

WHERE CAN WORKING IN TANDEM TAKE US? ROMANCE DATA MEETS GRAMMATICALIZATION THEORY

Natalya I. Stolova
Colgate University

This short essay was inspired by two of *La corónica*'s recent publications: the Critical Cluster *Historical Romance Linguistics: the Death of a Discipline?* organized and edited by Steven N. Dworkin (31.2) and its subsequent overview entitled "A Necessary Discipline: Historical Romance Linguistics" authored by Martin Maiden (32.2). The aforementioned pieces raise a number of issues related to the present state and the future of Romance philology, two of which are the scope of current research in the field and the relation between Romance data and general linguistics. Several of the Cluster's essays express unease about the fact that the comparative and the diachronic approaches which characterized the discipline in earlier times are nowadays practically ignored. For example, Jerry R. Craddock observes that due to the scarcity of Pan-Romance studies, the picture that emerges from consulting the *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* can be best described as that of "fragmentation and dispersal" (2003: 20); Peter Koch claims that the historical component serves as the force which "holds Romance philology together at its innermost core" (2003: 42); and Steven N. Dworkin reminds us that "from the outset Romance linguistics was by definition historical and comparative" (2003: 13). As for the link between Romance philology and linguistic theory, the Cluster demonstrates that the field in question not only benefits from the developments in general linguistics, but also contributes to them. Ralph Penny, for instance, points out that Romance data have served as testing ground for general theories of grammaticalization, capitalization and exaptation, as well as for social network theory situated within the sociolinguistic approach (Penny 2003: 86). In Martin

Maiden's words, "the potential 'enemy within' is neglect of a truly comparative perspective on the Romance languages" and "the best route, politically, to ensure the prosperity of our subject in universities is for us to assert, loud and clear, that linguistics needs us" (2004: 221). In what follows, I would like to offer some thoughts on the interrelation between the two issues just mentioned.

In the process of reading the Cluster one cannot fail to notice that one linguistic theory in particular, namely grammaticalization theory, is repeatedly brought up in essay after essay. A number of contributors (Steven N. Dworkin, María Teresa Echenique-Elizondo, Ralph Penny, John Charles Smith) refer to it to underscore its relevance for the Romance data, or, as in the case of Johannes Kabatek, to warn about its shortcomings. Peter Koch's essay "Historical Romance Linguistics and the Cognitive Turn" addresses the aforementioned theory in more detail. Koch demonstrates that the Romance languages form a microcosm able to illustrate developments attested in other language families. For example, the path LOCATION > EXISTENCE (e.g., Italian *c'è*) is also present in Germanic (e.g., English *there is*); the path POSSESSION > EXISTENCE > LOCATION (e.g., French *il (y) a*, Spanish *ha(y)*, Portuguese *há*, Catalan (*hi / ha*) corresponds to Greek *έχι*, Southern German *es hat*, Bulgarian *има*, Swahili *-na*, Nubi *fií*, etc. (Koch 2003: 45). The universal nature of these paths is not accidental: it can be explained by "cognitively natural metonymic or metaphorical bridges" (Koch 2003: 45). These bridges of metonymic and metaphorical nature manifest themselves in historical semantics as well. For instance, an ongoing research project entitled "Lexical Change – Polygenesis – Cognitive Constraints" directed by Koch at the University of Tübingen has revealed a series of cross-linguistic tendencies in the development of body-part terminology: e.g., the metaphorical change from Latin TESTA 'bowl' into such Romance words for 'head' as French *tête*, Italian *testa*, and Old Spanish *tiesta* is parallel to the semantic history of German *Kopf* and English *noggin* (Dworkin, in press). This microcosmic quality, according to Koch, makes the Romance data particularly valuable for diachronic cross-linguistic studies undertaken within the cognitive framework. Taking Koch's line of thought as my point of departure, I will argue that relying on the theory of grammaticalization not only gives Romance philology the opportunity to participate in a mutually beneficial dialogue with general linguistics, but also creates an impetus for our discipline to reconnect with the Pan-Romance historical approach.

Grammaticalization theory is a collective term which refers to the ideas put forward during the last quarter of a century regarding the development of grammatical markers, also known as grams. Its central concept is that of a grammaticalization path defined as “a frequently recurring route which signs with a given function may take when they are grammaticalized in language change” (Lehmann 1995: 25). Common examples of a grammaticalization path are spatial terms producing temporal markers; demonstratives producing articles; terms for body parts producing case markers, etc. (Traugott 1999: 179). Grammaticalization paths are often shared by genetically unrelated and geographically separated languages. The grammaticalization theory, which situates itself within the framework of cognitive linguistics, contends that this is due to the fact that grammaticalization is cognitively motivated. The definition of a grammaticalization path as a route of development and the observation regarding parallel types of evolution across languages suggest that the theory in question is firmly embedded into diachrony and comparative analysis.

