistemic, obligation), conjunctions (e.g. manner, similitive, until). To facilitate the readers' understanding of the concepts, compared with the first edition, the second edition of *Lexicon* has upgraded, modified and replaced terminology. The case SIMILE, for example, is modified as SIMILATIVE, and INSTEAD AS REPLACITIVE; and the grammatical label EXCLAMATION is replaced by

INTERJECTION. Taking into account some distinctions in the possession and modality domains, the authors have sub-classified complex concepts into different grammatical concepts by using prefixes and stems. Thus, in the book, “the stem stands for a conceptual domain and the prefix for the specific grammatical function”, as in A-POSSESSION, which stands for ‘attributive’-possession, B-POSSESSION for ‘belong’-possession, and H-POSSESSION for ‘have’-possession (p. 24). In the domain of modality, the authors also distinguish two subdomains: possibility and necessity. These two subdomains are further sub-classified as B/D/E-NECESSITY and C/D/E/PI-POSSIBILITY, thus replacing the less distinctive terminology used in the previous edition (p. 24). With these modifications, words and grammatical concepts acquire a narrower and more refined meaning due to new developments in the field and due to new findings that have become available.

In addition to the refined terms and concepts, this second edition of *Lexicon* is based on a more extensive database, greatly enriched with distinct language varieties and source-target pathways. Language varieties are significant parameters in showing similarities shared by grammaticalization pathways. While different languages may differ considerably in their features and how they construct grammatical items, the same grammatical process can be reconstructed and verified by language varieties spoken in a specific language. As already mentioned, the authors have added a large amount of linguistic data from languages of Eastern Asia, especially from Chinese, Korean and Japanese, because these languages have specific features and historical records, through which scholars have contributed substantial grammatical cases. Specifically, the second edition of *Lexicon* has also provided a richer data of Altaic, Nilo-Saharan, Pama-Nyungan, Sino-Tibetan, Turkic, pidgin and creole languages, as well as sign languages of different countries (e.g. America, Germany, Israel, Italia, Netherlands), which, on many occasions, were not touched in the first edition or simply lacked comprehensive discussion. Concerning Sino-Tibetan languages, the second edition of *Lexicon* has covered a wide range of dialects of Mandarin: Gan, Hakka, Hui, Min, Wu, Xiang, Yue (Cantonese), Jianghuai Mandarin, Zhongyuan Mandarin, etc. These dialects have served entries already included in the first edition as well as new ones; for instance, the first edition did not contain the pathway GIVE > IMPERATIVE, whereby verbs meaning ‘give’ may develop into imperative markers, and this pathway has been available in the second edition supported by the evidence given in Mandarin by *gei wo* ‘give me’, and in the Xuzhou dialect of Zhongyuan Mandarin by *ke<sup>55</sup> uo<sup>213</sup>* ‘give me’ (p. 197).

To our knowledge, 139 more source-target pathways have been included in the second edition of *Lexicon*, accounting for over a quarter of all the pathways of this second edition (existing pathways with updated grammatical labels are not counted in this respect). One salient example is the pathway CROSS > EXPERIENTIAL

(pp. 132–133), whereby the verb-meaning concept ‘cross over’ may give rise to experiential aspect markers referring to “an event has taken place at least once at some point in the past”. The concept EXPERIENTIAL and the related pathways are all exclusive of the second edition of *Lexicon* possibly because, according to the authors, this pathway is only given support by data from Sinitic languages (i.e. Mandarin, Changsha dialect of Xiang, Guangdong Hakka, etc.), which could hardly be reconstructed through the database of the first edition that lacked crucial evidence based on the analysis of Sino-Tibetan languages. Significantly, the authors have also listed several pathways of which the targets are discourse markers (also known as pragmatic markers). Brinton (2008: 1) defines discourse marker as “a phonologically short item that is not syntactically connected to the rest of the clause, and has little or no referential meaning but serves pragmatic or procedural purposes”. As shown in the second edition of *Lexicon*, discourse markers can be traced back to pathways having the following sources: ‘listen’, ‘look’, ‘now’, ‘right’, ‘say’, ‘so’, ‘then’, ‘well’, ‘what’ and ‘nominalizer’. Take the pathway SAY > DISCOURSE MARKER as an example (pp. 380–381), the verb *wa*<sup>6</sup> in Cantonese meaning ‘say’ serves as a clause-final discourse marker in turn-taking use, used to ask the speaker to repeat information presented earlier. Similarly, the verb *kong*<sup>2</sup> ‘say’ in Taiwanese and Southern Min used in clause-final position can also convey the discourse meaning of suggestion. As regards discourse markers, their development and mechanisms are still under discussion, and no consensus has been reached yet. Although grammaticalization is powerful in explanation, as mentioned in the introduction part of the book, there are still linguists arguing that discourse markers arise from pragmaticalization rather than grammaticalization. The authors of the book have also provided the following explanation to pathways involving discourse markers: they involve a mechanism of cooptation whereby “pieces of discourse located in one domain are transferred to another domain” (Heine et al. 2017: 813). To get a better view, the readers may need to focus more on the cross-language changes of discourse markers and gain more sufficient data.

