

Janet Zhiqun Xing (Ed.)

A Typological Approach to Grammaticalization and Lexicalization

Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

Editors

Chiara Gianollo

Daniël Van Olmen

Editorial Board

Walter Bisang,

Tine Breban,

Volker Gast,

Hans Henrich Hock,

Karen Lahousse,

Natalia Levshina,

Caterina Mauri,

Heiko Narrog,

Salvador Pons,

Niina Ning Zhang,

Amir Zeldes

Editor responsible for this volume

Daniël Van Olmen

Volume 327

A Typological Approach to Grammaticalization and Lexicalization



East Meets West

Edited by
Janet Zhiqun Xing

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-063722-9

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-064128-8

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-063742-7

ISSN 1861-4078

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019945640

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Foreword

The articles in this volume were selected from presentations at *the International Symposium on Typological Regularity of Semantic Change in Grammaticalization and Lexicalization* organized by Janet Zhiqun Xing and held at Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington, in April 2017. The purpose of this symposium was to provide new perspectives on the typological characteristics of grammaticalization and lexicalization in Asian and Indo-European languages.

I wish to acknowledge all the authors for their contributions and for commenting on one another's chapters. My special gratitude goes to Randi Hacker who proofread and copyedited the entire volume. I would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers and Daniel Van Olmen, the editor of *Trends in Linguistics*, for reviewing the complete collection and for providing constructive comments and suggestions for revision. Western Washington University and the Confucius Institute of the State of Washington funded the symposium and this resultant publication. Without it, this project could not have been completed.

Contents

Foreword — V

Contributors — IX

Abbreviations — XI

Janet Zhiqun Xing

Introduction — 1

Part I: Grammaticalization

Walter Bisang

Grammaticalization in Chinese – A cross-linguistic perspective — 17

Ekkehard Koenig

Establishing transphrastic relations: On the grammaticalization of demonstratives — 55

Xiufang Dong

From denotation to description: Noun-adjective and verb-adjective polysemy in Chinese — 75

Alain Peyraube and Thekla Wiebusch

New insights on the historical evolution of differential object marking (DOM) in Chinese — 101

Christine Lamarre

An associated motion approach to northern Mandarin motion-cum-purpose patterns — 131

Janet Zhiqun Xing and Axel Schuessler

Semantic extension in Old Chinese: Direction, transitivity, and voice — 165

Barbara Meisterernst

A new approach to the development of deontic markers: In Pre-Modern Chinese — 191

Shannon Dubenion-Smith

A typology of non-clausal postpositioning in German dialects — 231

Part II: Lexicalization

Edward Vajda

Ket polysynthesis, grammaticalization, and lexicalization — 257

Ken-ichi Takashima

A lexical category in Shāng Chinese: $V_{\text{controllable}}$ vs. $V_{\text{uncontrollable}}$ — 283

Chaofen Sun

Non-specific degree: Chinese gradable adjectives — 319

Yancheng He and Fuxiang Wu

Compounding word-formation in Ahou Gelao — 351

Subject Index — 385

Language Index — 391

Contributors

Walter Bisang, Department of English and Linguistics, University of Mainz and Department of Humanities, Zhejiang University, wbisang@uni-mainz.de

XIUFANG DONG (董秀芳), Department of Chinese Language and Literature, Peking University, xdong@pku.edu.cn

Shannon Dubenion-Smith, Department of Linguistics and Modern & Classical Languages, Western Washington University, dubenis@wwu.edu

Yancheng He (何彦城), College of Foreign Studies, Guangxi Normal University, yanchenghe@126.com

Ekkehard Koenig, Institut für Englische Philologie, Berlin Free University, koenig@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Christine Lamarre, Inalco-CRLAO (National Institute for Oriental Languages and Cultures/Center for linguistic research on East-Asian languages), christine.lamarre@inalco.fr

Barbara Meisterernst, Institute of Linguistics, National Tsing Hua University, bmeisterernst@gmail.com

Alain Peyraube, Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l'Asie Orientale (EHESS), alain.peyraube@gmail.com

Axel Schuessler, Independent Researcher, xschuesa@gmail.com

Chaofen Sun (孙朝奋), Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Stanford University, cfsun@stanford.edu

Ken-ichi Takashima (高嶋謙一), Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia, kenichi@mail.ubc.ca

Edward Vajda, Department of Linguistics and Modern & Classical Languages, Western Washington University, Edward.Vajda@wwu.edu

Thekla Wiebusch, Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l'Asie Orientale (EHESS), thekla.wiebusch@hotmail.fr

Fuxiang Wu (吴福祥), College of Linguistic Sciences, Beijing Language and Culture University, wufuxiang100@126.com

Janet Zhiquan Xing (邢志群), Department of Linguistics and Modern & Classical Languages, Western Washington University, Janet.Xing@wwu.edu

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd person
A	Agent
ACC	Accusative
ACH	Achievement phase marker
ADJ	Adjective
ADV	Adverbial marker
ANIM	Animate class
ANOM	Action nominal
APPL	Applicative
ASP	Aspect maker
AUG	Augmentation
BA	for <i>qǔ</i> , <i>jiāng</i> , <i>chí</i> , <i>zhuō</i> and <i>bǎ</i> in their function as object markers
CAUS	Causative
CL	Classifier
CLD	Cylindrical or stick-like objects
CNS	Consultation (Mood)
CNV	Convex objects
COMP	Complement
COMPAR	Comparative marker
COND	Conditional
CONJ	Conjunction
CONT	Continuous aspect
COP	Copula
COS	Change of State
CRS	Current-relevant-state
DAT	Dative
DEF	Definite (article)
DEM	Demonstrative
DIM	Diminutive
DIR	Directional
DIST	Distal
DIST	Distributive
DO	Direct object
DOM	Differential object marking
EXPL	Explanation of a situation
FEM	Feminine
FLT	Flat thin objects
FOC	Focus
FUT	Future tense
GD	Giving disposal
GEN	Genitive
GNR	Generic
HU	Human class
IMPF	Imperfective

XII — Abbreviations

INAN	Inanimate class
INCEPT	Inceptive (start of action or activity)
INDF	Indefinite
INF	Infinitive
INS	Instrument
INSTR	Instrumental
INTJ	Interjection
INTN	Intention (Modality)
INTRANS	Intransitive
IO	Indirect object
IPV	Imperfective aspect
ITER	Iterative (= repeated action or ongoing change of state)
KNW	Known human
LCL	Locative classifier
LOC	Locative
MASC	Masculine
MD	Making disposal
MEB	Mother's elder brother
MED	Medium size
ML.GRN	Grown male
MOD	Modal verb
MOD	Modification marker (nominal)
MOM	Momentaneous (= single action)
MQD	Manner-quality-degree (demonstratives)
NCL	N numeral classifier
NEG	Negation
NOM	Nominative marker
NP	Noun phrase
OBJ	Object
OM	Object marker
PART	Particle
PASS	Passive
PD	Placing disposal
PF	Perfect
PFV	Perfective aspect
PHS	Phase complement
PL	Plural
POS	Positive
POSS	Possessive
PP	Purposive
PRED	Predicate
PREP	Preposition
PRON	Pronoun
PROSEC	Prosecutive (motion across or through)
PROX	Proximal
PRS	Present tense
PST	Past tense

Q	Question marker
R	Realis
RDP	Reduplication
RED	Reduplicated form
REFL	Reflexive
REL	Relative clause marker
RES	Resultative
RND	Round or oval objects
SBJ	Subject
SFP	Sentence-final particle
SG	Singular
SRN	Surname
ST	Site or place
SUBORD	Subordinative
SUG	Suggestion
SVC	Serial verb construction
TAM	Tense-aspect-mood
TH	Thematic (prefix with no identifiable meaning)
TOP	Topic marker
TRANS	Transitive
TRANSL	Translative
VENT	Ventive
VLU	Valued or appreciated
VP	Verb phrase
YNG	Young

Janet Zhiquan Xing
Introduction

The collection of articles in this volume is intended to address typological characteristics in the processes of grammaticalization and lexicalization. More specifically, they focus on whether Asian and European languages share similar grammaticalization and lexicalization processes, whether the general processes of semantic change depend on certain typological properties of an Eastern or a Western language, and whether the processes of grammaticalization and lexicalization correlate with other features of genetically unrelated and typologically different languages. This introductory chapter is organized as follows: Section 1 provides an overview of typological clines of grammaticality in both Eastern and Western languages; Sections 2–4 lay out the framework of comparative studies used by all contributions (synchronic vs. diachronic, Eastern languages vs. Western languages, and grammaticalization vs. lexicalization); Section 5 briefly discusses some of the outcomes of this volume; and Section 6 outlines and summarizes the content of each contribution.