As indicated in the Cluster (Koch 2003: 48), grammaticalized constructions in Romance frequently find their way into the literature on grammaticalization. But when one tries to find Pan-Romance studies that treat these constructions in more detail, it becomes clear that the data are often highly dispersed. Verbs of motion (to offer an example related to my own research interests) serve well to illustrate this point. Due to their frequency, broad sense, conceptual saliency, and high aptitude to take on metaphorical meanings, verbs that express movement (e.g., GO, COME, etc.) are very likely to undergo grammaticalization. The Romance languages have amply availed themselves of this possibility by developing a high number of periphrastic constructions able to express grammatical meanings that belong to such categories as tense, aspect, mood and voice. For instance, in French *aller* ‘go’ followed by an infinitive can refer to the future tense (e.g., *Demain il va faire beau*, ‘Tomorrow the weather will be nice’); in Spanish a combination of *ir* ‘go’ and a gerund expresses the imperfective aspect of a gradual or progressive action (e.g., *El enfermo va mejorando*, ‘The patient keeps getting better’); in Portuguese the first person plural of the verb *ir* ‘go’ followed by an infinitive has evolved into a hortative (imperative) marker (e.g., *Vamos levá-lo para o carro*, ‘Let’s take him to the car’); in Italian *andare/venire* + past participle can indicate passive voice (e.g., *La denuncia non venne ricevuta* ‘The complaint was not accepted’), etc.

Such variety makes the Romance family a valuable testing ground for theories concerned with the relation between language and cognition, the cross-linguistic development of grammatical categories, and the nature of auxiliaries. Yet as I demonstrate elsewhere (Stolova 2003), the treatment of the constructions in question by Romanists is far from exhaustive. This might be due, in part, to the difficulties of identifying and defining precisely motion verbs. For example, in the case of French, the *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française* de Paul Robert edited by Alain Rey lists 228 infinitives in the section entitled “Mouvement”, while Annibale Elia in an article “Une note sur la syntaxe et la sémantique des verbes de mouvement en français” states that French has about 150 such verbs (Rey 2001: IV: 1717; Elia 1982: 352). Most research published so far focuses on periphrastic constructions in general (e.g., Schemann 1983 on Portuguese), on periphrases that express one particular grammatical category (e.g., Dietrich 1983 on Pan-Romance periphrastic aspect), or on structures in which the auxiliary is situated in a particular syntactic environment (e.g., Gómez Manzano 1992 on Spanish periphrases with infinitive), treating constructions that have undergone the ‘verb of motion > grammatical marker’ path only incidentally. Those works that do focus on such constructions tend to concentrate on one or a few Romance varieties at a time (e.g., Giacalone Ramat 1995 on Italian *andare/venire* + gerund), with national languages receiving a fair amount of attention and non-national ones often left neglected. In other words, what is missing is a systematic Pan-Romance treatment of the topic.

Such a treatment (which constitutes one of my current projects, tentatively entitled *Grammaticalization of Motion in the Romance Languages*) reveals several levels of the uniformity/diversity dichotomy, which, according to Koch, constitutes one of the principal assets of Romance linguistics. A comparison between Classical Latin, spoken Latin, and its Romance descendants exemplifies a typological shift. Classical Latin had only one periphrastic construction with a verb of motion: the future passive infinitive formed as a combination of a supine and IRI, the present passive infinitive of IRE ‘go’ (e.g., Plautus’s “nisi se sciat uilico non datum iri”, ‘unless she does not know that she is going to be given to a farmer’). The Romance languages, in contrast, have created a wide range of periphrases with motion verbs. In Stolova 2003 I demonstrate that these developments correspond to fifteen types of grammaticalization pathways:

(1) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive > (near) future tense

Example: (Spanish) *Voy a leer* este artículo mañana.

I am going to read this article tomorrow.

(2) verb of motion + past participle > passive voice

Example: (Rhaeto-Romance) El *vain lodá*.

He is praised.

(3) verb of motion + gerund > continuous aspect

Example: (Portuguese) *Anda lendo*.

He is reading.

(4) verb of motion (+ particle/preposition) + infinitive > continuous aspect

Example: (Italian) La situazione *seguitava ad aggravigliarsi*.

The situation kept getting worse.

(5) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive > inceptive aspect

Example: (French) Les enfants *se mettent à courir*.

The children start running.

(6) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive > iterative aspect

Example: (Sardinian) *Toro a léghere* cussu libru.