The current edition of *Lexicon* is of use both for grammaticalization studies and for historical linguistic studies in general. The authors’ wealth of knowledge and meticulous research across languages now available in written form provides an essential tool to many scholars, especially to many historical linguists. However, some improvements can be expected in the book. The first issue affects the grammaticalization of constructions in *Lexicon*. Unlike in Construction Grammar, the authors have defined the term “construction” as “a loose sense for recurring form-meaning pairings consisting of more than one morphological unit” (p. 2). In this view, the syntactic and syntagmatic relation between morphological units would be significant in accounting for the reconstruction of processes of grammatical change; because for some grammatical items such as a content word,

what is grammaticalized is usually not the single word but the whole construction in which that word occurs (Hopper & Traugott 1993). However, the concept-based approach in *Lexicon* can hardly illustrate such propositional relation that grammaticalizes in constructions. One typical example is the grammaticalization of the pathway GO TO > FUTURE (pp. 214–217), whereby the English motion verb *be going to* may become a future marker. In the book, the authors use the source concept GO TO stands for ‘go’-verbs expressing goal-directed movement. As such, the grammaticalization leading to the future marker is explained in and around the source concept represented by ‘go’-verbs alone. However, the construction involving the verb *go* should also be considered against the background that grammatical forms evolve in appropriated contexts and constructions rather than in isolation. As Bybee (2003: 602–603) points out, the grammaticalization of *go* as a future marker takes place in the context of a particular construction, that is, the “[movement verb + Progressive + purpose clause] construction”. Therefore, the book is weak in describing the grammaticalization of constructions concerning syntactic structures and propositional relations such as *be going to*. As already mentioned, what Bybee argues is that the construction plus the lexical items in it may also grammaticalize. The argument is in line with many grammaticalization theorists that emphasize the significance of syntactic context where grammaticalization occurs (Bybee 2003; Heine 2002; Himmelmann 2004). In *Lexicon*, the authors claim that “the intersection between Construction Grammar and grammaticalization has opened up a new and rapidly expanding field of study”, but still there are fundamental theoretical problems cannot be solved so far (p. 17) (e.g. the theoretical concept of unidirectionality) and better accounts are needed to deal with the intersection field between Construction Grammar and grammaticalization in future studies.

Second, the concept-driven pathways depicted simply from source to target in the book cannot clearly illustrate how each of the grammatical items of some forms or constructions change, and what factors contribute to the development of constructions consisting of more than one morphological unit. Following the principle that unidirectionality is the most central theoretical concept of grammaticalization, the authors reduce the process to the source and target uses “to achieve the goal of having a treatment of grammaticalization as a gradual process in the form of a lexicon” (p. 8). However, such a treatment is clearer with lexicons than with constructions. One example is that of the entries with source concept COME FROM (pp. 98–100) and COME TO (pp. 100–107), which separately develop into different target concepts: COME FROM may give rise to ABLATIVE OR NEAR PAST, while COME TO may develop into BENEFACTIVE, CHANGE-OF-STATE, FUTURE, PROXIMATIVE OR PURPOSE. Although the constructions of these two conceptual labels are different, that is, the prepositions following the verb *come* are either *from* or *to*, respectively, the authors

describe them as 'come'-verbs in a similar fashion, thus leading to ambiguity on the readers' part. Fischer (2003) also raised the question that since the two source entries develop into different targets depending on the preposition used, it is hard to judge which factors may influence the development with only the grammatical concepts given to the readers. In fact, the Chinese data illustrating the two pathways added in the second edition of *Lexicon* make this point clear since the grammatical forms corresponding to the source concept COME FROM and COME TO are treated as the same single 'come'-meaning verb *lai*, and the account in *Lexicon* fails to show how the prepositions contribute to the development of constructions as a whole.

Finally, several pathways involving discourse markers are not included in the second edition of *Lexicon*, such pathways relating to epistemic concepts like 'think', 'conjecture', etc. One reason for this deficiency is, as already mentioned, that the development of discourse markers is still in dispute while linguists have not reached any agreement yet.

To conclude, efforts have been made for a long time by linguists across the globe to undertake diachronic reconstruction with fragments that lack systematic correlations, and many of these fragments are pieced together in this second edition of *Lexicon*. The book not only provides and reconstructs a considerable number of grammatical pathways but also offers a new typological perspective that sheds light on the convergence and divergence of comparable changes across languages. It is an encouraging and engaging work for scholars and students who aim to discover and explain data in the historical and typological grammaticalization field. The extensive content and searchable appendices make the second edition of *Lexicon* a great reference book for a wide readership.

## References

Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan L. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticalization: The role of frequency. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 602–623. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fischer, Olga. 2003. Review of *World Lexicon of grammaticalization* by Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. *Functions of Language* 10(1). 136–143.

Heine, Bernd. 2002. On the role of context in grammaticalization. In Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*, 83–101. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Heine, Bernd, Kaltenböck Gunther, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long. 2017. Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Linguistics* 55(4). 813–855.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal? In Bisang Walter, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *What makes grammaticalization? A look from its fringes and its components*, 21–42. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.