1 Typological clines of grammaticality

Over the years, typologically oriented research on grammaticalization and lexicalization has been prolific and many universal tendencies have been identified, such as unidirectionality, or “the cline of grammaticality” diagrammed as “content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix” (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 7). In comparison, research on cross-linguistic variation in grammaticalization and lexicalization has been sporadic. Based on a diachronic study of Chinese texts, Xing (2012, 2015) suggests a cline of semantic accretion, $A > AB > ABC$, in grammaticalization for languages with isolating properties, competing with the cline of semantic recession, $A > AB > B$, suggested by Heine et al. (1991) built on Hopper’s layering principle (1991). Xing (2013, 2015) argues that the primary explanation leading to the two different clines of semantic change in grammaticalization as well as lexicalization is related to the typological properties of Chinese and Indo-European languages; that is, Chinese being an analytical and isolating language lacks explicit grammatical marking. Consequently, syntagmatic factors become key in the accurate interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. Most Indo-European languages, on the other hand, are generally characterized as inflectional languages, although they vary in terms of the degree of inflectional marking.

For instance, even though English still marks tense and number, it has lost much of its case system since the 11th century AD (for detailed discussion on the difference between English and German, see Hawkins 1986). This makes English less inflectional than other Indo-European languages, such as German, French, and Spanish, all of which have explicit markings on both nouns and verbs (e.g. case, number, gender, tense, aspect, voice). When comparing word-external properties in English and German, Hawkins (2018: 1) suggests “individual words [in English] carry less syntactic and semantic information in their grammatical and lexical representations and have become more reliant on neighboring words for the assignment of linguistic properties [than in German].” Regardless, the interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning in all Indo-European languages is generally less dependent on discourse and pragmatics than it is in isolating analytical languages, such as Chinese. This analysis aligns with Bisang’s characterization of grammaticalization as two different types of maturation: economy-based maturation that dominates in processes of grammaticalization in the East and mainland Southeast Asia and explicitness-based maturation that operates more prominently in English and German (Bisang 2009, 2015, and this volume).

To address the questions raised above, contributions to this volume focus on the properties, grammaticality, and grammaticalization and/or lexicalization of one or more of the following grammatical categories: demonstrative, modal auxiliary, complement, adjective, preposition or object marking, postposition, compounding, conjunction, negation, and aspect in either Asian (e.g. Chinese, Gelao, and Japanese), European languages (e.g. English, German), or Eurasian language (i.e. Ket). Through analysis of both diachronic and synchronic data, contributors discuss the evolution processes and/or typological properties of those grammatical categories. In addition to studies of two major language types (isolating languages as represented by Chinese and inflectional languages as represented by German), the study of a third type, agglutinative languages as represented by Ket, is also included in this collection. Our goal is to provide empirical evidence for the processes and regularities of grammaticalization and lexicalization in these languages.

2 Diachronic data

Unlike other collections, this volume includes studies of grammaticalization and/or lexicalization in written texts from the earliest Chinese to modern Chinese: Takashima’s study investigates the semantic and pragmatic functions of differentiating two verb types in Shang Oracle Bone Inscriptions (13th–11th centuries BCE); Xing and Schuessler’s study discusses the semantic extension of various types of

verbs in Old Chinese (11th–3rd centuries BCE); Peyraube and Wiebusch focus their study on the origin and development of object marking in Medieval Chinese (3rd–13th CE); Meisterernst examines the development of modal verbs in pre-modern Chinese, and several other contributors report on different grammatical elements in modern Chinese. These studies of Chinese texts recorded over the past 3000 years (11th century BCE – 21st century CE) present a consistent and coherent analysis of the development of the major categories of the Chinese grammatical system. One overwhelming conclusion reached by the contributors is that Chinese has all along had no obligatory markings of word class (e.g. nouns, verbs, adjective), from the earliest inscriptions to modern texts. The primary factors for accurate interpretation of a Chinese lexeme have been discourse and pragmatics.

3 Comparative analysis and typological properties

To demonstrate typological characteristics in grammaticalization and lexicalization, most of the contributions included in this volume are comparative in nature. Some studies compare the processes of grammaticalization or lexicalization in Eastern and Western languages (e.g. Bisang, Koenig, Dong, Meisterernst, Sun, and Xing & Schuessler), and some compare Chinese with or relate it to other Asian languages (e.g. Bisang, Vajda, Peyraube & Wiebusch, Lamarre, and He & Wu). Other contributions are less comparative in nature, focusing more on the typological and grammatical characteristics of pre-Classical Chinese and English (e.g. Takashima). In comparison, Dubenion-Smith's quantitative study takes a different angle from all other chapters by looking into the typological characteristics of postpositioning in German dialects and compares his findings with other related studies of word order variations. His findings, once compared with those of Peyraube and Wiebusch (this volume) and Hawkins (1986, 2018), help us better understand how a new word order has developed in different language types. Based on the results of these studies, we may conclude that inflectional languages (e.g. German) have a more flexible word order than isolating analytical languages (e.g. Chinese).

4 Grammaticalization vs. lexicalization

Another unique feature of this volume is the inclusion of studies that address the processes of both grammaticalization and lexicalization. Of the twelve

contributions, seven chapters deal primarily with the issues of grammaticalization, four focus on the processes and characteristics of lexicalization, one on typological properties of propositioning. Though there are more chapters on grammaticalization than lexicalization, several chapters discuss the interaction and/or similarities between grammaticalization and lexicalization. For instance, Vajda's study explores the grammaticalization of finite verbs in Ket. When he discusses the pathways involved in the development of the polysemies of those verbs, he necessarily touches upon the morphological issues of those lexemes where grammaticalization and lexicalization are clearly intertwined. In the literature, grammaticalization is traditionally defined as a change or process "from a lexical to a grammatical [form] or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical [form]" (Kurylowicz 1975: 52), while lexicalization, although less consistently, is defined as a process of conventionalization (Brinton & Traugott 2005) or as a diachronic process in which a non-word form becomes a word (Dong 2012). Evidently, these characteristics of the two types of processes entail overlapping cases of change. In other words, the question involves, for instance, whether the change from an intransitive meaning to a transitive meaning is a case of grammaticalization or lexicalization or both. Vajda considers the change in the verbs in Ket as both. A similar situation can be observed in the contributions by Dong, Sun, and Xing & Schuessler. In comparison, other studies included in this collection are relatively clear cases of either grammaticalization (e.g. Bisang, Koenig, Peyraube & Wiebusch, Lamarre, and Meisterernst) or lexicalization (e.g. Takashima, He & Wu).