I read that book again.

(7) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive > (near) past tense

Example: (Catalan) El seu discurs *va causar* un gran impacte en l'auditori.

Her talk produced a great effect on the audience.

(8) verb of motion (+ preposition) + past participle / infinitive > resultative marker

Example: (Spanish) *Llegó a ser* abogado.

He became a lawyer.

(9) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive/past participle > avertive/proximative aspect

Example: (French) Hugo *va pour plonger* la main dans sa poche.

Hugo is about to put his hand in his pocket.

(10) verb of motion (+ preposition) + infinitive > hortative mood

Example: (Portuguese) *Vamos levá-lo para o carro.*
Let's take him to the car.

(11) verb of motion + gerund/infinitive > sudden/unexpected action

Example: (Spanish) *Ahora sales diciendo que no sabías nada.*
 Now you *are telling* me that you did not know anything.

(12) verb of motion + coordinative conjunction + finite verb > sudden/unexpected/malefactive action

Example: (Spanish) *Y entonces, el niño va y se cae.*
 And then, the boy (*suddenly*) *falls*.

(13) verb of motion + past participle > state

Example: (Spanish) *María anda preocupada por el problema.*
 Mary *is worried* about this problem.

(14) verb of motion + preposition + infinitive > cessative/egressive (aspect)

Example: (Portuguese) *Porque é que agora deixaste de o ajudar?*
 Why is it that now you *stopped helping* him?

(15) verb of motion + past participle > deontic modality

Example: (Italian) *Questo lavoro va fatto.*
 This job *has to be done*.

It should be stressed that the number of periphrastic constructions is even higher than the number of grammaticalization pathways that have produced them because in many cases one channel is represented by more than one periphrasis. For instance, in Spanish the chain 'verb of motion + gerund > continuous aspect' has resulted in four constructions: *ir* + gerund (e.g., *ir diciendo*), *andar* + gerund (e.g., *andar diciendo*), *venir* + gerund (e.g., *venir diciendo*), and *seguir* + gerund (e.g., *seguir diciendo*).

As can be seen from the examples above, the tendency to undergo the 'verb of motion > grammatical marker' path is not limited to one particular neo-Latin variety, but rather can be claimed to be Pan-Romance. The level of participation in it, however, is far from being uniform: Spanish and Portuguese exhibit the highest number of developments (all the grammaticalization paths listed above except for number fifteen), French and Italian exemplify nine pathways,

Occitan, Catalan, Rhaeto-Romance, Sardinian and Rumanian participate in five, four, three, two and one channels, respectively. Some of these paths are attested in the majority of the languages, as in the case of 'verb of motion + gerund > marker of continuous aspect'. This grammaticalization chain manifests itself in Spanish *ir/andar/venir/seguir* + gerund, Old, Middle, and sixteenth and seventeenth century French *aller* (+ *en*) + gerund, Old French *venir* + gerund, Italian *andare/venire* + gerund, Portuguese *ir/andar/vir/seguir* + gerund, Catalan *venir/anar* + gerund, Occitan (Langadocian variety) *amar* + gerund, and Old Rhaeto-Romance *ir* + gerund. A parallel structure existed already in Late Latin. The relevant literature (e.g., Škerlj 1926: 202; Gougenheim 1929: 2; Bourciez 1967: 270; Dietrich 1983: 466; Haßler 2002: 173) commonly cites "STELLAS IRE TRAHENDO COMAS" by Venantius Fortunatus (sixth century CE) to exemplify this usage. Outside of the Romance family this development is also common. It is attested in a number of Turkic languages, several Mongolian varieties, as well as in English (*to go on* + *-ing*) (Maisak 2002: 76-77).

In contrast, other paths are language-specific: the chain 'verb of motion + past participle > marker of deontic modality', for instance, is found in no other Romance language but Italian. The deontic modality indicates necessity or possibility, as illustrated with Italian *Questo lavoro va fatto*, 'This job has to be done'. The fact that this Italian development has no equivalent in the Romance family fits well into the universal pattern of periphrases with GO, since this verb of motion rarely evolves into modal grammatical markers (Maisak 2002: 89). Certain constructions have developed into grams with opposite meanings. The combination 'GO (+ preposition) + infinitive' produced the so-called GO-future in some varieties (e.g., Spanish, French, Portuguese, Rhaeto-Romance), while creating the so-called GO-past in others (e.g., Catalan, fourteenth- through the seventeenth- century French). In the case of Occitan, both the past and the future meanings have coexisted since the Middle Ages, with the former usage being prevalent in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries, and the latter one gaining prominence from that time onward (Stolova, in press). Similar developments are attested in other language families. Suzanne Fleischman, for instance, gives examples of the GO-future in Hebrew, Palestinian Arabic, Cuna, Ibo, Kishamba, Krio, and Mauritian Creole, as well as examples of the GO-past in Swahili and Cuna (1982: 323; 326). What the developments listed above suggest, is that a full appreciation of the microcosmic quality of the Romance family and an adequate assessment of its participation in the universally attested