5 Some outcomes

Several conclusions or tentative conclusions can be drawn from the chapters in this volume. Koenig's study of demonstratives in both Eastern and Western languages and Bisang's comparative study of explicitness-based vs. economy-based maturation in grammaticalization support, to a varied degree, the analysis of semantic recession noted earlier. The results of other studies focusing on polysemies in Chinese (e.g. Bisang, Dong, Lamarre, and Sun) appear to be in agreement with the analysis of semantic accretion, which is identified to be associated with isolating languages. However, the case of manner-quality-degree demonstratives in Chinese does not observe the accretion of meanings, due, according to Koenig, to one or several complete renewals of the system in the course of its historical development. It seems to me that the lack of polysemous demonstratives in Chinese is not surprising but rather in alignment with the general tendency of Chinese grammatical forms. We know that Chinese generally does not mark

definiteness (cf. Bisang 1999), and the two basic demonstratives, *zhè* 這 ‘this’ and *nà* 那 ‘that’, as noted in Koenig, have been used as demonstratives since the 8th century AD. However, Fang’s recent study (2012) shows that *zhè* has emerged as a definite article in Beijing Mandarin. This newly developed polysemy of *zhè*, along with its demonstrative function, could be considered evidence of the accretion of meaning (i.e. $A > AB$). Additionally, all other subtypes of Chinese demonstratives (e.g. *zhèyàng* 這樣 vs. *nàyàng* 那樣, *zhème* 這麼 vs. *nàme* 那麼) have developed by compounding or lexicalizing the basic demonstratives with another character expressing manner, quality or degree, a typical process of lexicalization in Chinese (cf. Dong 2012).

It should be noted that Peyraube and Wiebusch’s study about the grammaticalization of the object markers *bǎ/jiāng* 把/將 appears to be a case against the analysis of semantic accretion. Their study, based on a number of investigations done by Chinese grammarians and their own analysis, have concluded that *bǎ/jiāng*’s object marking function in the disposal construction (*chǔzhìshì* 處置式) emerged and replaced other earlier disposal markers (e.g. *yǐ* 以, *qǔ* 取, *chí* 持, *zhuō* 捉) in Early to Late Medieval Chinese (3rd–10th CE). In a general sense, this replacement may be viewed as an instance of linguistic recession. However, it is not a change of semantic recession ($A > AB > B$); rather, it is more a form of (syntactic) recession. As to the semantic change in the process of *bǎ/jiāng*’s grammaticalization, Xing (1994, 2003, and 2013) provides historical evidence to show that *bǎ/jiāng* developed a number of polysemies in the process of their grammaticalization and lexicalization. She sorts *bǎ*’s polysemies into two different clines: 1) ‘to hold’ > ‘to take’ > causative marker > obj. marker, and 2) ‘to hold’ > ‘handful’ > classifier. All of *bǎ*’s polysemies can be found in modern Chinese, serving as either part of a lexicalized compound or a grammatical function, such as a classifier or an object marker. Clearly, this provides evidence for semantic accretion.

But, arguably, the most revolutionary discovery of this collection is Vajda’s study of polysynthetic verbs in the Siberian language Ket. Based on years of fieldwork and study of the morphological structures of Ket, a language heavily influenced by the neighboring suffixal agglutinating languages, he provides many examples to show that though the non-polysemous Ket verb stems can be multiplied, the general trend is for Ket polysynthetic verbs to lose their literal, etymological meaning upon being lexicalized or grammaticalized. That is to say that semantic change in Ket exhibits the cline, $A > B > C$, typologically different from the two explained earlier in that there is no intermediate stage where both meaning A and meaning B coexist. Such a change may be characterized as a change of semantic substitution. This finding leads us to the tentative conclusion that the tendency of semantic change in grammaticalization and lexicalization correlates with the morphological structure of a language.

Although Vajda's finding still needs to be attested in other agglutinative languages, all studies in this collection seem to point to the same conclusion, namely, that language type, specifically pertinent to morphological structures, affects the type of processes in grammaticalization and lexicalization. In other words, we see a three-way correlation: in analytical and isolating languages, such as Chinese, the trend of semantic change in grammaticalization and lexicalization is accretive; in inflectional languages, such as German, the trend is recessive, and in agglutinative languages, such as Ket, the trend is substitutive. These three-way correlations may be further summarized as follows: the more parsimonious the morphological structure of a language, the more polysemous the lexeme may become. Chinese has the most parsimonious morphological structure, therefore it is the most polysemous; Ket has the least parsimonious morphological structure, hence it is the least polysemous.

6 Organization of this volume

This volume is divided into two parts: Part I focuses on grammaticalization and Part II on lexicalization. However, it should be noted that the issues discussed in each part are not mutually exclusive as indicated earlier in Section 4.

In Part I, Bisang's chapter explores whether there is cross-linguistic variation in grammaticalization and whether that variation shows certain regularities. Based on the observation that discourse and pragmatic inference are particularly prominent in the processes of grammaticalization in Chinese (and most mainland Southeast Asian languages) (Xing 2015; Bisang 2015), this study shows that the co-evolution of meaning and form is limited in these languages and, more specifically, their grammaticalization products are characterized by non-obligatoriness and multifunctionality. From a more general perspective, the results of this study are modeled after Bisang (2009, 2015) in the context of two different types of maturation in grammaticalization: economy-based maturation as it dominates in processes of grammaticalization in East and mainland Southeast Asia and explicitness-based maturation as it operates more prominently in English and German. It is argued that hidden complexity scores very high in Chinese and that it does so not only in processes of grammaticalization but also in the lexicon. In fact, it is the comparatively high pragmatic flexibility of lexical items that favors and enhances processes of grammaticalization in Chinese. This study concludes that the similarity of grammaticalization and lexicalization as described by Xing (2015) is a reflection of hidden complexity in Chinese.

Koenig's contribution discusses grammaticalization processes among demonstratives in major European languages and two Asian languages – Chinese and Japanese – with special attention paid to a neglected subclass of demonstratives, viz. those expressing the ontological domains of 'manner', 'quality' and 'degree' (MQD-demonstratives). After presenting a general overview of the processes of grammaticalization typically observable in the notional domain under analysis, a variety of such processes are discussed and compared in the relevant languages. It is shown that there are striking parallels within European languages, on the one hand, and with Japanese, on the other, as far as the extension from the exophoric to the endophoric uses is concerned. The relevant processes, and thus the relevant similarities, are not as clearly observable in Mandarin, arguably due to radical renewals of MQD-demonstratives in the history of that language. In addition, two specific points related to the typical developments of function words (interrogatives, demonstratives), the role of losses and renewals, as well the importance of studying grammaticalization from a comparative perspective, are made in support of the view advocated by Diessel (2006, 2013) contra Heine & Kuteva (2005, 2007). One point is that the subclass of demonstratives under discussion provides further evidence for the assumption that not all grammatical categories and markers derive from members of major lexical classes, such as nouns and verbs. The second point is that the relevant processes also differ from other processes as far as their targets are concerned; they typically establish transphrastic relations, relationships across clauses, rather than strengthening intra-clausal relations between the constituents of a clause.

Dong's chapter focuses on semantic extension from denotative meaning to descriptive meaning in Chinese. Through analysis of historical data, this study has identified two major classes of words – nouns and verbs – that have undergone processes of semantic change. It is shown that some nouns originally denoting a concrete object tend to develop a meaning describing the property of that object and thereby also functioning as an adjective. These two meanings often coexist, with the nominal meaning being denotative and the adjectival meaning being descriptive. Similarly, some verbs originally denoting a concrete activity may gain an adjectival meaning describing the quality related to that activity. She argues that from a cognitive point of view, the semantic shift occurring in verbs is the same or similar to that occurring in nouns, namely from denotative to descriptive. After studying the pathways (metonymy and lexical subjectification) of different cases of semantic change from denotation to description, and comparing Chinese cases with English counterparts, Dong concludes that noun-adjective polysemy and verb-adjective polysemy in Chinese are a result of the lack of morphological markings in word classes in Chinese. Consequently, they are more frequently seen in Chinese than in English.

Peyraube and Wiebusch's contribution focuses on the origin and development of the object markers or prepositions *bǎ/jiāng* in disposal constructions. First, they challenge the following three hypotheses about the origins of the disposal construction: 1) all disposal markers including *bǎ* and *jiāng* are derived from and have replaced *yǐ* 以 through an analogical process; 2) the disposal construction developed from the subject-patient construction (*shòushì zhǔyǔ jù* 受事主語句), to which an object marker has been added, and 3) *qǔ* 取 meaning 'to take' in translated Buddhist texts of Pre-Medieval and Early Medieval Chinese (2nd–5th CE) might be the first attested disposal construction in Chinese, with the argument that disposal constructions were borrowed from the original language (a variety of Indo-Aryan or Indic languages known as Prakrits 普拉克利特語) of these Buddhist documents. Then through analysis of various disposal markers in texts of Medieval Chinese (3rd–13th CE), they conclude that the first hypothesis of an analogical phenomenon with *yǐ*, which might have served as a model for *qǔ* 取, *chí* 持, *zhuō* 捉, *jiāng* 將, and *bǎ* 把 in their grammaticalization, is worth maintaining. The second hypothesis, whereby the disposal construction could have developed from the patient-subject construction to which a differential object marker has been added, is not motivated. Finally, they propose that the joint processes of analogy (with the *yǐ* form) and grammaticalization (Verb > Preposition) play a role in the appearance and development of the 'disposal' construction. Their study also touches upon the issue of whether the 'disposal' form in Chinese can be considered a case of differential object marker (DOM) as modeled in Indo-European languages.

Lamarre's study discusses the encoding in Sinitic of motion-cum-purpose, i.e. 'go and buy food', by identifying two distinct patterns: A: *qù mǎi cài* 去買菜 [go + purpose VP] vs. B: *mǎi cài qu* 買菜去 [purpose VP + go]. Previous studies have shown that dialect specificities are key factors in accounting for the distribution of these patterns. Both A and B are attested nowadays in Standard Mandarin to express motion-cum-purpose 'go (and/to) VP', together with a seemingly redundant "blended" Pattern C: *qù mǎi cài qu* 去買菜去 [go + purpose VP + go]. Patterns A, B and C are attested in the case of venitive motion too, with *lái* (lai) 來. Despite the obvious fact that deictic motion verbs in Pattern B have undergone grammaticalization (as attested, for instance, by their phonetic erosion), only Chao (1968: 479) has analyzed the itive or venitive morphemes in Pattern B as "particles of purpose". The various alternative analyses put forward since then fail to convince. Lamarre argues that Chao's "particles of purpose" need to be assigned to a grammatical category and that associated motion is a plausible candidate. This hypothesis complements Yang (2012)'s claim, supported by historical documents, that the intense contact of Chinese with OV Altaic languages was an important factor in the spread of Northern Pattern B. It raises the issue of a

possible link between associated motion and deictic directionals, an issue under discussion in other linguistic areas.

Xing and Schuessler's collaboration, built on Schuessler (2007), explores the semantic extension involved in the dichotomy of direction, transitivity, and voice in Old Chinese (11th century BCE–3rd century BCE). Through analysis of semantic extension from introvert to extrovert, from nominal to verbal, and from active to passive, this study provides evidence to show that those semantic and grammatical extensions were triggered either by phonological/morphological factors, such as voicing, or by syntagmatic factors, such as word order. They argue that, although semantic extension in these cases underwent some of the same processes of semantic abstraction (e.g. metaphoricalization and metonymization) as those commonly discussed in the literature of grammaticalization, the primary mechanism found in OC semantic extension is semantic reanalysis (cf. Xing 2013).

Meinsterernst's contribution discusses the development of deontic modal markers from typological and morpho-syntactic perspectives. The modal system of Archaic Chinese (11th century BCE – 3rd century BCE) consists mainly of the so-called 'first modals', i.e. modals of possibility, which potentially appear as the first modals in many languages expressing deontic modal values. Modern Chinese by contrast has quite a complex system of modal marking: it starts to develop in the Early Middle Chinese period around the 1st century BCE, when new and more specialized markers of deontic modality emerge. This investigation proposes a connection between the loss of the derivational morphology reconstructed for Archaic Chinese and the development of a more explicit system of modal marking similar to what has been proposed for the Germanic languages.

Dubenion-Smith's contribution presents results of a corpus study of non-clausal postpositioning in modern German dialects, a phenomenon of a constituent not in its expected position in the inner field but in the postfield of the clause to which it is syntactically linked. Taking into consideration that most investigations of postpositioning in modern German examine the spoken and written standard, Dubenion-Smith builds his study on two works (Patocka 1997 and Westphal Fitch 2011) and extends the investigation to more linguistic areas and to the typological characteristics of the phenomenon in those regional dialects, including spoken dialect texts of the Zwirner Corpus (Institut für Deutsche Sprache) from the North Low German, West Central German, and Bavarian linguistic areas. In particular, the empirical focus of this study is base dialects, the most geographically restricted varieties with the greatest linguistic divergence from the standard language. The result of this study shows that prepositional phrases (form) and adjuncts (function) have comprised the vast majority of post-positionings from earlier stages of German, whereas postpositioned NPs have

been drastically reduced over time. Evidence from quantitative analysis suggests that the high rate of postpositioned prepositional phrases (PPs) are possibly attributable to the constituent length of PPs, contact placement, and the attraction principle. The goal of this chapter is to provide an exhaustive typology of postpositionings based on their form and function and to compare the results of this study to earlier studies on this topic.

Part II of the volume starts with Vajda's study of Ket's finite verb structure in its process of lexicalization and grammaticalization. Unrelated to any of the other language families of Northern Asia, the polysynthetic Ket language of Central Siberia displays morphological traits absent from most other Eurasian languages. This study finds that the typical cline of semantic change affecting morpheme classes in the Ket verb template is $A > B > C$, with no evidence that old and new meanings coexisted in the language for any length of time. This pattern contrasts with that typically found in Western Eurasian languages, where the cline is generally known to be $A > AB > B$ (Heine, Claudi, Hünemeyer 1991; Hopper & Traugott 2003), and also differs from that observed in East Asia's isolating languages, where it has been argued to be $A > AB > ABC$ (Xing 2015). An examination of Ket polysynthesis, lexicalization, and grammaticalization, therefore, strengthens the hypothesis that the varieties of semantic change prevalent in a language depend, at least in part, on its typological profile and formal morphological complexity.

Takashima's contribution investigates the grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic functions of verbs in the Shang Oracle Bone Inscriptions (OBI) (13th–11th Century BCE). He first classifies the earliest class of action verbs into two types: those of actions executable or controlled by humans (e.g., “We make a sacrificial offering of pigs to such and such an ancestor.”) and those of actions not executable or controlled by humans (e.g., literal translation “The moon had an eclipse.”). He then shows that this lexical feature not only complements the traditional theory of verb class, but also correlates with the use of negative markers, such as *bù* 不, *fú* 弗, *wú* 毋, and *wù* 勿, as well as the negative copula *fēi* 非 and the so-called modal particle *qí* 其. According to him, the categorical distinction of controllable vs. uncontrollable verbs may well be a linguistic manifestation of the Shang worldview which held that actions and events were divided into two realms of reality: those believed to be amenable to control and those – usually of states or events – believed to be not amenable to control. He argues that failure to distinguish between the two can seriously affect how we interpret the inscriptions to which such a categorical distinction and the concurrent behavior of the negatives and the *qí* 其 would certainly have applied during the late Shang dynasty.