grammaticalization pathways can be achieved only when a wide range of both standard and non-standard neo-Latin varieties is consulted and when the diachronic perspective is taken into account. In other words, the potential of Romance historical linguistics to contribute to linguistic theory (in our case the theory of grammaticalization) is intrinsically tied to the comparative and the historical dimensions of the discipline.

When explaining the Cluster's deliberately controversial subtitle, Dworkin points out that "the question of 'death' ... raises the issue of vigor of current research initiatives" (2003: 9-10). The contemporary attention to cognitive universals and the revival of interest in the mechanisms of language change have created a felicitous opportunity for Romance linguists to assert the vigorous nature of the field. I concur with the Cluster's contributors and with Martin Maiden that reconnecting with the Pan-Romance diachronic approach and continuing the dialogue with general linguistics will increase the vitality of our discipline and, in my opinion, these two strategies have the potential of rendering the best results when employed in tandem.

Works Cited

- Bourciez, Édouard. 1967. *Éléments de linguistique romane*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Craddock, Jerry R. 2003. "Reflections on a Premature Intimation of Impending Doom". *La corónica* 31.2: 19-23.
- Dietrich, Wolf. 1983. *El aspecto verbal perifrástico en las lenguas románicas: estudios sobre el actual sistema verbal de las lenguas románicas y sobre el problema del origen del aspecto verbal perifrástico*. Trans. Marcos Martínez Hernández. Biblioteca románica hispánica II, Estudios y ensayos 331. Madrid: Editorial Gredos. [*Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen: untersuchungen zum heutigen romanischen Verbalssystem und zum Problem der Herkunft des periphrastischen Verbalaspekts*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1973.]
- Dworkin, Steven N. 2003. "Thoughts on the Future of a Venerable and Vital Discipline". *La corónica* 31.2: 9-17.
- . In press. "La naturaleza del cambio léxico". *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Arco Libros.

- Elia, Annibale. 1982. "Une note sur la syntaxe et la sémantique des verbes de mouvement en français". *Quaderni di Semantica* 3.2.6: 351-57.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1982. "The Past and the Future: Are they coming or going?" *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Eds. Monica Macaulay, et al. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 322-34.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 1995. "Sulla grammaticalizzazione dei verbi di movimento: *andare e venire + gerundio*". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 80: 168-203.
- Gómez Manzano, Pilar. 1992. *Perífrasis verbales con infinitivo: valores y uso en la lengua hablada*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Gougenheim, Georges. 1929. *Étude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*. Paris: Librairie A.- G. Nizet.
- Haßler, Gerda. 2002. "Crosslinguistic and Diachronic Remarks on the Grammaticalization of Aspect in Romance Languages: Location and Motion Verbs". *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Eds. Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 163-79.
- Koch, Peter. 2003. "Historical Romance Linguistics and the Cognitive Turn". *La corónica* 31.2: 41-55.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München/Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Maiden, Martin. 2004. "A Necessary Discipline: Historical Romance Linguistics". *La corónica* 32.2: 215-21.
- Maisak, Timur. 2002. *Tipologija grammatikalizatsii konstruksij s glagolami dvizheniia i glagolami pozitsii. (Typology of Grammaticalization Paths of Motion and Posture Verbs.)* Dissertation. Moscow State University.
- Penny, Ralph. 2003. "Historical Romance Linguistics: A Sociolinguistic Perspective". *La corónica* 31.2: 83-88.
- Rey, Alain., Ed. 2001. *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française de Paul Robert*. 2nd ed. 6 vols. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.
- Schemann, Hans. 1983. *Die portugiesischen Verbalperiphrasen: Corpus und Analyse*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Škerlj, Stanko. 1926. *Syntaxe du participe présent et du gérondif en vieil italien avec une introduction sur l'emplois du participe présent et de l'ablatif du gérondif en latin*. Paris: Champion.
- Stolova, Natalya I. 2003. *Verbs of Motion in the Romance Languages*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

- . In press. “Expressing Time through Space: A Comparative Diachronic Perspective on Romance Periphrastic Past and Future”. *Proceedings of “On the Expression of Time and Space”*. Cluj-Napoca (Rumania): Clusium.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1999. “Grammaticalization and Lexicalization”. *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Eds. Keith Brown and Jim Miller. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 177-83.