Sun's study proposes that Chinese gradable adjectives that lexicalize a non-specific degree meaning are typologically different from English adjectives.

He provides synchronic evidence to show that, for gradable adjectives (e.g. *gāo* 高 ‘tall/high’, *gānjìng* 乾净 ‘clean’) to convey a non-specific degree meaning (e.g. *gāoxìng* 高興 ‘tall/high happy’ > ‘very happy’, *gāngān jìngjìng* 乾乾淨净 ‘clean clean’ > ‘very clean’), the co-occurrence of an appropriate context with a fitting degree word in the construction of an adjectival phrase signaling a specific degree is required. He argues that while gradable adjectives are lexically non-specific in terms of degree, closed-scale meanings entailing maximal or minimal degrees are expressed through de-adjectival verbs (e.g. *mǎnle* 滿了 ‘full ASP’ > ‘become full’; *kōngle* 空了 ‘empty ASP’ > ‘become empty’) or denoted in adjectival negation (e.g. *bù mǎn* 不滿 ‘not full’; *bù kōng* 不空 ‘not empty’). Sun concludes that there is no absolute adjective in Chinese, as non-specific degree is part of the conventional meaning of all Chinese positive gradable adjectives. The Chinese adjectival system is, therefore, typologically different from English.

He and Wu’s collaboration discusses compounding word formation in Ahou Gelao. As one member of the Kra branch of the Tai-Kadai family, Ahou Gelao is an analytic and tonal language. Typologically, it manifests SVO constituent order and a head-initial pattern in nominal phrases. Within the nominal phrase, all modifiers except numerals follow the modified head, with demonstratives coming last. This is just the opposite of Chinese. Even though Ahou Gelao is genetically unrelated to Chinese, it displays similarities with Chinese in quite a few ways due to areal diffusion, with compounding being one of the similar properties. Specifically, compounding serves as a major morphological process in the two languages. From a typological point of view, this chapter provides a brief survey of the compounding processes in Ahou Gelao, touching upon (1) the behaviors and properties that help distinguish compounds from phrases; (2) the syntactic and semantic relations of their constituents, and (3) compounding in different word classes. In addition, a brief introduction is provided to the lexicalization in the compounding process, especially the motivation, mechanism, degree, possibility of and the constraints on the lexicalization of phrases or syntactic constructions into compounds. Meanwhile, special references are made to the lexicalization and other properties of the compounding process in Mandarin Chinese throughout the chapter where applicable, intending to help readers have a better understanding of the compounding process in the Gelao language and Mandarin Chinese as well as other languages in the area.

To conclude, this volume gathers contributions from researchers who have pioneered and/or shaped various theoretical frameworks related to grammaticalization and lexicalization in both the East and the West. By doing so, it aims to provide some new perspectives on the typological characteristics of grammaticalization and lexicalization in Asian and Indo-European languages.

References

- Bisang, Walter. 1999. Classifiers in East and Southeast Asian languages: Counting and beyond. In *Numeral Types and Changes Worldwide*, Jadranka Gvozdanovic (ed.), 113–185. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bisang, Walter. 2009. On the evolution of complexity – sometimes less is more in East and mainland Southeast Asia. In *Language Complexity as an Evolving Variable*, Geoffrey Sampson, David Gil, and Peter Trudgill (eds.), 34–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bisang, Walter. 2015. Hidden complexity – the neglected side of complexity and its consequences. *Linguistics Vanguard* ISSN (Online), 2199–174X, DOI: 10.1515/linvan-2014–1014.
- Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. (Research Surveys in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17 (4): 463–489.
- Diessel, Holger. 2013. Where does language come from? Some reflections on the role of deictic gesture and demonstratives in the evolution of language. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5.2–3: 239–249.
- Dong, Xiufang. 2012. Lexicalization in the history of the Chinese language. In Xing (ed.) *Newest Trends in Studies of Grammaticalization and Lexicalization*, 235–274. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fang, Mei. 2012. The emergence of a definite article in Beijing Mandarin. The evolution of the proximal demonstrative *zhè*. In *Newest Trends in the Study of Grammaticalization and Lexicalization in Chinese*, Janet Xing (ed.), 55–85. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hawkins, John A. 1986. *A comparative typology of English and German: Unifying the contrast*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hawkins, John A. 2018. Word-external properties in a typology of Modern English: A comparison with German. *English Language and Linguistics*, 1–27.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar: A Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurylowics, Jerzy. 1975. The evolution of grammatical categories. In *Esquisses Linguistiques II*, 38–54. Munich: Fink.
- Patocka, Franz. 1997. *Satzgliedstellung in den bairischen Dialekten Österreichs*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Schuessler, Axel. 2007. *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press.
- Westphal Fitch, Gesche. 2011. Changes in frequency as a measure of language change: Extraposition in Pennsylvania German. In *Studies on German-language islands*, Michael Putnam (ed.), 371–384. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Xing, Janet Z. 1994. Diachronic change of object markers in Chinese. *Language Variation and Change*, Vol. 6: 201–222.
- Xing, Janet Z. 2003. Grammaticalization of verbs in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 31: 1, 101–144.
- Xing, Janet Z. 2012. Introduction. In Xing (ed.) *Newest Trends in Studies of Grammaticalization and Lexicalization*, 1–20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Xing, Janet Z. 2013. Semantic reanalysis in grammaticalization in Chinese. In Zhuo Jing-Schmidt (ed.) *Increased Empiricism: New Advances in Chinese Linguistics*, 223–246. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Xing, Janet Z. 2015. A comparative study of semantic change in grammaticalization and lexicalization in Chinese and Germanic languages. *Studies in Language* 39(3), 594–634.
- Yáng, Yǒnglóng. 楊永龍 2012. Mùdì gòushì“VP qu” yǔ SOV yǔxù de guānlián [The purpose construction “VP qu” in Chinese and SOV order]. *Zhōngguó Yǔwén* [Chinese Language] 6: 525–536.



Part I: **Grammaticalization**

Walter Bisang

Grammaticalization in Chinese – A cross-linguistic perspective

1 Setting the stage: Is grammaticalization a cross-linguistically homogeneous phenomenon?

Typologically-oriented research on grammaticalization is usually focused on cross-linguistic generalizations and universal tendencies in the diachronic development of grammatical markers. This type of research has brought to light an impressive number of grammaticalization pathways or clines (Heine & Kuteva 2002) such as the following:

(1) Givón (1979: 209):

Discourse > Syntax > Morphology > Morphophonemics > Zero

This cline is prominent in research on grammaticalization. It describes the different levels through which grammatical markers develop across time. What used to be a topic at the level of discourse may become a subject at the level of syntax at a later stage. From there, it may further develop into a morphological pattern, a morphophonemic element and ultimately a zero marker. Clines of this type are characterized by a number of properties that are claimed to be universal (Bisang 2016, 2017). They are realized in stages (cyclicity) with the individual stages following a fixed order and they are not reversible (the reversed order of “Morphology > Syntax” in (1) is not possible (cf. Newmeyer 1998, Norde 2009 on unidirectionality). Moreover, there are claims that the source concept determines the outcome of further processes of grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002) and that processes of grammaticalization are gradual (Traugott & Trousdale 2010). The gradualness of grammaticalization processes manifests itself in the fact that a linguistic sign can have both meanings at a certain historical stage, its source meaning A and its target meaning B (Heine et al. 1991, also cf. Hopper 1991 on “layering”). Thus, the extension from meaning A to meaning B is characterized by an intermediate stage in which both interpretations are possible – a fact that can be formalized as follows: $A > A, B > B$.¹ Finally, there

¹ I follow Xing’s (2015: 595) notation.

is the claim that the semantic change of a linguistic sign from a more concrete meaning to a more abstract grammatical function is also reflected in its form. If this assumption of the coevolution of meaning and form is correct, a linguistic sign loses its syntactic flexibility and its morphophonological substance along a cline like the one in (1).

In contrast to the extensive literature on universals and generalizations, the question of cross-linguistic variation in grammaticalization is rarely asked. The present study takes up this topic. It focuses on the observation from Chinese that the coevolution of meaning and form is reduced and that pragmatic inference remains important even if a linguistic sign has undergone grammaticalization (Bisang 2004, 2015b on Sinitic and other East and mainland Southeast Asian languages). The properties that characterize a large number of grammaticalized forms in Sinitic are the lack of obligatoriness and the presence of multifunctionality. This is illustrated in Section 2 with examples from the perfective marker *-le*, the multifunctionality of ‘give’-verbs and the use of classifiers to express the two functions of definiteness and indefiniteness with a single marker. Similar phenomena are described by Xing (2013, 2015) under the term of “semantic reanalysis”. Xing also emphasizes the relevance of pragmatics in its interaction with the syntagmatic properties of a language.

In Section 3, the lack of obligatoriness and multifunctionality is ascribed to a type of diachronic maturation that is based on economy and the concomitant pragmatic inference of the relevant value of a grammatical category in a given context. This notion of maturation differs from Dahl’s (2004) type of maturation, which is argued to be based on explicitness, i.e., the overt expression of values of grammatical categories even in situations in which their semantic content can be clearly inferred from context. It is assumed that products of grammaticalization are the results of a competition between economy-based and explicitness-based maturation in each language (Bisang 2015a, b; also cf. Haiman 1983 on competing motivations).

If economy-based maturation wins over explicitness-based maturation in a lot of individual cases, this may entail a number of further consequences for the structural properties of these languages. Two of them are discussed in this paper. The first one is concerned with the division of labor between grammar and the lexicon and its effects on grammaticalization and lexicalization, respectively. As is shown in Section 4 with examples using the Chinese perfective marker *-le* and the marking of (in)definiteness by numeral classifiers, some of the functions expressed by grammatical markers in languages with more extensive explicitness-based maturation is taken over by the lexicon in Sinitic (and other East and mainland Southeast Asian languages).

The second consequence of more extensive economy-based maturation has to do with the properties of morphological paradigms that arise in such environments. Section 5 starts with the argument of economy and discusses the factors that blocked the development of explicitness-based maturation in Sinitic to the extent that economy-based maturation and the reduced coevolution of meaning and form remained dominant for some 2,000 years. Based on that, it will be claimed that inflectional morphological paradigms that develop out of environments of economy-based maturation preserve certain pragmatics-related properties and therefore constitute a special type of “East and mainland Southeast Asian inflectional morphological paradigm.” The argument of explicitness will focus on semantic reanalysis as defined by Xing (2015). It will show that semantic reanalysis is not limited to the absence of morphology in a linguistic sign and that morphology that is the result of extensive explicitness-based maturation creates new options for it.

2 Properties of grammaticalization in Chinese: Reduced coevolution of meaning and form and the high relevance of pragmatic inference

The assumption that there is coevolution of meaning and form in processes of grammaticalization is not only reflected in Givón’s (1979) cline in (1); it goes right back to Meillet (1912), who introduced the term “grammaticalization”. In his description of the development of auxiliaries out of lexical verbs, he states that “the weakening of the meaning and the weakening of the form of the auxiliary word go hand-in-hand”² (Meillet 1912: 139). Later on, this assumption seemed to be more or less taken for granted. In some publications, as for instance in Bybee et al. (1994), this issue is addressed explicitly:

It therefore seems natural to look for a direct, and even causal, link between semantic and phonetic reduction in the evolution of grammatical material, beginning with the earliest stages of development from lexical sources and continuing throughout the subsequent developments grams undergo. Our hypothesis is that the development of grammatical material is characterized by the dynamic coevolution of meaning and form.

(Bybee et al. 1994: 20)

² The translation from French is mine (W. B). The original version runs as follows: “L’affaiblissement du sens et l’affaiblissement de la forme des mots accessoires vont de pair” (Meillet 1912: 139).

The coevolution of meaning and form is also part of Lehmann's (1995) conceptualization of grammaticalization in terms of the autonomy of the linguistic sign. In his view, grammaticalization goes with the loss of autonomy:

[T]he more freedom with which a sign is used, the more autonomous it is. Therefore, the autonomy of a sign is converse to its grammaticality, and grammaticalization detracts from its autonomy. Consequently, if we want to measure the degree to which a sign is grammaticalized, we will determine its degree of autonomy. (Lehmann 1995: 121–122)

The autonomy of the linguistic sign can be determined by Lehmann's (1995) six parameters of grammaticalization, i.e. the criteria of weight, cohesion and variability with their paradigmatic and their syntagmatic sides. Since these parameters are well-known, they will not be extensively discussed in this chapter. What is important, however, is that only one of them, syntagmatic variability (order of linguistic signs, rigidity of word order), shows strong covariation between meaning and form in grammaticalization processes in Chinese. The other parameters are of reduced importance in most cases. The parameter of integrity (paradigmatic weight) is briefly discussed for the purpose of illustration (for more information, cf. Bisang 2008, 2015b). Further below, paradigmatic variability will be discussed in the context of obligatoriness and pragmatic inference.

A linguistic sign needs a certain amount of substance, a certain, integrity, in order to maintain its autonomy (Lehmann 1995). At the level of semantics, reduction of integrity is associated with the loss of concrete meaning, or desemanticization, while the form-related side of reduction manifests itself in the loss of phonetic substance, or attrition. As can be seen from the cline in (1), the combination of desemanticization and attrition ultimately ends in a zero-marking, i.e., the total absence of phonetic substance combined with a highly abstract grammatical meaning. In Chinese, phonetic reduction mostly stops at a much earlier level of phonetic reduction. In the vast majority of cases, grammaticalized markers do not lose their syllabicity. They often lose their tone, as for instance in the case of the experiential marker 過 *-guo* (derived from the verb *guò* 'go through, pass, cross') or the general classifier 個 *ge* (derived from 箇 *gè* 'bamboo tree'). Even in the case of aspect suffixes like the durative marker *-zhe* (derived from the verb 著 *zháo* 'touch, contact') or the perfective marker *-le* (derived from the verb 了 *liǎo* 'complete, finish'), the loss of phonetic substance rarely affects the syllabicity of a linguistic sign in Mandarin Chinese. One of the rare examples is the plural marker *-men* in combination with personal pronouns. Thus, the pronoun of the third person plural 他們 *tā-men* [3-PL] can be pronounced as [ta:m] in rapid speech. Another good example is the frozen tone on the numeral *yi* 'one' in contexts in which the classifier in *yi ge* [one CL] gets lost in spoken Mandarin (Tao 2006).

A corollary of the coevolution of meaning and form is the development from pragmatic inference to semantic meaning or conventionalization (cf. e.g. Hopper & Traugott 2003). Thus, pragmatic inference is generally assumed to be the driving force that initiates and motivates processes of grammaticalization and loses its relevance once a new meaning has been established.³ Even though this scenario works with many languages, it does not reflect grammaticalization processes equally well cross-linguistically. A look at Chinese (and many other East and mainland Southeast Asian languages) reveals that pragmatic inference remains high even with grammaticalized linguistic signs (Bisang 2008, 2009, 2015b). This is clearly shown by Xing's (2013, 2015) analysis of Chinese in terms of semantic reanalysis, defined as a "syntagmatic process involving semantic interpretation based on contextual, pragmatic, and encyclopedic knowledge" (Xing 2015: 624). As a consequence, grammaticalization does not necessarily follow the cline of $A > A, B > B$ (cf. Section 1) but rather a cline of the type $A > A, B > A, B, C$, in which a new function is added to the already existing functions A and B. As Xing (2015: 595) points out, such processes favor the "accretion of more meaning over time" (Xing 2015: 595).

The relevance of pragmatic inference in Chinese products of grammaticalization shows up in two properties of markers that express grammatical categories, i.e. the lack of obligatoriness and the presence of multifunctionality. Each of them will be illustrated in the remainder of this Section.

The definition of obligatoriness adopted here follows Lehmann's (1995: 139) paradigm-based view. A grammatical marker is obligatory if a language has a set of markers for expressing values of a given grammatical category and the speaker has to select one of these values in a given syntactic environment. Thus, tense marking is obligatory if the grammar forces the speaker to use a past or non-past marker in an independent declarative clause of a language with a binary tense system of that type.

The absence of grammatical information that can be retrieved from context by pragmatic inference is found in multiple domains of Chinese grammar. A famous instance is radical pro-drop (Huang 1984, Neeleman & Szendrői 2007, Bisang 2014, and many others). In this case, arguments can be omitted without concomitant agreement on the verb. Another example is aspect marking. As is well-known, Chinese has aspect markers like *-le* (perfective), *-zhe* (durative), and *-guo* (experiential) but these markers are not obligatory. While the grammar of languages with obligatory aspect marking forces its speakers to use the perfective

³ Cf. the scenarios presented by the Invited Inference Theory (Traugott 2002) or Heine (2002) and Diewald & Smirnova (2012).

aspect in sequences of events, the use of the Chinese aspect marker *-le* (Li & Thompson 1981: 185–217, Smith 1997: 1997, Xiao & McEnery 2004, and many others) is not compulsory, as is illustrated by the following example:

- (2) Chinese (Li 2014: 142, adopted from Chu 1998)

華老栓忽然坐起身，擦著火柴，點上遍身油膩的燈盞，茶館的兩間屋子裏，便彌漫了清白的光。

Huá Lǎoshuān hūrán zuò-qǐ ∅ shēn, cā-zháo huǒchái,
 Hua Laoshan suddenly sit-move.up body strike-burn match
diǎn-shàng ∅ biànshēn yóunì de dēngzhǎn, chágǔǎn de
 light-move.up allover grease MOD lamp teahouse MOD
liǎng jiān wūzi lǐ, biàn mí-mǎn-le qīngbái de guāng.
 two CL room-LOC then fill-full-PFV blue.white MOD light
 ‘Hua Laoshan suddenly sat up [in bed], struck a match, lit the grease-covered oil lamp, and then a ghostly light filled the two rooms of the teahouse.’

The above example presents four events (‘sit up’, ‘strike a match’, ‘light an oil lamp’, and ‘fill a room with light’), each of which reaches its terminal boundary. Even though this is a clear instance of event sequentialisation, only the last event is marked by *-le*, while the previous three events remain unmarked.⁴ As will be explained in Section 4, the use of the classifier *-le* depends on discourse (Li 2014).

Multifunctionality is the other property that reflects the high importance of pragmatic inference in Chinese. A grammatical marker is multifunctional if it combines functions from more than one grammatical domain or if it covers grammatical functions from a single domain that represent different values (Bisang 2015a, b). If such a marker occurs in an utterance, its relevant function must be derived either from the construction in which it occurs or from general context. Xing (2015) discusses many examples of multifunctional markers in Chinese. The present study will additionally present the multifunctionality of ‘give’-verbs and of classifiers expressing definiteness as well as indefiniteness. The former example stands for multifunctionality across more than one grammatical domain, the latter illustrates how one and the same marker can express two values within a single domain (referential status).

The multifunctionality of ‘give’-verbs is well-known in East and mainland Southeast Asian languages (Bisang 1996, Song 1997, Lord et al. 2002, Rangkupan 2007, Thepkanjana & Uehara 2008 and many others). In Sinitic, ‘give’-verbs and

⁴ The ∅ sign in (2) only indicates the absence of information. It does not indicate a zero marking.

their functional range are discussed by Chappell & Peyraube (2006) and Peyraube (2015). The main functions of these verbs in Chinese are:

- Preposition: Marker of dative/benefactive
- Causative marker
- Passive marker

Each of these functions is associated with a specific construction. While many linguists use the term “coverbs” to describe verbs of an adpositional function (Li & Thompson 1981: 356–369), this study follows Paul (2015: 55–92), who convincingly argues that there is a category of prepositions in Chinese that is clearly different from verbs. The default position of PPs is preverbal (3a), some PPs, among them the ones headed by *gěi* ‘give’, can also occur postverbally (3b).

(3) Chinese (Wiedenhof 2015: 136)

a. 我給他寫信。

wǒ gěi tā xiě xìn.

1.SG P:give 3.SG write letter

(i) ‘I’m writing him a letter.’

(ii) ‘I am writing a letter for him.’

b. 我寫信給他。

wǒ xiě xìn gěi tā.

1.SG write letter P:give 3.SG

‘I am writing a letter to him.’

The following examples illustrate the causative construction with its structure [SBJ CAUS NP_{Causee} V] in (4) and the passive construction with its structure [SBJ_{Patient} PASS_{gei} NP_{Agent} V] in (5):

(4) Chinese causative with *gěi* ‘give’

請你給他休息幾天。

qǐng nǐ gěi tā xiūxi jǐ tiān.

please 2.SG CAUS 3.SG rest a.few Day

‘Please, let him rest for a few days.’

(5) Chinese passive with *gěi* ‘give’ (Chao 1968: 331)

你眼睛怎麼了？給人打了一拳頭。

nǐ yǎnjīng zěnmē le? gěi rén dǎ-le yī juàn tóu.

2.SG eye how PF PASS man hit-PFV one fist

‘What’s the matter with your eye? It was given a blow by someone’s fist.’

Even though each function is part of a specific construction, the possibility of not marking arguments or grammatical categories may create surface structures in which the ‘give’-verb can be associated with more than one construction (also cf. Bisang 2015b: 137–139 for a similar situation in Khmer). In example (6), the ‘give’-verb can be analysed either as a causative marker or as a preposition (even though the prepositional interpretation is less likely). Similarly, *gěi* ‘give’ in example (7) can be interpreted either as a preposition or a passive marker.

(6) Chinese (Wiedenhof 2015: 148)

請你給我喫點安眠藥。

qǐng nǐ gěi wǒ chī diǎn ānmiányào.

please 2.SG GIVE 1.SG eat some sleeping.pill

(i) Causative: ‘Please let me take some sleeping pills.’

(ii) Preposition: ‘Please, take some sleeping pills for me.’

(7) Chinese (Wiedenhof 2015: 148)

安眠藥給他喫了。

ānmiányào gěi tā chī-le.

sleeping.pill GIVE 3.SG eat-PFV

(i) Preposition: ‘The sleeping pills, [he] took them for him.’

(ii) Passive: ‘The sleeping pills were taken by him.’

The type of multiple analyses illustrated in the above two examples can not only be seen as a synchronic fact, it can also be seen as a driving force in processes of grammaticalization (Bisang 2015b). A given linguistic sign may occur in a situation in which the grammatical structure of a language allows analysis of it in light of another construction, which provides it with a new meaning that may then be diffused within a speech community if this situation comes up frequently enough.

The function of numeral classifiers is not limited to individuation (Greenberg 1972) or atomization (Chierchia 1998) in the context of quantification; it also extends to definiteness and indefiniteness in various Sinitic languages (Cheng & Sybesma 1999, Simpson 2005, 2017, Li & Bisang 2012, Jiang 2015, Wu 2017) and other languages of East and mainland Southeast Asia (Bisang 1999, Gerner & Bisang 2008, Simpson et al. 2011). An important construction for expressing (in) definiteness is the bare-noun construction or [CL-N] construction.⁵ While this

⁵ The other important construction is [DEM CL N]. Wu (2017) points out that this construction is ultimately more important in Sinitic.

construction is limited to indefiniteness in the postverbal construction in Standard Chinese (8a), its functional range is broader in other Sinitic languages. In the Fuyang variety of Wu Chinese, it marks definiteness preverbally and indefiniteness postverbally (8b). In Cantonese, it marks definiteness preverbally, while it can express indefiniteness or definiteness postverbally (8c):

(8) The classifier in [CL N] (Li & Bisang 2012: 336)

a. Mandarin Chinese

(*ge) *lǎobǎn mǎi- le liàng chē.*

CL boss buy PFV CL car

‘The boss bought a car.’

b. Wu dialect of Fuyang

kɿ *lɔpan ma lə bu ts^hots^hi.*

CL boss buy PFV CL car

‘The boss bought a car.’

c. Cantonese

go *louban maai-zo ga ce.*

CL boss buy-PFV CL car

‘The boss bought a/the car.’

In the above examples, the referential status expressed by the classifier in [CL-N] depends on word order. As Wang’s (2013) typology of [CL N] constructions in 115 Sinitic languages, shows (cf. Table 1), this is not always necessarily the case. In his Type I, the classifier can express definiteness as well as indefiniteness irrespective of word order. Similarly, in Type V, in which the [CL N] construction is

Table 1: Types of (in)definiteness marking in Sinitic (based on Wang 2013).

Type	Functions in preverbal position		Functions in postverbal position		Number of Languages
I	Def	Indef	Def	Indef	10
II	Def	Indef		Indef	2
III	Def		Def	Indef	9
IV	Def			Indef	2
V	–		Def	Indef	1
VI	–		–		6
VII	–			Indef	85

limited to the postverbal position, it can mark both functions. Thus, in eleven (ten from Type I and one from Type V) out of 115 Sinitic languages, word order has no effect on the (in)definiteness interpretation of the classifier.

The multifunctionality of the classifier as a marker of definiteness and indefiniteness shows up in 24 languages that range from Types I to V. Given the total of 115 languages, the classifier is multifunctional in 21% of the Sinitic languages analyzed by Wang (2013). Type I is found across various subfamilies of Sinitic (Jiangwu Mandarin, Hui, Wu, Xiang, Hakka, Pinghua, Min, Gan), while Type V is found only in the Shangyao (上堯) variety of the Pinghua subfamily in Nanning (Wang 2013: 387). The six languages in which the classifier is not involved in marking referential status (Type VI) are all from the Min family. Type VII, the most frequent type, reflects the situation in Standard Chinese (cf. example (8a)).

In addition to multifunctionality, numeral classifiers are not obligatory as markers of (in)definiteness. Even though more research is needed on this topic, the case of Weining Ahmao (the Hmong-Mien language spoken in Guizhou Province) will be discussed here briefly. This language has even developed a fully-fledged morphological paradigm for classifiers (Wang Fushi's 1957 excellent study; Gerner & Bisang 2008), which combines the categories of number (singular vs. plural), referential status (definite vs. indefinite) and size (augmentative, medial, small). As will be discussed in Section 5, this paradigm shows consistent reduction of the autonomy of the linguistic sign in terms of several of Lehmann's (1995) parameters and may thus be seen as a good example of the coevolution of meaning and form in a language of East and mainland Southeast Asia. In spite of this, (in)definite marking is not obligatory and thus deviates in an important way from the general expectation associated with high degrees of grammaticalization.

The following text in (9) from Wang Fushi (1957: 107–109) illustrates how (in)definiteness is marked in a narrative.⁶ The story is about a man who walks through the jungle with a basket of hats. When he falls asleep, the monkeys come and steal them. As soon he becomes aware of this, he gets angry and tries to get his hats back from the monkeys who mock him from the trees. At the end of the story, he gets so furious that he throws his own hat onto the ground. The monkeys imitate him and this is how he ultimately gets his hats back. In this story, the animate protagonists, i.e. the man and the monkeys, are always marked for (in)definiteness, while backgrounded nominal concepts often remain unmarked. The hats, which may be seen as inanimate “protagonists” that remain important

⁶ There are not that many published texts available. For some other texts, cf. Wang Deguang (1986).

throughout the story, are generally marked for (in)definiteness with one exception (cf. (9c) below).

The story begins with the passage in (9a). As one can see in line 1, the protagonist *tu*⁵⁵ *nu*⁵⁵ ‘human being, man, woman’ is introduced by the numeral *i*⁵⁵ ‘one’ followed by the classifier in its medium-size indefinite form.⁷ Later, the protagonist always occurs with the classifier in its definite form (cf. lines 5 and 7 in (9b) below). Moreover, the protagonist is marked by the medium-size indefinite form (*lae*³⁵) at his/her first mention for expressing that s/he is of average size (on the gender of this noun, cf. below). The second noun of interest in (9a) is ‘hats’, which is marked as indefinite by the numeral *i*⁵⁵ ‘one’ in line 2. This time, however, indefiniteness is marked only by the numeral, because the container noun *g’æy*³¹ ‘basket’ cannot be inflected for (in)definiteness. Finally, the backgrounded noun *tau*⁵⁵ ‘hill’ is unmarked (9b).

(9) a. Weining Ahmao (Wang Fushi 1957: 107)

*m’a*³⁵ *i*⁵⁵ *g’au*³⁵ *i*⁵⁵ *lae*³⁵ *tu*⁵⁵ *nu*⁵⁵ *tɿ*¹¹
 there.is one time one CL:MED:INDEF:SG Man carry.on.back
*i*⁵⁵ *n’ie* *g’æy*³¹ *kau*¹¹ *tɕ’au*³³ *v’æ*³¹ *i*⁵⁵ *lu*⁵⁵ *tau*⁵⁵.
 one big basket hat pass place one CL⁸ hill
 ‘Once upon a time, a man who carried a big basket of hats on his back
 was passing a hill.’

The passage in (9b) illustrates how other backgrounded concepts remain unmarked. Thus, *tɕa*³³ ‘wind’ and *nau*³³ *nau*^{53/31} ‘birds’ occur as bare nouns. The only exception is *hnu*⁵⁵ ‘sun’ (lines 6 and 9), whose occurrence with the classifier may be due to its uniqueness.⁹ This passage also illustrates the pervasive definiteness marking of the noun *tu*⁵⁵ *nu*⁵⁵ ‘man’ (lines 3 and 6). As one can see additionally, the man is now marked by a different classifier, i.e., *tsɿ*⁵⁵ in its medium-size definite form of *tsae*⁵⁵. This classifier, which is called an auxiliary classifier by Wang Fushi (1957), specifically serves for marking male gender. Thus, *lae*³⁵ *tu*⁵⁵ *nu*⁵⁵ [CL:MED:INDEF:SG human] in line 1 of (9a) is gender-neutral and so it can mean either ‘a man’ or ‘a woman’. With the use of the auxiliary classifier in *tsae*⁵⁵ *tu*⁵⁵ *nu*⁵⁵ [CL_{aux}:MED:DEF:SG human], the gender of the noun is specified as male.

⁷ The selection of the medium-size form indicates that the man was supposed to be of about average size, maybe also that he had no particular social status.

⁸ Here, Wang Fushi (1957) uses the augmentative form of the classifier. In his description from 1957, there is no definite/indefinite distinction in the augmentative form (but cf. Section 5).

⁹ I do not have enough data to comment on whether or to what extent the definite classifier is obligatory with unique nouns like *hnu*⁵⁵ ‘sun’.